		1
1		
2		
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
4	EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA	
5		
6		
7	IN RE: PROPULSID * Docket MDL NO. 1355-L	
8	PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION * * December 19, 2006 *	
9	* New Orleans, Louisiana	
LO		
L1	STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON	
L2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
L3	APPEARANCES:	
L4		
L5	Liaison Counsel for Herman, Mathis, Casey, Plaintiffs: Kitchens & Gerel	
L6	BY: RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQ. LEONARD A. DAVIS, ESQ.	
L7	820 O'Keefe Avenue New Orleans, Louisiana 70113	
L8		
L9	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault BY: RICHARD J. ARSENAULT, ESQ.	
20	2220 Bonaventure Court Post Office Box 1190	
$\begin{bmatrix} 21 \\ 21 \end{bmatrix}$	Alexandria, Louisiana 71309	
22	Hartley, O'Brien, Parsons,	
24	Thompson & Hill BY: BARRY HILL, ESQ. 2001 Main Street, Suite 600	
25	Wheeling, West Virginia 26003	
-		

APPEARANCES: 1 2 Levin, Fishbein, Sedran & Berman BY: ÁRNOLD LEVIN, ESQ. 3 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106 4 Capretz & Associates 5 BY: JAMES CAPRETZ, ESQ. t5000 Birch Street 6 Suite 2500 New Port Beach, California 92660 7 8 Zimmerman, Reed, P.L.L.P BY: CHARLES ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. 9 901 North Third Street Suite 100 10 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401 11 Barrios, Kingsdorf & Casteix 12 BY: DAWN M. BARRIOS, ESQ. 701 Poydras Street, Suite 3650 13 New Orleans, Louisiana 70139 14 For Defendants: Irwin, Fritchie, Urguhart 15 & Moore BY: MONIQUE GARSAUD, ESQ. 16 400 Poydras Street, Suite 2700 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 17 18 Drinker, Biddle & Shanley BY: THOMAS F. CAMPION, ESQ. TRACIE MILITANO, ÉSQ. 19 500 Campus Drive 20 Florham Park, New Jersey 07932 21 Preuss, Shanagher, Zvoleff & Źimmer 22 CHARLES F. PREUSS, ESQ. BY: 23 225 Bush Street 15th Floor 24 San Francisco, California 94104 25

1 2	Official Court Reporter: Jodi Simcox, RMR 500 Poydras Street, Room HB-406 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 (504) 589-7780
3	(504) 589-7780
4	
5	
6	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
7	produced by computer.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
10 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

PROCEEDINGS

(December 19, 2006)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.

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

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL 1355 in re: Propulsid.

THE COURT: Counsel, make your appearance for the record, please.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, good morning, Your Honor. On behalf of all counsel, we wish, Your Honor, and your staff a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Russ Herman appearing for the PSC. We have the state liasion committee and members of the PSC present, Mr. Arsenault, Mr. Capretz, Ms. Barrios, Mr. Hill from the state liaison committee; Mr. Levin, Mr. Zimmerman and Leonard Davis with me for the plaintiffs, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody for the defense?

MR. PREUSS: Your Honor, Chuck Preuss appearing on behalf of the defendants, along with Tom Campion and Monique Garsaud. And I would like to introduce to the Court and counsel, Tracy Militano, who is the brains behind everything here and keeping us straight on the numbers and working with Pat's office and trying to keep these things moving along.

THE COURT: All right. Well, welcome to the court.

I appreciate all of your work.

MS. MILITANO: Thank you.

THE COURT: This is a meeting. It's the 51st joint meeting of the parties and I received a joint report from the parties and defense from liaison counsel in advance of the meeting.

I'll take the items in the form and fashion which they have been brought up. First is state liasion counsel MDL Resolution II program.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the Court, in a moment I'll ask Ms. Barrios for comment. I want to compliment Ms. Barrios and Mr. Capretz, Mr. Arsenault and Mr. Hill for the job that they've done marshalling in Propulsid II.

