UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

IN RE: TAXOTERE
(DOCETAXEL) PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION
CIVIL ACTION NO. 16-MD-2740 "H" NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA THURSDAY, MAY 30, 2019, 10:00 A.M.

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
ALL CASES

TRANSCRIPT OF DISCOVERY/STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL NORTH UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: BARRIOS KINGSDORF \& CASTEIX BY: DAWN M. BARRIOS, ESQ. 701 POYDRAS STREET, SUITE 3650 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70139

GIBBS LAW GROUP
BY: KAREN B. MENZIES, ESQ. 400 CONTINENTAL BOULEVARD 6TH FLOOR EL SUGUNDO, CALIFORNIA 90245

MARTZELL BICKFORD \& CENTOLA BY: LAWRENCE J. CENTOLA, ESQ. 338 LAFAYETTE STREET NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 7013

LEMMON LAW FIRM
BY: ANDREW LEMMON, ESQ. 650 POYDRAS STREET
SUITE 2335
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130

ATKINS \& MARKOFF LAW FIRM
BY: DANIEL P. MARKOFF, ESQ.
9211 LAKE HEFNER PARKWAY, STE. 104
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA 73120

PENDLEY BAUDIN \& COFFIN
BY: CHRISTOPHER L. COFFIN, ESQ. 1515 POYDRAS STREET, SUITE 1400 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70112

STUEVE SIEGEL HANSON
BY: ABBY E. MCCLELLAN, ESQ. 460 NICHOLS ROAD, SUITE 200 KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64112

ANDREWS THORNTON HIGGINS RAZMARA BY: ANNE ANDREWS, ESQ. JOHN C. THORNTON, ESQ.
2 CORPORATE PARK SUITE 110 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92606

FOR SANOFI S.A.:
IRWIN FRITCHIE URQUHART \& MOORE BY: DOUGLAS J. MOORE, ESQ. KELLY E. BRILLEAUX, ESQ. 400 POYDRAS STREET, SUITE 2700 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

SHOOK, HARDY \& BACON
BY: HARLEY V. RATLIFF, ESQ.
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64108

FOR ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC.:

FOR SANDOZ, A NOVARTIS DIVISION:

FOR PFIZER, INC., AND HOSPIRA WORLDWIDE, LLC:

FOR HOSPIRA, INC., HOSPIRA WORLDWIDE, LLC, FORMERLY DOING BUSINESS AS HOSPIRA WORLDWIDE, INC., AND PFIZER INC.:

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART \& SULLIVAN BY: MARA C. GONZALEZ, ESQ. 51 MADISON AVENUE, 22ND FLOOR NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10010

CHAFFE MCCALL
BY: JOHN F. OLINDE, ESQ.
2300 ENERGY CENTRE
1100 POYDRAS STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70163

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

FOR SUN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES, LTD:

FOR ACCORD HEALTHCARE, INC.:

HINSHAW \& CULBERTSON BY: GEOFFREY M. COAN, ESQ. 28 STATE STREET 24TH FLOOR BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109

TUCKER ELLIS
BY: JULIE A. CALLSEN, ESQ. 950 MAIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100 CLEVELAND, OHIO 44113

ALSO PRESENT:
ANDRE MURA, ESQ.
LAURA DAVIS, ESQ.
BRIAN HAZEN, ESQ. JASON HARMON, ESQ.

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: CATHY PEPPER, CRR, RMR, CCR CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER REGISTERED MERIT REPORTER 500 POYDRAS STREET, ROOM B-275 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130 (504) 589-7779

Cathy_Pepper@laed.uscourts.gov

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY. TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION.

## I N D E X

> AGENDA ITEMS

SHIRLEY LEDLIE................................................ 6
PSC IS SEEKING ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS FROM SANOFI RELATED TO MS. LEDLIE'S FRENCH CRCI CLAIM............. 6 SANOFI'S REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF THE EXPENSES ASSOCIATED WITH ITS DISCOVERY OF MS. LEDLIE.......... 11 PRODUCING THIRD-PARTY SUBPOENA RETURNS AND OBJECTIONS. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 12

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
MORNING SESSION
THURSDAY, MAY 30, 2019
(COURT CALLED TO ORDER)

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. How is everybody doing?

VOICES: Good, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. I've read everyone's submissions and the responses to the submissions, and obviously I've been down this road with you now all for a while on a number of these issues.

First, I'm going to address these Shirley Ledlie issues. The PSC is seeking additional documents from Sanofi related to Ms. Ledlie's French CRCI claim, and then Sanofi is seeking reimbursement for its costs for proceeding to the Hague Convention to obtain Ms. Ledlie's testimony in France. From a discovery standpoint, as far as I'm concerned, Ms. Ledlie's role in this litigation is at an end.

