UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

IN RE: CHINESE-MANUFACTURED * 09-MD-2047

* DRYWALL PRODUCTS

Section L

LIABILITY LITIGATION *

Relates to: All Cases June 12, 2018

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Appearances:

For the Plaintiffs: Herman Herman & Katz, LLC

BY: RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQ.

820 O'Keefe Avenue

New Orleans, Louisiana 70113

For the Taishan, CNBM, and BNBM Defendants: Phelps Dunbar, LLP BY: HARRY ROSENBERG, ESQ.

365 Canal Street, Suite 2000 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Official Court Reporter:

Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR 500 Poydras Street, HB-275 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 (504) 589-7778

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography using computer-aided transcription software.

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

(June 12, 2018)

4

3

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

5

Call the case, please.

6

7

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL No. 2047, In Re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation.

8

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

9

MR. ROSENBERG: Good morning, Judge Fallon.

10 11

Harry Rosenberg, liaison counsel for CNBM, BNBM, and Taishan,

12

13

Your Honor.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court. Good morning,

1415

Judge Fallon. Russ Herman for plaintiffs.

THE COURT: We have three matters today. Our monthly

16

meeting is first and then we have a motion to extinguish. We have a number from Knauf, and we have a number of people on the

17

have a number from Knauf, and we have a number of people on the

18 19 line waiting for that. Then, third, there's a motion for Esquire Bank. I would like to meet with the attorneys

20

involving that motion on both sides and talk to them about some

2122

Let's go to the meeting first. I have received from the parties a proposed agenda. I discussed with them in

chambers a bit of it. We will take it in the order presented.

24

23

Anything, Harry or Russ?

briefing schedule that can accommodate all of them.

25

MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, we have no issues to present to the Court this morning on behalf of CNBM, BNBM, and Taishan.

THE COURT: I talked to the parties a moment ago about the status of the litigation. The MDL court has approved my suggested motion to remand the cases to Florida, so they will be going to Florida. There are also some cases that are involved in Virginia. We will be dealing with that at the appropriate time.

Then we have some cases here, that were filed in Louisiana, involving Louisiana properties that we have to deal with. The parties are discussing what, if any, discovery is necessary. The way I see those particular cases is that we ought to focus on first the remediation damage cases. Those cases should involve limited discovery. Then there are cases that involve other damages other than the remediation damages.

As I mentioned in my opinion, it says that on June 9, 2015, the Court considered only remediation damages for current owners. Other damages such as alternate living expense, bodily injury, foreclosure, loss of rent, and so forth may be considered at another time. So that is going to have to be considered.

The plaintiffs will have to indicate what claims they have, what evidence they intend to support those claims, and have the defendants have an opportunity to thoroughly

discover that type of claim, and then we will talk with them about how we proceed. If there are jury trials, maybe we can have multiple cases go to the jury at the same time so we can minimize it.

As I mentioned, I don't like multiple cases in bellwethers because it's not helpful. It's not indicative of what a single case tried is going to cost or how it affects things, but when you have to move the cases -- we have maybe several thousand of them here -- we can't take one at a time. We will be doing this into the next century, or at least some other people will be doing it in the next century.

We have to figure out a way of expediting this. We may have to put our heads together and come up with some creative way of doing it, but that's further down the line.

Anything from the plaintiffs?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. There are two reports. Jake Woody is here from BrownGreer. He has a report for Your Honor.

THE COURT: Jake.

MR. WOODY: Good morning, Your Honor. Jake Woody from BrownGreer, the settlement administrator for the Chinese Drywall Settlement Program. The only thing I have to report is that we have approximately \$2 million left in the Other Loss Fund.

THE COURT: That's in the Knauf cases.

MR. WOODY: That's correct. It's part of the settlement program. We will distribute that money pro rata over the next few weeks and months. It's to approximately, 3,500 people. All these people have already received a payment from the Other Loss Fund. This is just distributing the remainder to them.

THE COURT: That's what we have to do with the Other Loss Fund. They are paid. If there's anything left, then we do it proportionately, and that's the method of doing this kind of thing.