I want to thank Mr. Hill for his efforts with defense counsel, Mr. Campion and Mr. Preuss, in attempting to work through some issues that have come up regarding Propulsid I, which may bear on Propulsid II.

With respect to Propulsid II, I'll just call on Ms. Barrios for any comment she has at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. While she's coming up to the podium, Propulsid II is a collection of the state court cases. Propulsid I is the cases that were sent to this court under the MDL program; that is to say, cases that were filed in either state or federal courts but then have been removed to the federal court and transferred under the MDL concept 1407 to

this court to be held.

That case proceeded. During the process, we had liaison counsel the court appointed to keep in touch with the litigation. And I told state liaison counsel that I would do what I could from my vantage point to encourage and work with them in handling the state court cases, both in preparation as well as in ultimate resolution, if that was appropriate or a possibility.

With that in mind, the state liaison counsel kept in touch with the Court and with this litigation, furnished invaluable ideas and contributed to the overall working of Propulsid I, and then we're presently at the Propulsid II stage. I'll hear from Ms. Barrios now.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor. I, too, would like to add my note of appreciation. Were it not for Jane Oxhandler of Richard Arsenault's office and Mary Williams of Barry Hill's office, we wouldn't be standing here today telling you that enrollment has been met.

From the defense side, I would also like to welcome Tracie Militano and thank her because she's been our conduit on getting the actual numbers necessary to be met.

Your Honor, when we first started talking about Propulsid II, I was personally thrilled to be able to discuss with the state attorneys that we had a resolution program in mind. They were very interested in knowing what would happen

to their Propulsid cases.

So from the standpoint of the state's attorney, having an alternate method of resolution has been a terrific idea, and they're very happy about that. When we met in Jackson, we were hit with some questions about the overall process of Propulsid I. We had explained that issues were under discussion, and I understand that they are still under discussion.

I'd also like to thank, for the record, and I've failed to it before, is Mr. Ingram. He was very instrumental at our Jackson meeting in standing up and speaking with most of the Mississippi attorneys on the process and on why they should enroll their cases in Propulsid II.

So with that said, Your Honor, we are very pleased to say that the enrollment has been reached with the hard work of all those people that I've mentioned. And I understand that there are ongoing discussions about resolution issues of different matters with regard to the process, and we stand ready, willing and able to assist in any regard.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BARRIOS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything from the defense on the

Propulsid II? Chuck, do you have any comments?

MR. PREUSS: Yes, Your Honor. Dawn and her committee certainly are to be commended on all the hard work in getting

enrollment minimums reached. They have been reached.

MR. PREUSS: Mainly from Mississippi. They are some left over federal ones and there are some tolling claimants that didn't sign up on MDL I that have come in on MDL II. And the requirement was if you came in at all, then you had to

bring everything in, which was slightly different from MDL I.

THE COURT: Where do they come from, Chuck, mostly?

But we do have a joint notice prepared. We think it's important to get that posted so we can get started and give notice to individuals as to when their claim forms are due. And we have submitted that and we'd like to get it posted on the Web site, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any comment on that? Richard?

MR. ARSENAULT: Judge, this is kind of a creative exit strategy that we've employed in Propulsid I. I think jurists, and lawyers, and pharmaceutical companies, and defendants around the country are trying to get their arms around exit strategies and resolution and everything from dealing with class actions to other creative ways to try to resolve cases.

And Propulsid I, I think, was very creative.

And I know for a fact that it's being considered as a model in many other pieces of litigation, other MDLs. And with anything that's new, there are going to be issues, apparently, and things that may or may not be considered.

And we just want to, I think, be careful with Propulsid II; that if there's anything to learn from Propulsid I, that where we tighten things up, expedite the process, or learn from that, that we should do that to the extent that it's possible.

THE COURT: What about the notice; is there any harm in having the notice out?

MR. ARSENAULT: Well, I think there's no harm in waiting for a short period. If there are any issues that can be resolved with regard to Propulsid I, that would be a benefit to us in Propulsid II.

