UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA 3 4 5 Docket 05-CV-4206-L PATRICK JOSEPH TURNER, ET AL \* and Consolidated Cases 6 versus v. December 20, 2005, 9:00 a.m. 7 New Orleans, Louisiana 8 9 10 STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 12 **APPEARANCES:** 13 14 For the Plaintiffs: SIDNEY D. TORRES III, ESQ. 1290 7th Street Slidell, Louisiana 70458 15 16 For the Defendant: Frilot Partridge Kohnke & Clements BY: KERRY J. MILLER, ESQ. 107 Global Circle 17 18 Lafayette, Louisiana 70503 19 Official Court Reporter: Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR 500 Poydras Street, Room B-406 20 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 (504) 589-7778 21 22 23 24 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript 25 produced by computer.

## 

## 

## **PROCEEDINGS**

## (December 20, 2005)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Call the case.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: 05-4206, Patrick Joseph Turner, et al versus Murphy Oil USA, Inc.

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

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, Sidney Torres on behalf of the plaintiffs.

MR. MILLER: Kerry Miller on behalf of Murphy Oil, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This is our monthly status conference. I met with liaison counsel earlier and they have presented me with an agenda. There are several items on the agenda. The first is discovery issues. I'll hear from the parties as to that.

MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor. The defendant was to produce the name of the person who would be presented for the 30(b)(6). I think they are going to do that within the next three days. The discovery is progressing along. We have presented to the defendant the class reps. I think the last class rep. will be taken tomorrow. There are a number of named plaintiffs whose depositions will be taken. Plaintiffs'

1.9 

experts' depositions have been scheduled. We are working with the defendant on that. The defendant is also giving us the dates and times within the next week or two to take the depositions of their experts. Also, the digital photographs will be presented to us this Friday; is that correct?

MR. MILLER: Correct, Your Honor.

**THE COURT:** Anything from the defendant on discovery?

MR. MILLER: No, I think that's it, other than to note the agreement we reached in chambers that we would not be submitting a Pretrial Order, per se. What we are going to do, I think, is we are going to exchange exhibit lists on January 6 and then follow the schedule that's in place for all other deadlines.

THE COURT: With regard to that, I discussed with counsel in chambers that a Pretrial Order may not be useful in this particular case. I'm mainly interested in each counsel knowing what the other counsel is going to present during hearings so that no one is surprised and they are able to be prepared. Counsel advised me they have exchanged witness lists and what they need to do at this point is exchange exhibits so that part will be complied with and a statement of the facts and issues, but that can come in through their memorandum. So we are going to tailor this Pretrial Order, as it were, for the needs of this particular case.

The second issue on the agenda was discussions

of settlement with someone who was represented. I'm convinced that the defendant didn't recognize at the outset that they were dealing with someone who was represented. As I mentioned to counsel, we are going to have some slippage. We have so many people involved in this case that sometimes, through no one's fault, there are going to be discussions with someone who is represented. You have to be heads up. Plaintiffs ought to advise the defendant of all of the class reps and all of the represented people, and the defendant ought not to discuss settlement or contact represented people. We do the best we can with trying to stop any slippage, but this seems to be one that got through the cracks. I understand that the parties have attempted to correct that situation and will continue to do so.

There's a third item on the agenda, notice of objection to discovery propounded by Murphy Oil. Do you want to speak to that?

MR. TORRES: Yes. We had put that on the agenda because of the short time period we had here. We had gone forward and offered up a large number of named plaintiffs that defendant had requested that we produce. We just wanted to bring to the Court's attention we didn't want to in any way concede that this was relevant. We pretty much have accomplished the taking of those depositions, but we just wanted for the record to let the Court know that we were not

conceding that this was relevant.

THE COURT: Let's both sides keep their eye on the ball. We are at the certification aspect of the case and not the liability or damage aspect of the case, so that's where the discovery ought to be focused at this point. I'm not saying that later on discovery ought not to consume other issues, but the issue the Court is concerned with is the issue of certification, so let's keep your eye on the ball at that level.