MR. WOODY: That's correct. We will send those checks to the attorneys just like with the first payment, and I did want people to be aware of what those checks are for. We will put some language on the check that explains it in further detail as well.

THE COURT: When can you get those out?

MR. WOODY: I hope to have them out before the August status conference, hopefully before July. It's not a completely onerous task, but it does take a little bit of time to print and mail.

THE COURT: Will that end the Knauf matter?

MR. WOODY: That would be the end of it. The only thing that will be left after that is people who haven't cashed their checks and things of that nature. I think what we will do is pay that money into the Court registry and give the Court

an accounting of what it's for. When people want to get it, they will have to file a motion with you to come and get it. I would like to close those accounts so that we can stop filing tax returns and things like that. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court. I'm going to call on the Irpino firm, Pearl Robertson, who has handled it for the PSC in the main, and Christy may want to speak. They will both speak briefly about where they are on translations.

THE COURT: We are talking now about the translation.

MS. ROBERTSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Yes.
Briefly, on May 3, 2018, pursuant to Your Honor's order
regarding translations, the PSC has met and conferred with
Taishan on multiple occasions. We feel like we have come a
long way. We are not exactly where we want to be, but we are
going to continue to work together. We hope that certainly by
the next status conference we will have a very substantive
report to report to Your Honor regarding the manual translation
from the Peng production.

THE COURT: Christy, do you have anything to add?

MS. EIKHOFF: I have nothing to add, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that it?

MR. HERMAN: I just, may it please the Court, have two other comments.

I appreciate Judge Becnel leaving her bench

today to be here, Judge Mary Becnel. Also, I do want to pay a remembrance to a terrific lawyer and colleague, Jack Benjamin, who recently passed.

THE COURT: I didn't see Judge Becnel in the audience. I would have mentioned her. She is a great judge in her area. I have worked with her many times.

MR. ROSENBERG: Judge Fallon, if you would just permit me a moment a personal privilege. I would just like to echo Russ' comment about welcoming Judge Becnel into this Court as well as recognizing the tremendous work and career that Jack Benjamin has had as a practitioner in this community and the contributions he has made.

THE COURT: Well, thank you both for that.

The next meeting is July 18 and the following one is August 14. We will start at 8:30 with lead liaison and then we will go into the general meeting.

Let's go to the next item of business, a motion to extinguish. Is anybody here from Knauf that wants to mention that? Knauf, anybody? I thought there was somebody here for Knauf.

MR. ROSENBERG: Judge, I'm sorry. I know that the motion was in the status report.

Right, Lenny?

I haven't seen any attorney for Knauf.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, we have had communications

back and forth with Danny Dysart as well as Kerry Miller. I know that they are working on the matters. There are some loose ends that they are dealing with. I thought they would be here, but maybe it might be good to roll it over to the next status conference.

THE COURT: Anyone on the phone for the motion to extinguish?

MR. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike Ryan from South Florida.

THE COURT: Mike, I'm sorry that nobody is here for Knauf. I hate to impose on you, but we are going to have to move this over to the next meeting.

What's your problem from the standpoint of extinguishing, anything that the Court can help you with?

MR. RYAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes, we have had discussions with Danny Dysart, as Lenny pointed out. They understand the predicament our homeowners are in. We are trying to work through it. These are final stage issues, contractor problems. We provided as much information as possible. I think the discussions will continue with Knauf to try to resolve this as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: Well, continue to meet with them and see if you can bring this to a head because I do want to tie up the loose ends. I don't want there to be any loose ends on that aspect of the case. We have been able to resolve that half of

the case to hopefully the satisfaction of the parties. We are now into the Taishan aspect of the case.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, I don't want to speak for Kerry, obviously, but I do know that, just as Mike Ryan just spoke, there are a couple of cases where there are contractor delays and things like that, but they are nearing the end. I think that they will be wrapped up shortly.

MS. RICO: Your Honor, I'm sorry. Natalie Rico. I'm on the phone as well for the motion to extinguish on behalf of Patrick Montoya, who actually apologizes that he could not be there himself.