It seems to me that waiting a few weeks is of no moment at the end of the day when balanced against the potential gain that we can realize from any improvements in Propulsid I that might be acceptable to all the parties and Your Honor.

MS. BARRIOS: Excuse me, Your Honor. The notice, as I understand, will set various deadlines for plaintiffs counsel to meet. And if when the Court and parties are re-examining the issues with Propulsid I, if any of that process has changed, those deadlines may go by the way side or the requirements that you have to do by the deadline may go by the way side.

So I would also urge that the Court consider waiting about 30 days to post anything.

ΤU

THE COURT: Chuck, do you have any response to that?

MR. PREUSS: No, Your Honor. The joint notice has been signed off by everybody and the minimum dates were reached on October 31. So under the terms of the agreement, that's six months they stay open, claim forms are due 120 days after enrollment or after October 31, whichever occurs later.

And so the time that is -- if it's not useful to give notice on the Web site, it cuts down the time in which people will have to make their decisions to join as of April, so that's the reason.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Herman?

MR. HERMAN: With great respect for Mr. Preuss, it's a very rigid position, considering that deadlines have been extended in the past.

We are concerned that, one way or the other, any motions or briefings we might file under seal regarding the Propulsid I process, one way or the other, will impact Propulsid II. Our office, as liaison counsel, has monitored daily the process and progress of Propulsid II.

And the matters are so well integrated that issuing a notice at this time might in some way serve as, in the general sense, not in the legal sense, an estoppel if some process revisions came about to Propulsid I. We believe they ought to be incorporated into Propulsid II, and our motion under seal and our briefing under seal will so indicate.

So we do not think a 30-day extension of all 1 2 deadlines, including the filing of notice, will do violence to 3 the agreements. 4 **THE COURT:** Okay. 5 MR. CAPRETZ: Your Honor, if I may, let me add that 6 the -- I think it's the unanimous opinion of the Court, state 7 liaison committee, that we delay it a reasonable period of time 8 to see if we can work out the misunderstandings that we have in 9 the process. 10 **THE DEPUTY CLERK:** Would you give your appearance, 11 please, sir? 12 MR. CAPRETZ: James Capretz. 13 **THE COURT:** Okay. 14 MR. HERMAN: He's been gone from Louisiana for a 15 while we used to say Capretz. 16 THE COURT: Just give it to me, Chuck, I'll take a 17 look at it, and I'll deal with it in time. The trust account 18 is Item 2. 19 MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. We have made a report 20 to the Court. And, in addition to the court trust account, 21 we're pleased to indicate that at this juncture the total dividends on the various funds are as follows: 22 23 On the administration fund -- I'll round these 24 off -- \$495,000; on the settlement fund, \$3,142,000; and on the

attorney's fee fund, \$320,000.

25

The investment vehicle jointly agreed to by the parties has worked out very well, particularly under the circumstances of the economy the last two or three years. And we appreciate very much the way in which the special master, Mr. Juneau, has seen to the administration and coordination between Deutsche Bank, the court-appointed paid master, and with the parties involved.

And in that regard, we also jointly wish Mr. Juneau and his staff a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and we appreciate very much the way in which they have performed their duties. Certainly, any discussion that we have regarding process is not in any way related to the performance of Mr. Juneau or his staff, because they have been outstanding. They've been cooperative. Daily, we receive information from them.

And I can say it's a pleasure for us and our staff to work with them.

THE COURT: All right. Trial schedule is the next item on the agenda. There was one trial set, but my understanding it's been --

MR. PREUSS: It's still on the calendar.

THE COURT: Okay. And another item is MDL mediation resolution program. Let me hear from the special master in that regard.

MR. JUNEAU: Your Honor, for the record, Patrick

Juneau, the special master. Just so we'll have up-to-date information: As of this morning, there are 113 claims that are actually being submitted to the medical panel. Obviously, some of these are still in the review process, because more than one doctor examines the file.