The next item was item 4. As I mentioned, there's some use of the public media in the St. Bernard Parish government web site to promote and solicit participation in the settlement program without disclosure. The Court issued an order requiring certain disclosures to be made. When something like this is brought to my attention, it's of concern to the Court. I told counsel for each side I'm going to set a rule to show cause why Murphy should not be held in contempt of Court. I will set it for this Friday at 11:00. I also ask counsel to discuss this matter and see whether or not there's some misunderstanding on either side and whether it can be corrected; and, if so, advise the Court and then I will take it off of the calendar. I have to act on matters that are brought to my attention that are potentially abusive conduct.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, I have had a conversation with Mr. Frilot and Mr. Miller and they have stated they will

take a look at the ad we are talking about and take the appropriate action, so we are satisfied with that.

MR. FRILOT: For the record, Your Honor, it's my understanding that WDSU ran this tape under their news without our knowledge and certainly not at our request. It's not paid advertisement. We will ask WDSU not to repeat that performance, but it was not generated by our instance.

THE COURT: Then I will take that off of the calendar for Friday at 11:00. Either side, if there's any question of a violation of my order, bring it to my attention and the Court will act on it.

MR. TORRES: If Your Honor please, I understand it may be in Baton Rouge, also.

MR. MILLER: Do you know what media outlet?

MR. TORRES: We'll get together with them.

THE COURT: Mr. Dumas.

MR. DUMAS: Yes, sir. Your Honor, I sent a copy of the tape to Sidney. It's WAFB Television. They had a story on it. They called me for an interview and I refused to talk.

THE COURT: Let's get with counsel for defendant and give them the information so that can be handled. The defendant has also brought to my attention a certain web site that is entitled "Murphy Oil Spill Web Site." It's not their web site. It's a web site promoted by the plaintiffs. They are concerned about some misinformation. Also, they have

brought to the Court's attention postings on NOLA.com by plaintiffs' counsel, which they are also concerned about as being misrepresentative of the facts, and some statement by an attorney in a letter December 6, 2005, which they feel is not appropriate and not consistent with the facts.

Again, these matters need to be discussed with counsel first. If after discussing the matter liaison counsel cannot reach an agreement, then they need to bring it to the Court's attention. I have directed counsel to discuss these three matters. If they can't reach some agreement that's satisfactory to the defendant, the defendant needs to get that information to the Court and the Court will act on it. I don't want any misinformation from either side. Both sides need to be heads up on that.

Another item on the agenda was Murphy's publishing an ad about a voluntary settlement program. Is that something either the defendant or the plaintiffs put on the agenda?

MR. MILLER: Yes. I had put that on the agenda in response to some of the other media issues that we had talked about.

THE COURT: There was some discussion at the liaison counsel meeting this morning that at least Murphy is discussing with the Court and opposing counsel whether or not they could or should post some information on their web site or

information to the media correcting what they feel have been misstatements. It's hard for me to deal with it in a vacuum, but my concern is that that's generally not the last word. When Murphy seeks to correct misinformation, then the plaintiffs seek to correct the corrected misinformation. We go on and on, and instead of focusing on the issues before this Court somehow or another the focus is outside of what's going on in this Court. Before we do that, I would expect the parties to discuss it with the Court and discuss it with counsel first.

Any other item on the agenda before we move into the motions before the Court? Anything that either counse? want to bring up or anyone in the audience wishes to discuss?

MR. MILLER: Not from the Murphy side, Your Honor.

MR. TORRES: Not from plaintiffs' side, Your Honor. Your Honor, some of the plaintiffs' attorneys are leaving because they have a deposition to attend.

THE COURT: I understand. The next meeting will be on January 31, 2006. I'll meet with liaison counsel and any members of the committees that liaison counsel feels appropriate on January 31 at 8:30. Following that meeting, we will have with the general meeting at 9:00 here in open court.

\* \* \*