Similar to what Mr. Ryan was saying, we have contractor delays and permitting delays with two of our clients. I believe Knauf was going to suggest an August 1 deadline. We have spoken with them, and we are going to push to have everything completed for the final milestone by then. What we did say to them is that a little more time may be needed, and I guess this can be addressed at the next status conference.

Then with respect to our other client,

Prime Homes, that is a larger client that has 28 properties. I

don't know if Your Honor remembers, but there were delays in

starting construction on that property. During all these

delays, construction prices went up, and there was a motion

pending before Your Honor for six months to a year, something

09.14

like that.

We have had discussions with Knauf. They have suggested that this client switch to the cash-out, which due to the crushing prices of construction and whatnot the client is going to probably have to do, but we just wanted to make Your Honor aware of the situation.

THE COURT: We will talk about it, then, at the next meeting, July 18, if you can be on the phone and give me some status report so we can try to end up this aspect of the case.

MS. RICO: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

With regard to the Esquire Bank matter, if the attorneys would meet me in the back in the conference room, we will talk about the matter. Thank you very much.

MR. YANCE: Your Honor, if I may be heard just a moment on the record.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. YANCE: Tucker Yance from Mobile.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. YANCE: I do believe there are some law firms that have joined into my motion regarding Esquire Bank that are listening on the phone. I also have a couple of things to say with regard to -- I believe you referred to it as a briefing schedule. I would like to have discussions on the record for the benefit of the attorneys that are on the telephone.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. YANCE: Forgive me. I'm not a frequent filer in this case, but it's my understanding that the submission date, as recognized and calendared by the Court, is the hearing date for the purpose of handling motions that do not have a specific and independent request for oral argument, and also that there will be no separate hearing on motions that do not contain a separate request for oral argument.

So be that as it may and coupling that with either of the local rules or Your Honor's Pretrial Order 1C, the deadline for a response to the motion regarding Esquire Bank has long since passed. According to the Court's local rules, there shall be no response. Today is the date for submission of the motion and it's unopposed. It's been joined in by several other law firms and so it's ripe for ruling.

Considering the disturbing -- and I understand it is disturbing -- nature of the motion itself and the immediacy that is clear on its face -- and the facts that are set forth in that motion are publicly available to this Court almost in their entirety -- I would say it would be appropriate -- even if Your Honor doesn't want to rule on my motion without giving an additional chance to respond, I believe it would be appropriate for a *sua sponte* regaining control of the \$200 million sitting in Esquire Bank under the circumstances. I personally can find no downside and only

09.18

upside for doing so. The only downside to doing so would be a detriment to Esquire Bank, as set forth in my motion, which is of no consequence in this case.

So even setting that aside, I want to point out that nearly every motion that has been filed in the attorneys' fee phase of this case has been met with a relatively rapid response by the fee committee, and this is regardless of whether such motion -- and often in absence of a setting of a hearing by the Court. A motion is filed and in due course it's responded to.

This motion, as I said, is extraordinarily troubling with regard to a lot of money belonging to a lot of people, and it's remained unopposed for almost a month. So I would suggest that that is an indicator that there is no really good response to this motion, and any attempt to ask for time to respond to it is an attempt to delay the payout.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YANCE: So I would ask again the Court either grant the motion or *sua sponte* regain control of the \$200 million sitting in the investments.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the other side.

What do you need time for and why haven't you responded in a month?

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court. Russ Herman in response.

There are a number of misstatements in Mr. Yance's motion. There are personal attacks in Mr. Yance's motion. There is ongoing requests for documents -- by folks who have joined with Mr. Yance -- from BrownGreer, and BrownGreer has responded with the assistance of Esquire Bank.

The issue is one in which we need a briefing schedule and a hearing. I am actually prepared today to make an oral response, but I am awaiting some critical information.

My understanding --

THE COURT: He says you could have responded within a month. You haven't responded in a month.

MR. HERMAN: Well, Your Honor, we have received, over the course of this month, repeated requests for information from me, from Esquire Bank, and BrownGreer. We could hardly do that until the information stream was passed.

