```
1
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                      EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
 3
     IN RE: CHINESE-MANUFACTURED)
 4
    DRYWALL PRODUCTS
    LIABILITY
                                )
 5
    LITIGATION
                                ) CIVIL DOCKET NO. 09-MD-2047-EEF-JCW
 6
                                ) SECTION "L"
                                ) NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
 7
                                ) THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012
                                ) 9:00 A.M.
 8
    THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
    ROBERT C. PATE, AS
    TRUSTEE FOR THE CHINESE
10
    DRYWALL TRUST
11
    VS.
12
    AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL
    SPECIALTY LINES INSURANCE
13
    COMPANY, FCCI COMMERCIAL
     INSURANCE COMPANY, FCCI
    INSURANCE COMPANY, ET AL
14
15
    2:09-CV-07791 (E.D. LA.)
     *******
16
               TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
17
18
               HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON
19
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
2.1
    OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:
                                     SUSAN A. ZIELIE, RPR, FCRR
                                     United States District Court
22
                                     Eastern District of Louisiana
                                     500 Poydras Street, Room HB406
23
                                     New Orleans, La 70130
                                     susan zielie@laed.uscourts.gov
                                     504.589.7781
2.4
    Proceedings Recorded By Mechanical Stenography. Transcript
25
     Produced By Computer Aided Transcription.
```

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	For the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee:	HERMAN HERMAN KATZ & COTLAR
4		BY: RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQ. BY: LEONARD A. DAVIS, ESQ.
5		820 O'Keefe Avenue New Orleans LA 70113
6		504.581.4892 rwestenfeld@hhk.com
7		LEMMON LAW FIRM
8		BY: ANDREW LEMMON, ESQ. 650 Poydras Street Suite 2335
9		New Orleans LA 70130
10		504.581.5644 andrew@lemmonlawfirm.com
11	For the Plaintiffs:	LEVIN, FISHBEIN, SEDRAN & BERMAN
12		BY: ARNOLD LEVIN, ESQ. 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500
13		Philadelphia PA 19106 877.882.1011
14		alevin@lfsblaw.com
15	For the Defendant:	Frilot, LLC
16		BY: KERRY J. MILLER, ESQ. Energy Centre
17		1100 Poydras Street Suite 3700
18		New Orleans LA 70163 504.599.8000
19		kmiller@frilot.com
20	For Defendant Knauf:	KAYE SCHOLER
21		BY: STEVEN GLICKSTEIN, ESQ. 425 Park Avenue
22		New York NY 10022-3598 212.836.8000
23		sglickstein@kayescholer.com
24		
25		

1		
1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	For Insurer Steering Committee:	BARRIOS, KINGSDORF & CASTEIX BRUCE KINGSDORF, ESQ.
4		701 Poydras Street Suite 3600
5		New Orleans LA 70163 504.524.3300
6		bkingsdorf@bkc-law.com
7	For Home Builders:	STONE PIGMAN
8	101 1101110 1411140101	BY: DOROTHY H. WIMBERLY, ESQ. 546 Carondelet Street
9		New Orleans LA 70130 504.593.0849
10		dwimberly@stonepigman.com
11	For North River:	THOMPSON COE
12		BY: KEVIN RISLEY, ESQ. One Riverway
13		Suite 1600 Houston TX 77056
14		713.403.8295 krisley@thompsoncoe.com
15		
16		
17	Also Present:	DANIEL J. BALHOFF, ESQ.
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA; THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012
 1
 2
                                 9:00 A.M.
 3
              THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
              THE CLERK: MDL 2047, in re: Chinese Manufactured
 4
 5
     Drywall Products liability litigation.
 6
              THE COURT: Counsel make their appearances for the
 7
     record, please.
              MR. MILLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Kerry Miller on
 8
 9
    behalf of the Defense Steering Committee.
10
              MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, good morning,
     Judge Fallon. Russ Herman for the Plaintiff's Steering
11
12
     Committee.