The document request I want to address first. The PSC's document request to Sanofi, I think that that request falls outside the scope of permissible discovery in the case and outside the scope of my February 6, 2019, order.

Documents related to this foreign nonparty's
claim in another country are just, in my view, not relevant to this matter. This is particularly true given the personal nature of much of what's been requested.

As recently as yesterday, in its letter to the Court, the PSC called discovery that's already been taken of Ms. Ledlie disproportionate, stating Ms. Ledlie's testimony simply lacks relevance to the merits of the claims of thousands of women who have sued Sanofi for their injuries. Sanofi nevertheless insisted on pursuing discovery of a foreign individual who was removed from the plaintiffs' witness list.

It's hard to describe the PSC's position in seeking additional documents in a foreign proceeding that relate to Ms. Ledlie as anything other than doublespeak based on the arguments that the PSC has made throughout this litigation as to Sanofi's efforts to conduct discovery as to her both here and in France.

Ultimately, I don't think any of the information that's been requested, and I'll borrow again from the PSC's own arguments, can be described as having a direct and precise link with the trial plaintiffs' trials, and for that reason, the requested additional discovery concerning Ms. Ledlie is denied. MS. MENZIES: May I make a statement for the record? THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MENZIES: So, the record is clear -THE COURT: Just identify yourself -- oh, she's got it.

I'm looking. She knows who you are now.
MS. MENZIES: We go back.
Okay. The main points we want to make for the record, Your Honor, is that, one, there is an agreement between the parties that has been entered into a formal order in this court. It's Document 1072, related to discovery of French information, where Sanofi has agreed not to raise the French Blocking Statute or anything else to request for documents in France.

Where we see the relevance in the narrow request that we're talking about has nothing to do with Shirley Ledlie; in fact, it would be fine if they redact her name out. What is relevant to us for purposes of the deposition we're about to take next week is the fact that internally Sanofi is not only -- you recall your order allows us to ask about communications for possible legal action.

What Sanofi was doing at the time in 2009 -- '8, '9, '10, '11 was not only in communication with somebody on potential legal action about permanent alopecia, ongoing alopecia but actively defending a claim for permanent alopecia. So what we see as relevant is the internal documents that Shirley Ledlie would never have anyway, but the internal documents from the risk management department and others at Sanofi that are working up their defense of that claim.

So the record is very clear, the document that was used as Exhibit 6 in the Shirley Ledlie testimony in France was not the ultimate adjudication by the CRCI. It was actually Sanofi's legal position paper arguing why her claim is not valid. So when we have an active legal action going on, we don't see how that, at least in the context of discovery, isn't relevant for this upcoming deposition.

The second point on that, too, Your Honor, is that we have asked them, "Do these documents exist? If they don't, let us know. If they are too hard to get, let us know." We haven't heard any answer on that at all.

So under the umbrella of what --
THE COURT: They've objected to producing anything in response to the request.

MS. MENZIES: Arguing that it's outside of the scope and irrelevant.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. MENZIES: What we don't know is do they have these documents and they are not willing to produce them on the basis of irrelevance.

So if they have the documents, and given the breadth of relevance related to these issues other than Shirley Ledlie, Sanofi's internal actions defending a claim for permanent alopecia for a patient who took Taxotere, which, by the way, at the same time they were getting communications from
other women like Pam Kirby, who we know is in communication with Sanofi also at this same time, so the accumulation of those communications -- and Pam is not the only one. We've now just a few weeks ago received two more letters in the same time period of women. One in Oklahoma.

So all of this at the same time is building this awareness of Sanofi that they are going to be facing legal litigation; in fact, they are facing it in other countries. There are claims in Germany and otherwise.

So, for the record, we believe that this is well within the scope of the discovery related to the issue of possible legal action for women related to Taxotere and ongoing alopecia.

Thank you.
MR. RATLIFF: Your Honor, unless you plan to change your mind from your original ruling, I don't really have anything further to say.

THE COURT: I'm not going to change my mind. I've stated it in such a way that it will be reflected in the minute entry. Obviously y'all will become familiar with Rule 72 in this case, so if you all need to invoke it again, that's fine.

MR. OLINDE: Your Honor, some people on the phone emailed me and said they couldn't hear. Maybe it's just because of the microphone.

THE COURT: Well, my microphone is on.

MR. OLINDE: Yes, I think it may have been because of the speakers.

THE COURT: All right. Hold on. I've turned it up.
Okay. All right. As to Sanofi's request for reimbursement of the expenses associated with its discovery of Ms. Ledlie, I'm going to deny that request.

It's true that I previously described the PSC's shifting positions on the appropriateness of discovery on Ms. Ledlie generally, as well as their shifting positions on cooperating and obtaining that discovery as gamesmanship, and I think that still holds true.