I also don't think, under the usual practice of this Court, when a counsel before this Court with 52 years of experience is attacked personally that that matter can be responded to without some thought.

I am not accusing Mr. Yance of anything other than, if he had these remarks, to release them publicly to a large number of firms without attempting to seal the record, that that's just not proper. Perhaps these folks do not understand that we have ongoing litigation against Taishan and that given the fact that the documents were also distributed on

the record, accessible to the defense, it does not give us sufficient time. Now, all I'm asking for is a briefing schedule and a hearing date, with the Court's permission.

THE COURT: All right. I will do this. We will do both of them. I will get the \$200 million -- this is attorneys' fees. If it were claimants' money, it would be a different issue, but this is attorneys' fees. I will get those and put them in the registry of the Court.

I will issue an order *sua sponte*, but I will give you an opportunity to respond in a brief form. How much time do you need?

MR. HERMAN: A week.

THE COURT: Do you need any response?

MR. YANCE: I don't anticipate needing a reply, so to speak. However, of course, I don't know what's going to be said. A week would be sufficient, if I can have an extra week to reply.

THE COURT: Well, let's do two weeks and one week.

That will give you an opportunity. Then we will set it for oral argument. If we need any evidence, let me know and I will arrange to have evidence.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, we do not object to moving the funds. We have been attempting to find out a number of issues with the clerk of court's funds as to whether the QSF in this case is going to be separated from other QSFs -- because

as I understand it right now this is a national fund -- is the clerk of court going to make the type of monthly reports or bimonthly reports to BrownGreer and then to the Court-appointed CPA through BrownGreer, and what are the fees going to be. I think there are a number of issues, and we do not object moving it to the clerk of court in a safe place.

Also, there's some issue as to what happens with the interest on this fund. It's our position that whoever the depository is, the interest ought to be attributed to the fund itself. So we do ask that Your Honor, through Your Honor's means, take a look at that.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? Thank you very much. You have two weeks, and you have one week.

MR. HERMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Anything else from anybody? Danny, do you want to come up?

We had some people on the line to discuss this. They said they were working with you and they hoped to get the matter resolved by the next status conference sometime in July. The next one is July 18.

MR. DYSART: That's right, Your Honor. I apologize for being late to the conference. Apparently we had a mixup in schedules.

With respect to our motion, I have been in contact with just about everybody that have remaining claims.

There are a few that are unopposed that we can submit for extinguishment at this time. Those would be Rodney Litus and Ronni and Rodella Ervin. Those can be submitted without opposition as extinguished.

For the remaining claims --

THE COURT: Anybody on the line for either of those?

MR. DYSART: They are represented by David Durkee,

Judge. I have spoken to David.

His other two claims, Mr. Dalsin and Mr. Russel or Graham, he is unopposed to having those at least pushed back to -- what I have discussed with all counsel is what we would like to do is have a deadline. These claims have been going on for years. Some of them have not had any activity for years.

What we talked about was potentially asking the Court to submit an August 1 deadline, to try to have those completed by August 1. If individual issues come up, then they can move to extend the time period as it may be.

With respect to Jake and the Knauf defendants -- Jake at BrownGreer -- we would just like a deadline put in place for the remaining claims so that we are all working towards wrapping these up my August 1.

The only other one that is a little different would be Prime Homes. I have spoken to Patrick Montoya and Natalie Rico. I'm not sure if they were on the line --

THE COURT: They were.

MR. DYSART: -- but it's my understanding that they 1 09:28 2 have agreed to switch to Option 3 for those claims, and that 3 they can submit that by August 1 as well. THE COURT: I will do that with August 1, but be here 4 on July 18 to give me a status report and find out whether or 5 6 not we need to move that date. 7 MR. DYSART: I will, Your Honor. Thank you. All right, folks. Thank you very much. 8 THE COURT: THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. 9 10 (Proceedings adjourned.) 11 * * * 12 CERTIFICATE I, Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR, Official Court 13 Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District 14 15 of Louisiana, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding, from 16 17 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 18 19 20 /s/ Toni Doyle Tusa Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, FCRR 21 Official Court Reporter 22

23

24

25