13
              THE COURT: Please use the microphones. We have
14
     several hundred people on the phone.
15
                   I met with liaison and lead counsel a moment ago
16
     to discuss the agenda with them. I'll take it in the following
17
    order.
                   Pretrial orders, anything on that?
18
              MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, under item No. 1, there's
19
20
     nothing new.
21
              THE COURT: I know we have an order of preservation of
22
    evidence that was entered just recently.
23
                   Any state court trial settings that we need to
24
    talk about?
25
              MR. HERMAN: Dawn isn't here but, her partner is here
```

to advise the Court.

MR. KINGSDORF: Bruce Kingsdorf, Your Honor, appearing on behalf of Ms. Barrios.

All of the state court trial settings remain the same as stated in the joint report except for one. At the bottom of page 5, the California setting, the Monks case, the case has been settled at mediation. There is a hearing before the Court on March the 5th to iron out a few details. And it's expected at that time to be taken off the Court's docket for an April trial.

THE COURT: I do appreciate all of the help that the state courts have given to us in this matter, and I hope we haven't inconvenienced their dockets by asking them to move their cases the several times that I've had to do that. And I do appreciate their cooperation. It's been a great help to this aspect of the case.

MR. KINGSDORF: Thank you, Your Honor.

I'd also not that there are no cases past conditional transfer order No. 25, there are no additional remands. And I do have disks to present to the Court as to the current status.

THE COURT: Good, okay. Well, thank you very much.

MR. KINGSDORF: I have one for Mr. Miller also.

THE COURT: Good.

Anything on insurance issues?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor will be meeting with that after the hearing today.

I do want to state for those on the phone that all of Your Honor's pretrial orders, status conference reports, transcripts, other relevant matter, can be accessed on the Court's website at www.laed.uscourts.gov with a link directly to, quote, drywall MDL, end quote.

THE COURT: Just a word on the insurance. The insurers being invited to participate in the global resolution of the matter, this should be their last opportunity to do that. If they want in, then I want them to participate.

If they feel that they do not want in, then what I'm going to do is, when I'm advised of that, when it comes to my attention, I'll then carve them out of the stay order and let the cases proceed against them so that they can have some finality, which they're entitled to.

And those insurers that are participating, of course the stay order will be in effect and they can then resolve any particular details that they have to resolve.

And also, I might say that, by participating in this discussion, they are not waiving any of their rights or not caving into the jurisdiction of the Court or anything of that sort.

But those insurers who are not interested in participating, the plaintiffs should go forward against them,

and I'll carve them out of the stay order.

Homebuilders fees and costs.

MS. WIMBERLY: Yes, Your Honor. Dorothy Wimberly for the Homebuilders liaison counsel's office.

Yesterday, the Court entered a show cause order, it's record docket 12546, identifying those builders who have failed to comply with the Court's prior fee orders.

I would note that, unfortunately, despite our efforts to make certain that it was accurate, I have been apprised of two errors on it, which we will be promptly rectifying and removing, those people who had timely complied.

But the only difference from what's in the joint report regarding this is that the show cause order is set for March 22nd, immediately following the monthly status conference.

I would encourage counsel for all builders who are identified on the exhibit attached to the order to please get in touch with our office. We will be able to provide you with the amount that you are owed based upon the prior orders, the necessary forms if you cannot locate them in the record, and answer any questions and if special arrangements need to be made for anyone. We've done that for other builders. But the important thing is that you please contact our office so that we can work through this and not burden the Court further.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you very much. And I encourage them to do so.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, item No. V, state federal coordination, Mr. Kingsdorf has the report.

First, I'd like to thank Mr. Kingsdorf and Ms.

Barrios for the job that they are doing with the Consumer

Product Safety Commission. Mr. Kingsdorf will make that report.

I'm still frankly concerned on behalf of the PSC that we still don't have the information about the CPSC. The arm of the United States Government denied access to the Leung mines, which we feel is a paramount issue.