I don't believe it rises to the level sufficient to lead me to shift the costs of that discovery to the PSC, which, in the end, vigorously opposed the taking of that discovery.

First of all, Sanofi affirmatively sought to take the discovery via the Hague Convention in this court and in the French court, and they did that in the face of the PSC's opposition. It was fully aware at all times of the costs associated in what it sought. There is no evidence, only speculation, as far as I can tell, as to how Ms. Ledlie might have acted differently had the PSC asked her nicely to cooperate in discovery.

While I disapproved of the changing positions and tactics with regard to this entire Shirley Ledlie saga on the
part of the PSC again, I don't think that they rise to the level necessary to shift the cost of the discovery at this point after it's been completed.

All right. As for the other issue that's been raised, the issue of producing third-party subpoena returns and objections, let me make this clear, and I'll make it clear in the minute entry, that there are no exceptions to that requirement.

Anything that is received from a third-party pursuant to a subpoena that is sent by any party in this litigation has to be shared and produced to the other parties. Whether it's actual document productions, whether it's objections, whether it's communications or other correspondence, everything needs to be shared among the litigants.

To the extent that that has not been done by any party, I'm going to require it to be done within 14 days. Within those 14 days or at the expiration of those 14 days, I'm going to require all the parties to submit -- and, John, you all can submit a single affirmation on behalf of the collection of your clients -- to submit an affirmation that has been accomplished and that there are no documents, objections, correspondences, or communications from third parties pursuant to subpoenas that are in the possession of any of the parties that have not yet been shared.

I don't think that is the case currently, based on what Sanofi told me in their position paper, but just to be clear, and because there is a suggestion that maybe other parties have not yet shared some of that information, I've stated what needs to be shared, and I've given you 14 days to do it and to confirm for me by a filing in the record that it's been done. All right?

MR. RATLIFF: Your Honor, may I address that very quickly?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. RATLIFF: Number 1, in our submission that was filed, I guess, on Tuesday evening, there was a chart of all of our subpoenas and the responses and the documents. There was one error in that, which I just realized this morning, which was one for a subpoena we sent to Dr. Mario Lacouture. He has never -- they never responded to that subpoena, so there was a date on which we produced documents.

I talked to my paralegal. That was the date the subpoena was sent out, not the documents had been received. I've communicated that previously to counsel, but I'll communicate that again in writing.

THE COURT: I know there is a lag time between when you all receive the documents and when you have to produce them. That's fine. That's understandable. That's built into the process. To extent that there are documents stuck in that lag
time when the 14 days expires, just include that information in the declarations that you file.

MR. RATLIFF: Then the other thing is just, I guess, a point of clarification as to what you want produced, which is --

THE COURT: If you get anything -- anything from a third-party pursuant to a subpoena, it's to be shared. Anything.

MR. RATLIFF: Understood. So, like, an email, like, we typically have dealt with their outside counsel, and we send an email saying, what's the status of the production, are we going to hear from that?

Is that something -- because I know that happened on both sides because they've issued a lot of subpoenas. We know they've talked to people they've subpoenaed, their outside counsel. Is that something you envisioned as part of you order?

THE COURT: If you all want to agree that such ministerial emails need not be produced, I'm fine with that.

MR. RATLIFF: I think we would be fine. I just don't know if I can go back and recreate every email that's been sent by my paralegal to an outside counsel.

THE COURT: I'm not concerned about those sorts of emails. I'm talking about substantive information that you would want if it were being sent to Ms. Menzies or Mr. Centola.

You want to see it. I don't think there is a mystery about what I --

MR. RATLIFF: Yeah. Understood. That was the only thing I wanted to clarify for Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. CENTOLA: Just to confirm, Your Honor,
Larry Centola for the PSC. We can talk to Mr. Ratliff about this. We do want the transmission cover letter or the transmission email that says, "The following are attached," which then we can tie a bow around what has actually been produced.

THE COURT: I can envision there are e-mails about what format do you want this in? Can I have a week extension? You know, that sort of thing.

MR. CENTOLA: We can work with them and agree to not produce such ministerial emails or cover letters, but the cover letters that describe what is being produced, so we can tie a bow around what is being produced. That is our concern.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
All right. Very good. I'm going to see you all again soon, right? Don't I have something else scheduled? No. MS. BARRIOS: No, Your Honor.

Dawn Barrios for the PSC. There was a PTO 85
hearing, a show cause hearing that was supposed to be Tuesday, but Sanofi had requested that it be adjourned. I know that
they did, in all fairness, they did request a new date for the PTO 85 hearing.

THE COURT: They did. I don't have that. Why don't you all come up with a couple of options and just talk to Blanca, and she'll put it on the calendar. Whatever works for you all, as long as it's on the calendar.

MS. BARRIOS: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. RATLIFF: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'll see you all next time.
(WHEREUPON, at 10:18 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
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