MINUTE ENTRY FALLON, J. December 20, 2000

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

		:	MDL NO. 1355
IN RE:	PROPULSID	:	
	PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	:	SECTION "L"
		:	
		:	JUDGE FALLON
		:	JUDGE AFRICK

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL CASES:

A pretrial status conference was held on this date at 10:00 a.m. in the courtroom of Judge Eldon E. Fallon. In attendance for Plaintiffs were Richard J. Arsenault, Daniel E. Becnel, Jr., Leonard Davis, Kim Evers, Russ M. Herman, Frederick T. Kendall, III, Larry Morris, Stephen Murray, Jr., and Michael Papantonio. In attendance for Defendants were Thomas F. Campion, James B. Irwin, Quentin F. Urquhart, Jr., and Charles F. Preuss. At the conference, counsel reported to the Court on the topics set forth in Joint Report No. 2 of Plaintiffs' and Defendants' Liaison Counsel, and the Court made the following rulings:

1. <u>Document Production Protocol</u>:

Plaintiffs shall file a motion concerning document production protocol by January 15, 2001. The motion will be set for hearing at an appropriate time in order to provide both sides an opportunity to brief the disputed issues and to present evidence. The setting of this motion shall

not prejudice either party.

2. <u>State Liaison Counsel</u>

The Court accepts the recommendations of Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel and appoints to serve as State Liaison Counsel: Richard Arsenault, Issac Byrd, James Capretz, Walter Dumas, Barry Hill, Tina Nieves, Mark Robinson, and Chris Seeger. State Liaison Counsel may participate in future pretrial conferences and offer consultation concerning matters affecting concurrent state litigation.

3. <u>Service of Pleadings Between Liaison Counsel</u>

At the request of Liaison Counsel, pleadings may be served between Liaison Counsel using one hard copy and one electronic copy provided either by email or diskette.

4. <u>Disclosure of Documents for Depositions</u>

Following the conference, the Court heard oral argument on Defendants' motion to compel opposing counsel to disclose documents intended for use during a deposition. The Court, after reviewing written briefs and considering oral argument, denied Defendants' motion for the reasons orally stated and memorialized in the Court's minute entry dated December 26, 2000.