But Mr. Kingsdorf will speak as to the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

MR. KINGSDORF: Bruce Kingsdorf, Your Honor.

I had a lengthy conversation yesterday with Melissa Hampshire representing the CPSC, and they have received the PSC's appeal from the denial of the request for documentation from the CPSC and they have lodged various exemptions and exceptions to our request.

However, they have offered a compromise, Your
Honor, of an in-camera inspection by the Court of approximately
31,000 documents, which they will be compiling. They have
advised that it will take 348 man hours to compile the
documentation. I asked whether that was straight time,
overtime, one person, 100 people. They really couldn't give me
an answer for that. But it will apparently take a few weeks to
compile.

```
1
                   They are concerned about disseminating the
 2
     information which has some personal information, and there are
 3
     certain requirements apparently of the CPSC that there be
     notification given to manufacturers and distributors of the
 4
 5
    product that complaints are made against.
 6
                   I advised that, because they were Chinese
 7
     companies, it was nearly impossible to provide notice to the
    manufacturers. Then they advised that they would have to
 8
    provide to the distributors. And I don't really know how that
 9
10
    will work, Your Honor.
                   But they are willing to do an in-camera inspection
11
     under a protective order, and I have contact information so that
12
13
     the Court can communicate directly.
14
              THE COURT: We've got to cut through this. Just give
    me the contact information, and I'll order them to give it to
15
16
     the Court in-camera. And I'll deal with the number or amounts
17
    or whatever it is. But give me the contact information so I can
18
    get to it.
19
              MR. KINGSDORF: I have that. Would you like me to give
20
     it to your law clerk after the conference?
21
              THE COURT: Yes, great.
22
                   How about the omnibus class action complaints?
23
              MR. LEVIN: As of last night, Your Honor, we have
24
     another one. That's what's new.
25
              THE COURT: Plaintiff's motion to establish?
```

1 MR. HERMAN: Nothing new, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: What about the pilot program, any report on 3 that? MR. HERMAN: It's proceeding very well. We commend 4 5 Kaye Scholer on the process that they're doing, as well as the 6 contractor that they've chosen. Things seem to be moving much 7 more smoothly. I don't have a report with me, but perhaps Steve 8 9 wants -- Steve Glickstein wants to address it. I know that Mr. 10 Wallen sent in a report earlier this week, and there were I 11 think 1,200 to 1,400 residences in process. MR. GLICKSTEIN: Good morning, Your Honor. 12 13 Glickstein for Kaye Scholer and Knauf defendants. 14 I don't have anything, any statistics to add to the written report, other than as Mr. Herman said things are 15 16 progressing through the system very well. We are still 17 enrolling and are willing to enroll. And any plaintiff's counsel whose clients prefer not to wait until final approval of 18 19 the class action settlement to get their homes into the queue 20 can do so now. 21 THE COURT: The terms sheet, anything on that? 22 MR. HERMAN: Nothing new, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: This settlement, you've got to recognize 24 that it's not like the usual settlement where one side gets a 25 check and the other side gets a release. There's going to be a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11 lot of implementation and work in order to put this matter together. And so at least the parties ought to be giving some thought to that, as to a substructure that can be used. And I'll be talking with them about that at the appropriate time. Anything from the Knauf defendants? MR. HERMAN: We continue to meet, that is the PSC, with Knauf, particularly in so far as scheduling, implementing the settlement. Yesterday, representatives Mr. Miller, Mr. Schonekas, Steve Glickstein, Arnold Levin and Leonard Davis and I met for a couple of hours, and we've got a checklist that we're working through. And we believe we're making progress in terms of further implementation of the settlement prior to final approval by Your Honor. And I might add at this point, we have discussions with L&W this afternoon with Banner. There have also been discussions with Minor Pipes as regards those three potential settlements, and we're making headway in connection with those. THE COURT: Any Taishan defendants, any report on that?