We have and will meet today. Your Honor -- I

We have and will meet today, Your Honor -- I have signed almost 150 motions in order, but they're individual because of the HIPPA laws and so forth. And we're going to meet with the representative defendant, your staff, and the plaintiffs and try to work out, mechanically, how do we get the order attached.

It's strictly an administrative matter. But in view of the electronic filing requirements under the law, we need to comply with that. We're going to do that today.

The other thing that I will mention, Your Honor, that there are a significant number of claims that we anticipate receiving in fairly short order because of what the stepped-up procedure we instituted about two conferences ago. That's expedited a receipt of the information from the special master's office so we can turn it over to the panel.

I might add, Your Honor, that once the information is received by our office, the required information under the program, within one week that matter goes to the panel. So that process is fully activated.

THE COURT: How long does the panel generally take?

MR. JUNEAU: You know how these doctors are, Your Honor. But they usually -- it looks like we're dealing with about a two-week period, because just coordinating these two doctors to get it. But that really has not been a problem.

In the totality of the process we're talking about, once everything's done according to the protocol that was developed in this case, it hits our office and everything is submitted that's supposed to be submitted. Things happen quick.

So what we've done is try to look at the back side of the process to try to expedite the things that need to be done in terms of briefing under the protocol that's set forth in the term sheet according to the records and have to be submitted deficiencies. That's the thing we're really working on getting cleared up, and we've made substantial progress in that regard.

I guess the ultimate point I'm driving at here, Your Honor, because institution of those processes, I think you're going to see, in short order, a lot quicker matters being submitted to the panel. But the panel is not the problem insofar as getting it to the panel and them having to make the decision. They've been very, very productive in that regard.

THE COURT: So you have 113 claims that have been submitted to the panel thus far?

MR. JUNEAU: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: How many of those were found for the 1 2 plaintiff and how many found for the defendant? MR. JUNEAU: Here are the numbers in that regard. 3 The breakdown is as follows: There were six claims determined 4 5 to be eligible; there were 79 declared not to be eligible; and 6 28 are in panel review as we speak. 7 **THE COURT:** How many in review, 29? MR. JUNEAU: 8 28. 9 THE COURT: 28? MR. JUNEAU: Yes, sir. And one last number, Your 10 11 Honor, there are 195 cases that have totally cleared any 12 deficiencies, information's being submitted and we're waiting 13 on the brief that is required on the term sheet from the 14 defendants. As soon as those are received, those 195 are ready 15 for submission to the panel. **THE COURT:** So that's in addition to the 113? 16 17 MR. JUNEAU: That's in addition to the 113. 18 Now, how many of the ones that are THE COURT: 19 eligible, not eligible were there -- they need unanimity and 20 then when there's no unanimity, then a third person was brought 21 How many of those were there? 22 MR. JUNEAU: There were ten cases that resulted in 23 tie votes, if you will. THE COURT: Uh-huh. 24 25 MR. JUNEAU: And of those ten, four were declared to

be eligible. So if you look at the totality of those numbers,
that's four that came from those split decisions. I've already

indicated to the Court that six were declared eligible.

That would mean there were four that came from the split decisions were declared eligible; and there were two that didn't have any splits, we just took in totality declared

to be eligible. That's how the six is arrived at.

THE COURT: Okay. How many total do you feel that

we're going to be dealing with?

MR. JUNEAU: Well, we have 696 death claims, Your Honor. And of the personal injury claims received as Tier II and III, those not specified, that's 3,674.

One of the procedural problems is this, Your Honor: A lot of these claims, even though they're listed like that -- and this is just my observation -- really would fall in an administrative claim category.

But the way they're submitted is not an expedited form. It's the full claim form. And if they submit them like that, we are obliged to have those cases actually totally reviewed, report the deficiency, if there are deficiencies, whatever the deficiencies are, and then submit that to an actual medical panel, because that's what they're asking be done.

What that really does is when you do that, it extends the process, you know, of the reviews. It just takes

time to do that, and that's just one of the inherent processes matters that we've attempted to address. We've attempted to address that. Your Honor.