The Taishan defendants, as everybody knows, the depositions went off in Hong Kong a month or so ago. I was present at them. It consumed a week. We started at 8:30 in the morning on Monday, and went to 6:00 o'clock each day, in a windowless room, and we finished up about 3:30 on Friday afternoon. And everybody left on Saturday morning to come back

to the United States.

I thought the depositions went well; there were only about maybe 15 objections throughout the week. I ruled on them immediately, and we moved on.

The witnesses were cooperative. And the lawyers, of course, handled themselves very well, on both sides.

I do appreciate the support of the two senators from Florida and the two senators from Louisiana and the two senators from Virginia. I appreciate their help. They wrote letters to Taishan announcing that I would be there and looking forward to my prompt return, and copies were sent to the state department and the other individuals who were kind enough to check on me periodically. But things went well, and all of those who participated did well.

We had a great interpreter. The state department was kind enough to give us some references. We picked the interpreter who was very good at her craft, and we didn't have any other interpreters in the room. I thought it was better just to have one interpreter. So I made her a 706 expert for the Court, and so she was the interpreter for the litigation. I thought she did a splendid job, and I appreciate all of her help.

The parties are completing their discovery on the jurisdictional aspect of the case. I think the plaintiffs had maybe one or two witnesses on the west coast that they're going

```
to be deposing. I've given them the schedule for briefing, and
 1
 2
     I would intend to have oral argument on that motion in June,
 3
     middle of June. And, hopefully, I can get my opinion out
     shortly thereafter, and we'll see where we go from there.
 4
              MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, if I may, I have a couple of
 5
 6
     comments regarding Taishan.
 7
                   Tom Owens, attorney for Taishan, met yesterday in
     our offices with Leonard Davis to discuss certain issues,
 8
 9
     including discovery issues. And we appreciate Mr. Owens'
10
     participation in that meeting.
                   I'd be remiss if I did not, in connection with the
11
     Hong Kong depositions, thank my partner Leonard Davis for
12
13
     coordination, administration. And Chris Seeger, Arnold Levin,
14
     Jerry Meunier, Eric Gonzalez and others that went to Hong Kong.
15
     And they also were supported by second chairs and a number of
16
     PSC and non-profit PSC members that helped prepare for those
17
     depositions. And we thank Your Honor for making those
18
     depositions move professionally and with substance.
19
              THE COURT: Interior/Exterior defendants, anything on
20
     those?
21
                   Banner defendants?
22
              MR. HERMAN: The Allocation Committee continues to
23
            The deadline for report is March 5th, and there are
24
     meetings scheduled for today.
25
                   But, at page 14, the issue -- this is under XII,
```

```
page 14, the issue of North River, excess insurer of INEX, the
 1
 2
    Court issued an order setting a hearing on motion to lift the
     stay today. Would Your Honor like to hear that after
 3
     conclusion, or now?
 4
 5
              THE COURT: I can here it after. We'll go into all of
 6
     the motions at one time.
 7
              MR. HERMAN: XIII. As I indicated, Your Honor, the
    Allocation Committee will be meeting again today. I believe the
 8
    meeting is either at 11:30 or noon, at Kerry Miller's office, as
 9
10
     there are other meetings scheduled.
11
              THE COURT: Anything new on Venture Supply?
12
              MR. HERMAN: Nothing new.
13
              MR. LEVIN: There's something new as of this morning.
14
                   Your Honor, you will receive today probably an
15
     agreed-upon order by Venture's carriers to appoint John Perry as
16
     a mediator with regard at least to two insurance policies
17
     dealing with Venture and Porter Blaine.
18
              THE COURT: Okay.
19
              MR. MILLER: Your Honor, Kerry Miller.
20
                   Just one point of clarification on a point Russ
21
     just made. The Banner allocation is at my office 30 minutes
22
     after this conference concludes. So we're going to start there
     30 minutes after.
23
24
                   It looks like we're moving pretty good, so I'm
25
    guessing around 10:30.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: I met yesterday with Venture Supply, those
 2
     defendants, as well as representatives from the plaintiff's
 3
     committee. And hopefully we'll be able to resolve some of those
     issues.
 4
                   Anything on profile forms, plaintiff/defendant
 5
 6
    profile forms?
 7
              MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, there's a motion set before
     you today that Your Honor will hear following this status
 8
 9
     conference schedule, and there are additional matters.
10
              THE COURT: Anything on pro se plaintiffs?
11
              MR. HERMAN: Mr. Johnston, Bob Johnston, isn't here
12
     today.
13
                   He reported that there's nothing new from the last
14
     written report that he submitted, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. Other than the motions, anything
16
     further from anybody?
17
                   The next meetings are March the 22nd, April the
     26th, and I set May 17th as the meeting in May.
18
19
                   Let's take a five minute break and we'll come
20
     back. Court stands in recess.
21
                   (Proceedings in recess.)
22
              THE COURT: We have a couple of motions before us.
                   The omnibus motion for plaintiff's motion for
23
24
    preliminary default judgment, the record document 12551. We've
25
     had a number of changes to it.
```

MR. LEVIN: Arnold Levin, Your Honor. 1 2 Your Honor, last night, you received the third 3 amended errata. I think that will be the last amended errata, so it's an order for the Court to act on it. 4 5 THE COURT: I'm going to grant the preliminary default. 6 I'll post those people on the website showing that I've entered 7 a preliminary default. And then I'll eventually, within a couple of weeks, set a time for dealing with the final permanent 8 9 default to confirm the default. 10 I moved this motion at least three times. Told 11 people even before the motion was filed that I was going to do it. Notwithstanding that, they haven't answered, they haven't 12 13 done anything to the case. So they've been properly served, and 14 I've got to move them out of the case. So I'll do so by granting a default against them. And, once the default is 15 16 confirmed, then you can act accordingly. 17 MR. LEVIN: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: The next item is objection to stay and preliminary approval order of the Knauf settlement agreement, 19 20 that's docket 12138. 21 MR. GLICKSTEIN: Steve Glickstein for the Knauf 22 defendants. 23 We have had several telephone conferences with the

We have had several telephone conferences with the objectors. We are 99 percent toward agreed-upon order. We have a final telephone call scheduled for tomorrow.

24

25

1 I would ask that the Court just kick the motion. 2 If for some reason that, unexpectedly, we don't have an agreed-upon order, probably we'd want to set it either 3 telephonically or in person before the next status conference. 4 5 But I'm hopeful that we'll have an agreed-upon 6 order. 7 THE COURT: Why don't you get to me within a week, let me know one way or another. 8 9 If not, then I'll set it on a date convenient with everybody, and I'll do it on the phone. 10 11 MR. GLICKSTEIN: Okay. 12 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. 13 Plaintiff's Steering Committee motion to compel or 14 to seek sanctions for certain defendants who have produced the profile form, that's document No. 12435 and 12548. 15 16 MR. LEMMON: Good morning, Your Honor. Andrew Lemmon on behalf of the PSC. 17 Pursuant to various court orders and including 18 specifically pretrial order No. 25, the defendants were all 19 20 required to provide profile forms to both the PSC and to the 21 other liaison counsel. 22 We filed an errata today. We filed an exhibit 23 first with our motion, Exhibit A, for people who contacted us 24 with, you know, some information, some promise to provide us 25 information.

Exhibit B was people who provided nothing, we haven't heard from at all.

We filed an errata last night that shows where we've progressed with that. We've gotten some more profile forms in since we filed this originally. We have some more promises that we're going to get some more in. So we're asking the Court to enter an order to compel or sanctions against them for failure to comply with the Court's order.

THE COURT: Why don't you give me the list of people who haven't complied, and then I'll issue an order finding them in default, and I'll devise some penalties for it.

MR. LEMMON: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

What about the lifting of the stay regarding claims against North River? That's 12459.

MR. LEVIN: Arnold Levin again Your Honor.

We're to the point where delaying any action on North River doesn't make any sense. Everything else is moving towards an ultimate resolution, at least on the Knauf side of the ledger sheet and the downstream defendants and the carriers on the Knauf side.

We have an entitlement to move against North River if the INEX settlement is approved. However, Mr. Herman has schooled me on the Louisiana law; and, in the Amato case, we have a direct action against the insurance carrier.

So it makes no sense to tread water and then start the process in June or July, when we can begin to start the process now.

If the stay is lifted, we can file some discovery, but ask the defendants, North River -- and they don't have to take action on that discovery right now. Let's just discuss it, and at the same time let's also discuss resolution. And at least we'll move that aspect of the case along.

THE COURT: What's the other side of that?

MR. RISLEY: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Risley for the North River Insurance Company.

The reason it doesn't make any sense to lift the stay right now is because we have a moving picture in front of us. There's not just the INEX settlement but there's the Knauf settlement. If those are both approved, the PSC will end up owning a very few number of claims, because what will be left is the Taishan claims and maybe some mixed house claims. So, why lift a stay for a party that a few months from now may have no interest in the claims at all? It makes more sense to us to figure out who has the right to sue us before we lift the stay and go forward.

A second point is, even on the non-KPT houses, there's a question of exhaustion. There's \$8 million of primary coverage below us that right now is unimpaired. It's supposed to be paid as part of the underlying settlements; but, if those

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

settlements are not approved, then there's still no exhaustion against us and the claims are not ripe. There may be claims on file; but, until there's exhaustion, there's nothing to go forward on against us. If we started a trial this afternoon, the Court would have to direct a verdict in our favor. So why don't we get the exhaustion issues out of the way with the settlements and make sure those claims are ripe? THE COURT: How do you do that without discovery? MR. RISLEY: The discovery on exhaustion would be, if the Court approves the Knauf settlement, it will be the position of INEX and the primary carriers, they've paid their limits, they're out. So that wouldn't involve the discovery from us, that involves the resolution of that settlement agreement. Now, I would say this. We have offered to sit down and talk. I heard the Court say that the insurers are willing to participate in the global settlement within the next couple weeks, I suspect. It might make some sense then to put this off 30 days to see if those discussions go anywhere. If they want to send us the discovery now so we have it, that's fine. But I would rather not open the door until we know whether the settlement talks will be fruitful or not. One last point, Judge. If Court is inclined to lift the stay against us, we also have claims on file against

Knauf, which is the manufacturer. We have similar claims

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

against KPT. I think it would be unfair and violation of due process to allow them to pursue the claims against us without us allowing those claims to be perused against a third party. So, if the stay is lifted, it shouldn't be just against North River but also in favor of North River to pursue the claims it has. If we're going to get it done, let's get it done all at once. THE COURT: Okay. Let me hear the response. MR. LEVIN: Sounds like a lawyer just made a statement, Your Honor. We're in this courtroom, everybody is moving towards resolution. One of the ways to move towards resolution is to have an active docket. We've agreed not to take action after the stay is lifted, if Your Honor does lift it, but we want to be ready. We certainly will speak with them. But there's no reason why we should have our hands tied with a stay when we have a direct action against North River. And, if they have defenses to that action, they can raise them in that action. But we shouldn't be precluded from moving in that direction. THE COURT: What's your position about opening discovery against Knauf? Or maybe I ought to ask Knauf that. MR. GLICKSTEIN: Steve Glickstein. This actually came up during a prior argument. First, Knauf, as Your Honor knows, has been exhaustively discovered. God knows how many of our witnesses

have been deposed, but it's been over a dozen.

North River, I believe, has participated in that discovery. And, if they haven't, they've had every opportunity to participate in that discovery.

Knauf, unlike North River, has stepped up to the plate and has offered a global deal.

Under Louisiana law, North River can, if they need to, try the empty chair and don't need to be in the case.

So, if the stay is lifted, there is no basis or reason to lift the stay against Knauf in order to permit North River to do whatever it needs to do at trial or in order to try to allocate the fault.

MR. RISLEY: Your Honor, if I could.

The reasons that they offer now to lift the stay were just as valid when the first stay was put in place with their consent and when the Court put in the Knauf and INEX stays that they asked for. Those reasons haven't changed.

But it would be the worst of all possible worlds, and with all due respect an abuse of the discretion of the Court, I believe, to allow us to be a defendant but not at the same time assert claims. Under the redhibition statute, we're entitled to recover from the manufacturer. The extent of that discovery is based upon whether INEX was an innocent seller or not. But that's where we have an absolute right to assert those claims in the same proceeding claims that are be asserted

against us. 1 2 THE COURT: I do understand the issue. 3 What I'm going to do is I'm going to keep the stay for two weeks, let you all talk. Get back to the Court within a 4 two-week period, and then I'll hear from all of you all to 5 6 determine whether or not to lift the stay; and, if so, which 7 aspect of the stay would be lifted on Knauf. Let's do it that 8 way. 9 MR. RISLEY: We'll do that. Thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: You have the responsibility to contact me 11 in two weeks. 12 MR. RISLEY: We will do so. 13 MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, Your Honor, it 14 would be helpful if North River would file a motion and a brief 15 regarding the issue of lifting the stay as to Knauf so we can 16 respond formally. 17 THE COURT: I don't know whether I'll do that or not. 18 But I'll give you two weeks. 19 Now, I hope I don't have to visit that situation, 20 because it seems to me that either you're in or you're out. And 21 it's not only true with North River but it's true with all of 22 the insurers. If you're interested in resolving the matter, I 23 want you to feel comfortable doing it. If you're not interested 24 in it, then you've got to get on with your case. You just can't 25 tread water the rest of the time. I need everybody to focus and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

tie up this aspect of the case so I can look at the other aspect of the case, and that's what I'm trying to do. MR. RISLEY: Understood, Your Honor. THE COURT: Rule to show cause for installers, builders and suppliers for failure to provide required confidential affidavits. I know we have several people who haven't done that. Dan Balhoff is here as the special master. And those who have not supplied the confidential mediation affidavits have to meet with him and talk it through. Let me know who hasn't. I'm going to have to take action. You want to come forward? MR. BALHOFF: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: I don't see any downside on this. I'm dumbfounded as to why you haven't received the information. They're confidential. I don't need to know about it. You just need to know, frankly, what the coverage is. What's the problem there? MR. BALHOFF: I wish I knew what the problem was. actually, we've gotten a very good response, Your Honor. Several hundred affidavits. There are approximately 250 defendants who have not responded. I don't know if some of those are defunct or not. I think the point that we wanted to make today is

today's the chance for absolution. Anybody that is here, I will 1 2 be -- if the Court is willing -- I will be here in the courtroom 3 after you've concluded your proceedings today to receive 4 affidavits from anyone that has them. If you can produce them, we'll strike you off the list. I will make a report to the 5 6 Court, and I assume the Court will decide at that point whether 7 and what sanctions to impose upon those who have not responded. THE COURT: I'm going to have to impose some sanctions, 8 9 so I'll give you one last opportunity to resolve the matter. If it's not resolved, then I'm going to have to act. I'm not going 10 11 to be able to be just overlook it. So let's get that done. 12 MR. BALHOFF: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 Any further motions that we have? Anything else, 15 folks? 16 Thank you very much. The court stands in recess. 17 (9:51 a.m., proceedings concluded.) 18 19 CERTIFICATE 20 I, Susan A. Zielie, Official Court Reporter, do hereby 21 certify that the foregoing transcript is correct. 22 23 /S/ SUSAN A. ZIELIE, FCRR 2.4 Susan A. Zielie, FCRR 25