We brought this up, I think, last time or before in some matters where we thought it was just obviously was clearly without any question, undoubtedly, you could just look at the pure submission, was purely an administrative claim.

And in an effort to try to address those, from our standpoint, but not waive anyone's right for a medical review and so forth, at least it triggered those, and at least the defendant at that point, then it has the option of getting a reduced briefing schedule, because that's really all that would be required under that circumstance. And they have done that, and we're in the throws of dealing with that now.

That's that group of cases that I told you I think there's going to be a thrust of cases hitting us. We've dealt with Tracie on those, and that seems to be working fairly well.

All of that's designed to get the ultimate, the things that we've got to get addressed. More specifically, these death claims and personal injury claims that have got all the information, we want to get to those cases. We don't want to hold up those cases in the process. And that's, essentially, what's going on.

THE COURT: Okay. Any comment from anybody on

1 statistics? Everybody agrees with those statistics? 2 MR. HERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. Anything further on the mediation resolution program? 4 MR. HERMAN: Not from plaintiffs, Your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: Okav. 7 MR. PREUSS: No, Your Honor. 8 **THE COURT:** What about pro se, the next item on the 9 agenda? MR. HERMAN: There will be a hearing, as I 10 11 understand, already set on dismissing the number of pro se claimants on January 3rd, 2007. The curator, Attorney Robert 12 13 Johnston, has signed the order -- excuse me -- provided notice 14 of the court-signed order to all pro se plaintiffs. 15 THE COURT: Any input on that process? Is this working, not working, needs to be something done with it, or is 16 17 it working? 18 MR. HERMAN: I spoke with Bob Johnston about ten days 19 ago. He was not in, but I spoke to the person in his office 20 who is handling it and they have had really no problems. 21 seems to be going along fine. **THE COURT:** Anything from the defendants on that? 22 23 Any problem that you see? 24 MR. IRWIN: No, Your Honor. I think they're all 25 reasonably working them out.

1	MR. JUNEAU: And, Your Honor, Patrick Juneau, for the
2	record. Mr. Johnston's office has been a participant and
3	regularly speaks with all of us on our weekly calls on
4	Thursday. So he's up to date on everything that we're talking
5	about here.
6	THE COURT: An emergency motion for attorney's fees
7	is still that's
8	MR. HERMAN: Still continuing.
9	THE COURT: Okay. We'll continue those.
10	Anything more on the agenda that anybody needs
11	to talk about?
12	MR. HERMAN: No, Your Honor.
13	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thursday, February the 8th.
14	THE COURT: How about Thursday, February 8th?
15	THE DEPUTY CLERK: 8:30 and 9:30.
16	THE COURT: It doesn't matter. Either call in or in
17	court. Do we need to be in court or call in?
18	MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, we'll confer
19	THE COURT: Why don't you discuss it, confer and then
20	let me know.
21	MR. HERMAN: about the motion.
22	As far as February 8th is concerned, that's fine
23	with plaintiffs.
24	THE COURT: What about call in or in person, does
25	anybody have any feelings on that?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, my feeling is it depends on 1 2 when Your Honor wants to hear whatever motions we file under 3 seal and the response time necessary for defendants to respond. THE COURT: 4 Okay. 5 MR. PREUSS: The 7th would work better, if that's 6 possible. MR. HERMAN: I'm not available on the 6th or the 7th. 7 MR. PREUSS: Well, I can make it work. 8 9 THE COURT: Make it work, okay. All right. 10 What I'll do is I'll put it in person. Call me 11 if we need to change it to a telephone conversation. 12 MR. HERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you all. And, again, 14 from the Court's standpoint, I wish all of you and your 15 families Happy Holidays. MR. HERMAN: May I approach on another matter? 16 17 Sure, sure. THE COURT: (WHEREUPON, the Court was adjourned.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE

I, Jodi Simcox, RMR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District 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.

> Jodi Simcox, RMR Official Court Reporter

JODI SIMCOX, RMR - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA