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THE COURT: This is Case Number 20-md-02924, In re: Zantac (Ranitidine) Products Liability Litigation. We are here today for a status conference relating to social media discovery, is my understanding from my conversations with the special master. Part of the purpose of the hearing is for me to get a better handle on exactly what the issues are.

Let me start by recognizing counsel for the Plaintiffs.

MS. FEGAN: Good afternoon, your Honor, Elizabeth Fegan on behalf of Plaintiffs.

MS. WHITELEY: Good afternoon, your Honor, Conlee Whiteley on behalf of Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Who is representing the brand Defendants this afternoon?

MS. SHOWALTER: Good afternoon, your Honor, Annie Showalter for the brand Defendants.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Showalter. Anyone else?

MR. DEVEREAUX: Good afternoon, your Honor, this is Stephen Devereaux for Boehringer Ingelheim.

MR. YOUNG: Christopher Young, your Honor, for the Sanofi Defendants.

MR. SACHSE: Good afternoon, your Honor, Will Sachse on behalf of GSK. I am hoping to be a passenger on this one. THE COURT: I was told Ms. Showalter was the pilot and
everyone else was just on standby.
MR. SACHSE: Absolutely.
THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. My
understanding from a conversation I had with the special master earlier this week is that there is a dispute which I understand arises from requests for production made by the Defendants to the class representatives of some of the classes. That is one of the things I want to clarify, is which classes are we talking about.

I am pretty sure $I$ understand it involves the economic loss classes. I am not sure if it also involves the medical monitoring classes. My understanding is that it does not involve the personal injury classes. So, let me start with that.

Ms. Showalter, can you clarify for me who is the target of the requests for production?

MS. SHOWALTER: Of course, your Honor. It is the economic loss and medical monitoring classes, and you are correct, the personal injury class is not included.

THE COURT: Okay. So, the request for production has been made. My understanding is the Plaintiffs have lodged legal objections to the request, and either Ms. Whiteley or Ms. Fegan, I don't know who is speaking primarily for the class, what are the legal objections that have been raised? I am not asking you to argue those positions, I am just trying to
identify what the positions are.
MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, could I back up just a moment and explain a little bit about what the requests specifically are and the scope of what is being attacked? This isn't just limited to social media, which is why we are here today in the context of asking for a change of process.

THE COURT: For the record, this is Ms. Fegan. Go ahead.

MS. FEGAN: Yes, thank you, this is Ms. Fegan. Your Honor, the requests that were originally made, the requests for production, were made more than a year ago. At that time we did lodge objections and we did state how we would conduct our searches. We also, over time, through meet and confers, agreed to produce medical records.

Through that process with our 112 current named Plaintiffs we have actually produced over a hundred thousand pages, and we have been very clear about how those searches were being conducted and what our process was.

For the first time last week we received three pages of narrative that the scope of what we are searching must be expanded and 200 new search terms, not just for social media, but for any conceivable place that Plaintiff may have ESI, whether it is a computer, whether it is email, whether it is Snapchat. We are talking about a very, very large scope even if through our process we have determined that a particular

Plaintiff has no relevant ESI through a particular forum or search place.

Because we are so far into this litigation and what is being asked is that we go back to the very beginning and it would significantly impact the schedule, it has an impact outside of this MDL. We believe that this is being used in order to set a standard for class actions going forward and, frankly, far beyond anything in my 25 years that $I$ have ever had requested of a class representative. We are asking that the process be changed.

The three things that we are asking for, your Honor, just to be clear, is a change in sequencing, a change in pages, and a change in time for our response.

THE COURT: I will -- I promise you I will get to all of those.

MS. FEGAN: No problem.
THE COURT: That is the whole purpose of today is, not to argue the merits of anyone's position, but actually to set a briefing schedule on process going forward. I appreciate the background, but $I$ am really only here to discuss process.

Ms. Showalter, can you give me a sense of what is the scope of the request, what is the information that is being requested? Obviously, it has been over a year, there have obviously been meet and conferrals. What is left? What is sort of currently at issue? Maybe the request for production
asks for a lot and what is left is some subset of the request. Can you clarify that for me, Ms. Showalter?

MS. SHOWALTER: Yes, your Honor. We issued a number of requests many, many months ago now, and my understanding is that those that are primarily the subject of today's discussion were requests for ESI, including, but not limited to, social media, although Ms. Fegan is correct that we also issued requests that encompassed medical records and other documents. My understanding is that that is not what we are here today to discuss, although $I$ would be remiss if $I$ didn't mention that we requested a $26(\mathrm{~g})$ certification as to the completeness of that other discovery and that is something that we are waiting on.

With respect to social media and ESI, what we are looking for is a collection of whatever ESI sources a particular Plaintiff has, their email, the social media platforms that they use, wherever they store electronic documents, and we would like a certification that those sources have been identified and searched and then a production of what from those sources we specifically requested.

THE COURT: I understand. Let me repeat it back and make sure $I$ understand it correctly from both sides' perspective.

What is still at issue is not medical records and things like that, that production is occurring. There may be
an issue as to whether it has been completed and what certification the Plaintiffs need to give. Mr. Sachse is an expert on that process having been through it on the other side. You all can confer with Mr. Sachse and Ms. Finken about how that works, but we will put that to the side.

What is still in dispute, as I understand it, are some ESI requests including, but not limited to, whether a party is required to search social media accounts in order to respond to an ESI request.

Am I correct, Ms. Showalter, is that your understanding?

MS. SHOWALTER: Yes, that is correct. We have been discussing those issues since at least February of this year.

THE COURT: Understood. There will be plenty of time for everyone to argue their positions. I just want to make sure $I$ am pointing at the right bull's eyes.

Ms. Whiteley or Ms. Fegan, at a very high level of abstraction, is that the issue here; there has been a request for ESI, a request that you search certain sources of ESI, and you object either to the scope of the request, no matter where you have to search, and/or having to search the social media or both? Am I correct?

MS. FEGAN: No, your Honor, you are not, because I want to be very clear, we have conducted searches of relevant ESI. I think this goes more towards scope and what is required
and how that search is conducted, and that, to me, I think is really fundamental, the fundamental issue.

We have gone through the process of working with our clients to identify relevant sources of ESI and to conduct searches of relevant sources of ESI. So, it is not just that we are objecting straight out to doing any of that.

THE COURT: Understood, understood.
All right. So, I guess -- a couple of thoughts, and then we will get to the process questions. I guess there is a couple of responses that the Plaintiffs can make to a request like this, right? One is, we have looked at everything and we have given you what we have. Here is a Rule 26(g) certification that says you got everything, there is nothing that is being held back. That is one response.

Another response is, under Rule 26(g), we only have to conduct a reasonable search -- go back over the transcript with Mr. Oot, he made this argument very articulately about a year ago. We only have to make a reasonable search, we don't have to look in every corner of every box or every ESI account that everybody has, and we are not going to. We are giving you what we are giving you. We conducted a reasonable search, here is our Rule $26(g)$ certification. If you want to contest that, you can go in front of the Court and the Judge will resolve whether we conducted a reasonable Rule 26 compliant search.

Another response is, we are willing to look a little
bit more, we haven't completed our search. We are not agreeing to look everywhere, but we understand there is still some flexibility here, but we think there is additional searching which is proportional to the needs of the case and there's additional searching that's not, but we want to negotiate that rather than unilaterally put our foot down and say we are done.

I am just trying to figure it out, and you don't have to answer this now. I am going to give you time to brief all these issues, but $I$ am putting you on notice. That is a question $I$ just want to have clarified for me: Where are we?

If the Plaintiffs are saying we are done, we haven't looked everywhere, and we are not going to, then the question to me is, am I going to order the Plaintiffs to look for more stuff than they agreed to? That is fine, that is an issue I will address.

If the answer is we will look for more, but what they are asking us to look for is disproportionate, that is a different analysis and $I$ will rule on that, and that's fine.

MS. FEGAN: I think we are in the third category, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are willing to look for more, but you just think what they are asking you to do is disproportionate to the needs of the case?

MS. FEGAN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. That helps. Let's focus on that.

Let me tell you what my kind of -- knowing virtually nothing about exactly what the dispute is, let me tell you some preliminary questions would $I$ have. Again, not -- you don't have to answer this fully, but to the extent you want to give me a high level flavor, this is helpful.

Ms. Showalter, my usual entry question in every discovery dispute, what is it you are looking for and why is it relevant? I understand these are the class Plaintiffs, so I kind of infer that what you are trying to figure out is, you want to use this information in some way either to challenge certification of the class as a whole or to challenge the adequacy of these 112 individuals as class representatives.

I don't want you to disclose your secrets, but is that generally the relevance theory, that it is relevant to their adequacy as a class rep?

MS. SHOWALTER: We don't have any secrets, your Honor. Yes, so it's both their adequacy as the class representative and the class certification issues, and obviously discovery as to their particular cases. I can provide some examples of the sorts of ESI that we are looking for and how that is relevant to specific aspects of the case if that would be helpful.

THE COURT: Before you do, what I am more interested in is not necessarily the ESI you are looking for -- and again, you don't necessarily have to tell me this today, but it would help inform my process -- is what are the facts we are trying
to develop? For example, I can say maybe the argument is, this person isn't an adequate class representative because they are 92 years old and may have 73 other co-morbidities. What we want to find out is how old are they and what co-morbidities do they have.

Those are the facts that you are trying to develop and I can understand the theory of relevance built upon those facts. That would then lead to the next question, which is, is searching this particular ESI the most efficient proportional way to develop those facts.

If that makes any sense, if you want to respond to that, Ms. Showalter, I will be happy to hear. I just wanted to give you some examples.

MS. SHOWALTER: Yes, that makes perfect sense, your Honor. So, those are exactly the sorts of facts that we are looking to develop. So, for example, co-morbidities or other cancer related risk-taking behaviors, like whether a particular class Plaintiff, regardless of what they may have said in their medical records, was a smoker, whether that is evidenced on, for example, things that they were posting to social media; whether in their ESI they can demonstrate proof of use or purchase of the product if they are an economic loss class Plaintiff; whether they have receipts for Ranitidine. For example, CVS emails me a receipt for every single thing that $I$ purchase.

Those are the sorts of things that we are looking for and the reasons that they are relevant to the particular facts we are developing.

THE COURT: Okay, very well. Let me turn back to Ms. Fegan and Ms. Whiteley.

MS. FEGAN: Those are easy for me to address, your Honor. We have, in fact, searched for and produced receipts to the extent that they had them. We searched ESI for Ranitidine. And when we talk about co-morbidities and cancer, we have offered -- even though we think it is beyond what we need to be doing, but we have offered to search for anything related to any health or medical condition.

So, we have offered to do more, but the more that we are talking about -- I think that is why it is really critical in the context of briefing to talk about it in the context of, you know, the 200 search terms they asked us to use because they can't be tied so easily in the way your Honor just did, which is a very helpful discussion to have and what we think is going to be required in this kind of going forward process.

MS. SHOWALTER: Your Honor, may I respond to that briefly?

THE COURT: Yes.
MS. SHOWALTER: One of the examples there that went unaddressed was smoking where it isn't disclosed in a medical record, but, for example, there is a post evidencing that a

Plaintiff was a smoker on social media. Those are the sorts of things that have not been provided. That is not another illness that Plaintiffs have offered to search for. Their other searches offered were limited to mentions of Zantac, Ranitidine, or NDMA.

So, there are a number of important outstanding risk factors that our search terms address that have not been included in what has already been searched.

THE COURT: Understood. I am going to preempt what Ms. Fegan I am sure is going to say, which is, yeah, but it is not worth us searching 112 people's Facebook posts for the last five years to try to find that needle in that haystack.

That seems to me -- let's get to the end of this proceeding quickly. That is what $I$ need you to tee up for me. If that is really where the issue joins here, that the Plaintiffs agree, look, if the person is really a smoker we can, at least for these purposes, agree that is relevant, but this isn't the way you go about figuring that out, or even if it is, it is so burdensome for us to have to do it that we shouldn't have to do it. Okay. That is what I am hearing as sort of the issue that has been framed here.

Now let's talk about how we frame it properly so that each side gets a fair opportunity to argue their legal position, submit, if it is a burden question, obviously declarations of what the burden would be or wouldn't be, or
anything else you want to offer, but let's talk about a process to get there. Let's start with who should go first.

There was a request for production from the Defense. The Plaintiff has objected on, I am guessing, proportionality and relevance grounds, so it is back to the Defendant. You are, in essence, seeking to compel them to produce and to search for things they have said they won't search for.

I guess you go first, Ms. Showalter.
MS. SHOWALTER: Your Honor, I think the one wrinkle in that is that we have now provided them the search terms and more detail about the scope of what we are looking for, and we haven't gotten a response to that. So, it would be helpful to know, perhaps some of those search terms are acceptable to Plaintiffs, or is it the whole process of collecting social media and searching it that is objectionable to Plaintiffs.

I am worried that if we go first we are briefing a little bit against ourselves and not really knowing what Plaintiffs' full position is.

THE COURT: Ms. Fegan, should you go first?
MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, no. I think in the traditional sense when there is a motion to compel, the person who wants to compel has to define for the Court what it is that they are seeking to compel. That is why we requested this change in process from the PTO process, because that position has changed over the last ten months, and we feel it is
important that it get locked in at this point in time.
THE COURT: I agree in part and I disagree in part.
The whole purpose of the objection process is to identify what you are giving them and what you are holding back, like what exists, what we are giving you. Ms. Finken and Mr. Sachse and I had, I don't know, half a dozen hearings to work through these sorts of issues.

I think Ms. Showalter is right to the extent that if you give her transparency and you tell her, we agree to search for this and we ain't searching for that, or we agree to search here, but we won't search there, then I don't have a problem making the Defense go first.

I think they are entitled to know either what exists -- the traditional things that all discovery responses are supposed to tell them, here is what we gave you, here is what we have looked for, we know it exists, but we are not giving it to you for some legal reason, and here is where we looked and we didn't find anything, and here is where we aren't going to look.

Those are the four boxes that you need to fill in to then allow the Defense to frame their briefing to then allow you to respond to that briefing.

Do you have a problem doing that, Ms. Fegan?
MS. FEGAN: We have already done that, your Honor. I would like to back up a little bit here in terms of the meet
and confer process and kind of what has happened in the last ten days. We advised them what we were willing to do, and in the context of that, we said we would do additional searches for any health and medical condition. They asked during the meet and confer process to have the opportunity to provide ten search terms on risk factors. Instead, we got 200 search terms.

I don't know which ones they would contend are related to these risk factors. I don't know if they would change, if they have to define these to the Court. They did not for those 200 search terms say, and they were asked to, but they didn't say for two with the little asterisks by it, that is related to this risk factor or it's related to adequacy or it's related to something else.

So, honestly, for us to start without understanding how 200 search terms are relevant to any of these areas, that would require us to start to assume what their argument is and then argue against it.

I would just ask that, at the very least, they identify why particular search terms are relevant, and I think that this is why in the motion to compel process it is important that the Defendants first argue why there is a relevance issue, and then we can come back and deal with both relevance and proportionality.

MS. SHOWALTER: Your Honor, may I respond to that,
please?

THE COURT: In a second, yes. Back to you, Ms. Fegan, your whole argument presupposes that you have given them the information $I$ am talking about, which is, this is what we gave you, this is what we are holding back, this is what we looked for and we don't have, and this is what we are not going to look for.

Then, if they say to you, well, you said you are not going to look there, we want you to look there and we want you to use these search terms, and we want the court to compel you to use those search terms, then I think I can -- I understand your argument, Ms. Fegan, as long as they have that baseline information.

So, my question back to you is, do you believe they either have it or are you willing to provide it within short order?

MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, I think we can provide that -I believe we provided it, but to make it succinct and in a way that this Court will ultimately be able to digest it, I think that we can provide that information within seven days. I am saying seven days just because for 112 people, it is not the same for each one because each one has different sources. It is not a matter of, like with a company, being able to say we searched the network, we didn't search teams.

Instead, we actually have 112 people who have
different things, and different -- so it will take us time to collate that, but that is something we can do and provide to them through the special master in the meet and confer process, and then that will give the basis for us to move forward with the motion to compel process.

THE COURT: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that.
Ms. Showalter, assuming you can get that
information -- and maybe you don't think seven days is fast enough, but we can talk about that -- now I am happy to hear your response.

MS. SHOWALTER: Yes, your Honor. For the threshold we would absolutely need to know as to each Plaintiff how they went about identifying the sources that were searched, was this a simple conversation where they asked the Plaintiff what their sources were, or how was that verified, which sources were searched as to each particular Plaintiff.

My understanding is that that search thus far has just been for references to NDMA, Ranitidine, and Zantac, and they have offered searches only for other illnesses, and that hasn't been done yet. That would need to be confirmed.

With respect to our search terms, we had discussed developing search terms that would get at the top ten cancer risk factors, not ten terms, and that we would provide those to Plaintiffs along with other search terms that were relevant to the categories that are in the charts we provided. For
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example, one of them is labeled Damages. I think it is pretty clear what those terms are related to.

So, if there are any of those terms that Plaintiffs are willing to search, we would appreciate knowing what those are, because those are then knocked off the table for purposes of our briefing and we can narrow the issues. With that information this should be a pretty straightforward dispute.

THE COURT: I agree with at least the second half of what you are saying, which is, if the Plaintiffs are going to agree to do -- agree to some of your search terms, they ought to tell you that before you file your motion to compel. What I don't want to see is a motion to compel and the answer is, no, no, Judge, we agree to half of this. That is a waste of everybody's time and money and energy.

As to the first half, $I$ don't think you are entitled to know the communications they had to figure out what to search for. Again, you can blame Mr. Sachse, he very persuasively made the argument that that is privileged, the conversations that you have with your client to ask then what they have and where they have it is privileged. I don't know that $I$ ever formally ruled on that, but I don't think they have to give you that.

I think they have to tell you this is where we looked, this is what we looked for, this is what we found, and this is what we know is out there, but we are not going to look. I
think that is what you are entitled to know, those facts, not their process for how they decided what to look for and all of that.

MS. SHOWALTER: I agree, your Honor. I think you put it more artfully. What $I$ was trying to get at is whether there was anything being withheld, if there are places that they refused to look.

THE COURT: It's ironic for me. I can just flip you over, that's Ms. Finken's argument. You win on that for the same reason Ms. Finken won, but transparency is a good thing. I hope it is clear where we are in terms of the information exchange that $I$ am expecting to occur.

Ms. Showalter, any objection if I give them a week to get that information to you? During that week I expect the parties will continue to confer with the special master. She is listening right now and so she can also facilitate making sure that my expectations are met.

Ms. Showalter, any objection to a week to allow that process to play out? Then we can start the clock on how long you will need -- once you know what you are seeking to compel, how long you will need to brief that issue.

MS. SHOWALTER: I think that a week sounds all right to me, although I am looking to Mr. Sachse and Mr. Devereaux to make sure that there isn't any disagreement. I am seeing nods of affirmation as opposed to shakes of disagreement, so, yes,
that is fine.
Your Honor, are we going to be discussing whether we are proceeding under PTO 32 or briefing this issue as a motion to compel?

THE COURT: That is where we are going. Absolutely, yes, now that $I$ know the scope of where we are going.

What is the Defense's preference? Do you want to do -- well, tell me your preference, Ms. Showalter.

MS. SHOWALTER: Our preference, your Honor, would be the PTO 32 process. We see this as a routine issue that is briefed all the time in this sort of litigation. We have operated under the PTO 32 process in this case for much more complex, as we see it, issues. To the extent that there is information that can be provided, we think it could simply be attached to that memorandum. Often the shorter the submission, the clearer and better it is.

Time is of the essence here. We are getting ready to notice these depositions, and the information we are talking about is part of the custodial files that would need to be provided in advance of our taking them. And what is even more of the essence, during our most recent meet and confer Plaintiffs referred to their position that discovery on the class cases actually closes on the December 2021 date.

We disagree with that. I don't know whether that is still their position. If that is the case, time is even more
of the essence.
MS. WHITELEY: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Hold on, everybody. We can't talk across each other.

Ms. Showalter, why don't you finish. Ms. Whiteley, I will recognize you next.

MS. SHOWALTER: That may not be correct. That was a single comment by one Plaintiff's counsel during the meet and confer. If it is their position that that is the close of all discovery, then that would mean we have to move all the more expeditiously. 21 days for full briefing and 50 pages we just think is unnecessary.

THE COURT: I can truncate the briefing. When you say PTO 32 or formal briefing, to me really the issue is, do we do something jointly and simultaneously or do we do something sequentially? It sounds to me like the Defense's preference is that we do something jointly and simultaneously.

MS. SHOWALTER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well. Ms. Whiteley, you wanted to say something. Let me recognize you.

MS. WHITELEY: Yes, your Honor, thank you. This is Conlee Whiteley on behalf of Plaintiffs.

We did mention that in one of the orders, that date, but we just mentioned it because it could be considered a discrepancy. We have not taken the position that is the
deadline, nor do we think that that is practical. I don't believe there is an actual deadline, but the depositions can go on well into next year, and we think that the fact discovery period, to be fair to Defendants, should go contemporaneous with that deadline.

THE COURT: I haven't looked carefully at this issue in the PTOs in this case. All $I$ can tell you is in my other matters with Judge Rosenberg, her general trial order is that the parties can by consent continue to take discovery after the discovery cutoff, recognizing motion deadlines are not moving. So, the deadlines for motions for class certification are not going to change even if you all by consent continue to take discovery after the discovery period, if that is allowed in this MDL. I just haven't looked at that question.

I understand Ms. Showalter's position on that.
Let me turn back to Ms. Fegan or Ms. Whiteley. Is your position -- is there a relevance objection. To the extent Ms. Showalter is saying they are trying to find out if somebody is a smoker, or somebody is a sky diver, or somebody is engaged in any sorts of behaviors, is the objection that it is not relevant to class cert or to the adequacy of the class representatives, or do you agree that it can be relevant, you just object to the proportionality and the burden of having to search for it?

Ms. Fegan.

MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, to some of what they are seeking we do have a relevance objection. That being said, we think that there are more proportionate ways to find the information.

So, we are not going to say you can't ask them at their deposition if they smoke, you can't explore that in their medical records, you can't find that out some other way, but whether somebody is holding a cigar at their baby's birth and having us go through and try to find a picture, that ah-ha moment, is probably not proportional.

So, it does depend on -- and this is why I think the -- I recognize it is not full briefing, but sequencing is important, for them to identify why something is relevant and then for us to deal with also secondarily proportionality.

Ultimately, using smoking as the example and knowing the extent of the medical records, it is likely to be in the medical records, and they are welcome to ask them. We have a little bit of both, your Honor, but it is going to be in the records that have been produced to date.

THE COURT: I understand. Ms. Showalter, anything further? The Plaintiffs preference is that we do sequential briefing?

MS. FEGAN: That is correct, your Honor, and I understand it will be truncated in time and in pages, but we do feel very strongly that sequencing is the most important factor
for us.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Showalter, I will give you the last word.

MS. SHOWALTER: Our last word would just be, your Honor, that assuming we are continuing to work with Special Master Dodge over the next week and we are provided the information that Plaintiffs have offered, it seems that we can continue to narrow the issues enough that we could submit a sensible joint set of papers at the end of this.

I am not sure why sequential briefing would be necessary assuming those conversations really are ongoing.

THE COURT: Um-m-m, okay. Well, I am concerned about the timing that it will -- so, if we give a week for the Plaintiffs to provide information to the Defendants, and that will be October 28th -- if I give you each a three or four-day turnaround on your briefing, $I$ can get it done the following week. We can meet before the end of that following week and you will have a ruling at that point.

I am not sure, given the history of how long it takes to do joint memos, because you have to pass them back and forth and everybody has to review it, that getting those done in less than seven or eight days is feasible as well.

And candidly, I will tell you, me personally, I have not dealt a lot with class certification related issues which is why I was probing with Ms. Fegan. If my ultimate decision
is going to really have to weigh heavily on how do Courts decide class cert and how this really affects adequacy and typicality, and things like that, then a little bit of extra legal briefing would be helpful to me, not a full blown appellate brief, but a little bit of help in understanding the relevance theory. Why is smoking relevant to typicality, why is it relevant to adequacy, and things of that nature, that would be helpful to me.

That's why I am inclined to do sequential briefing and give you some extra pages.

Ms. Showalter, if I say you can have all this information from them by next Friday -- or a week from today, which would be next Thursday, how quickly after that is it reasonable to ask you to turn around an initial submission? I can give you up to ten pages, maybe.

MS. SHOWALTER: I think that three to four days, your Honor, would be perfectly fine. We are willing to do this as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: If I gave you until the following -- let's say I gave you until the following Wednesday at noon -- I'm sorry. If I gave you until Tuesday at noon, and then I gave the Plaintiffs until Friday at 5:00 to file their response, and then I set a hearing at the beginning of the following week -I wouldn't ask for a reply brief at that point. You can argue to me what your reply would be, but I wouldn't wait to get it
in writing.

Does that seem reasonable to you, Ms. Showalter? MS. SHOWALTER: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Fegan, does that seem reasonable to you?

MS. FEGAN: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Let's do that then. I will order the Plaintiffs to provide to the Defense by close of business next Thursday the information we have been discussing, I will just call it the transparency information that $I$ have been discussing, working through the special master and working together.

The Defendants', you can caption it a Motion to Compel or Discovery Memo, whatever you want to call it, will be due by noon Eastern time the following Tuesday, which is, I think, November $2 n d$, and then the Plaintiffs' response will be due by five o'clock on Friday, November 6th, whatever that Friday is, and then $I$ will confer with the special master and the court staff and find out the following week what day we can schedule an argument. I will call it a PTO 32 hearing, but it is a discovery dispute resolution hearing.

Again, that is ten pages a side for briefing and argument. You can supplement that with declarations or other evidence, either side, as to burden, as to the scope of the search, things of that nature. I will let you develop a full
record, I am not limiting you to ten pages in that regard.
Ms. Showalter, any other questions or any clarifications? Are you satisfied -- maybe not with the process, but are you satisfied you understand what the process is?

MS. SHOWALTER: I am satisfied both with the process and that $I$ understand it. I don't have any questions. Mr. Sachse, Mr. Devereaux, anything from you?

MR. ROOD: Your Honor, I wouldn't mind putting in a request for a short two to three page reply if necessary. It will be dependent upon, obviously, the opposition. I would request permission for that.

THE COURT: No. Trust me, I will give Ms. Showalter plenty of time to reply. I never cut anybody off in terms of their ability to argue. If there are legal cases you need to submit, then you can present them to me at the hearing or by consent of the parties, if the parties agree they can file supplemental authority, you can submit them. I can take the matter under advisement if $I$ have to.

I am not going to wait to get a reply brief. If $I$ am getting full briefing -- by the way, I said close of business, let me be clear, five o'clock Eastern time on that Friday. I said ten pages, let me be clear, double space, one-inch margins. If $I$ have to give time for a reply brief I have to push back the hearing, and I don't want to do that.

I appreciate your request, Mr. Rood, but I will deny that request.

Ms. Showalter, you are good with the process, you understand it. Ms. Fegan or Ms. Whiteley, are you okay with the process and any questions about the process?

MS. FEGAN: We understand it, thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. My usual exit question, I'll ask it again. Ms. Showalter, not objecting to anything I may have ruled on here or any -- not waiving any objection you may have to what I have done here this morning, was there anything else you wanted to raise while we are all together today?

MS. SHOWALTER: Your Honor, only that the Defense is thinking of discussing with Plaintiffs having a more fulsome discovery hearing about some of the other outstanding class issues at some point down the road as things are starting to come to a close, so just previewing that, but no, nothing else today.

THE COURT: Whenever you need one, let me know and we will make it happen.

Ms. Fegan, Ms. Whiteley, again not waiving any objections you may have to anything that has happened during this hearing, anything else you wanted to raise or any clarifications that you wanted?

MS. FEGAN: Other than I am not sure what
Ms. Showalter is referring to, we have no other issues, your

Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: Very well. I guess I will actually get to meet all of you in person December -- is it 2 nd and 3 rd we are having Science Day? I look forward to finally noticing some of you have legs, so that will be good. We will be in recess, and I look forward to getting your briefing.

MS. SHOWALTER: Thank you, your Honor.
MR. SACHSE: Thank you, your Honor.
MS. FEGAN: Thank you, your Honor.
(Thereupon, the hearing was concluded.)

*     *         * 
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|  | $\begin{array}{lll} 4600 & {[1]} & 1 / 25 \\ 4748 & {[1]} & 2 / 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|rllll} \hline \text { agree }[12] & 14 / 16 & 14 / 17 & 16 / 2 \\ 16 / 9 & 16 / 10 & 20 / 8 & 20 / 10 & 20 / 10 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. DEVEREAUX: [1] 3/18 <br> MR. ROOD: [1] 29/8 | 5 | 20/13 21/4 24/22 29/17 |
| MR. SACHSE: [3] 3/22 4/1 |  | agreed [2] 5/13 10/14 |
| 31/7 MR YOUNG: [1] $3 / 20$ | 50 [1] $23 / 11$   <br> $504-524-5777$ $[1]$ $1 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{\|ll} \text { agreeing [1] } & 10 / 1 \\ \text { ah [1] } & 25 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { MR. YOUNG: [1] } & 3 / 20 & & \\ \text { MS FEGAN: [17] } & 3 / 8 & 5 / 1 & 5 / 8\end{array}$ | 5171 [1] 1/13 | ah-ha [1] 25/9 |
| MS. FEGAN: [17] 3/8 5/1 5/8 | 5567 [1] 1/22 | ahead [1] 5/8 |
| $6 / 15$ 8/22 $10 / 18$ 10/23 13/5 15/19 16/23 18/16 24/25 | 561-803-3434 [1] 2/7 | ain't [1] 16/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 22 & 28 / 5 & 30 / 5 & 30 / 23 & 31 / 8\end{array}$ | 5777 [1] 1/16 | all [16] 4/3 6/14 8/4 9/8 |
| MS . SHOWALTER: [22] 3/14 | 5:00 [1] 27/22 | 10/8 16/14 21/2 21/22 22/11 |
| 4/16 7/2 8/11 11/15 12/13 | 6 | /9 23/10 24/7 24/12 27/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}13 / 19 & 13 / 22 & 15 / 8 & 17 / 24 \\ 1 / 3 / 10\end{array}$ | 60606 [1] 1/12 | allow [3] 16/21 16/21 21/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 31 / 3 & 21 / 21 & 22 / 8 & 23 / 6 & 23 / 17\end{array}$ | 619-699-4748 [1] 2/3 | allowed [1] $24 / 13$ |
| 26/3 27/15 28/2 29/5 30/11 | 6th [1] 28/17 | along [1] 19/24 |
| MS. Whiteley: [3] 3/10 23/1 | 7 | already [2] 14/8 16/24 |
| 23/20 |  | [5] 4/11 5/13 7/7 21/16 |
| THE COURT: [39] | 70130 [1] 1/15 | although [3] 7/7 7/10 |
| / | 725 [1] 1/21 | am [34] |
| /s [1] 31/16 | 73 [1] 12/3 | analysis [1] 10/ |
| 0 | 8 | ANNIE [2] 1/20 3/15 |
| 02924 [1] 3/1 | 844-399-5171 [1] 1/13 | another [3] 9/15 9/25 14/2 |
| 1 | 9 | 20/12 |
| 1100 [1] 2/2 | 92 [1] 12/3 | any [20] 5/22 9/6 11/16 |
| 112 [5] 5/15 11/12 14/11 | 92121 [1] 2/3 | 12/11 13/12 17/4 17/16 $20 / 3$ |
| 18/21 18/25 | A | $30 / 930 / 9$ |
| 1180 [1] 1/24 | ability [1] 29/15 | 30/20 30/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12th [1] } 1 / 21 \\ & 150[1] \\ & 1 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | able [2] 18/19 18/23 | anybody [1] 29/14 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 150[1] & 1 / 11 \\ 1600[1] & 1 / 24 \end{array}$ | about [21] 4/9 5/3 5/17 5/24 | Anyone [1] 3/17 |
| 19104 [1] 1/19 | 8/4 9/17 11/2 13/9 13/14 | anyone's [1] 6/18 |
| 2 | 18/4 19/9 19/13 22/19 26/12 | 16/18 21/6 25/20 29/8 30/8 |
| 20-md-02924 [1] 3/1 | $30 / 5$ 30/14 above [1] 31/13 | 30/10 30/21 30/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG [1] } \\ & 1 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | absolutely [3] 4/2 $19 / 12$ | appellate [1] 27/5 <br> appreciate [3] 6/19 20/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 200 \text { [5] } 5 / 21 \quad 13 / 16 \quad 17 / 6 \\ & 17 / 11 \quad 17 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | abstraction [1] 8/18 | Arch [1] 1/18 |
| 20005 [1] 1/22 | acceptable [1] 15/13 | are [115] |
| 202-434-5567 [1] 1/22 | account [1] 9/19 | areas [1] 17/16 |
| 2021 [3] 1/5 22/23 31/15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accounts [1] } 8 / 8 \\ & \text { across [1] } 23 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { aren't [1] } & 16 / 18 \\ \text { argue [8] } & 4 / 25 & 6 / 18 & 8 / 15 \end{array}$ |
| 21 [2] 1/5 23/11 | actions <br> [1] $6 / 7$ | 14/23 17/18 17/22 27/24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 215-994-4000 \text { [1] } 1 / 19 \\ & 22 \text { [1] } 31 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | actual [1] 24/2 | 29/15 |
| $24 \mathrm{th}[1] \quad 1$ | actually [5] 5/16 6/18 18/25 | argument [9] 9/17 12/1 17/17 |
| 25 [1] 6/8 | 22/23 31/2 | 18/3 18/12 20/18 21/9 28/20 |
| 26 [5] 7/11 9/12 9/15 9/22 | additional [3] 10/3 10/5 | 28/23 |
| 9/24 | 17/3 | arises [1] 4/6 |
| 28th [1] 26/15 | address [3] 10/15 $13 / 6$ 14/7 | around [1] 27/14 |
| 2929 [1] 1/18 | adequacy [7] 11/12 11/15 | artfully [1] 21/5 |
| 2nd [2] 28/16 31/3 | 11/17 17/13 24/21 27/2 27/7 | articulately [1] 9/17 |
| 3 | advance [1] 22/20 | 11/12 11/15 11/17 11/18 |
| 30309 [1] 1/25 | advised [1] 17/2 | 14/20 18/12 18/12 19/12 |
| 32 [5] 22/3 22/10 22/12 | advisement [1] 29/19 | 19/16 $20 / 15$ 21/25 $22 / 3 \quad 22 / 10$ |
| 23/14 28/20 | affects [1] 27/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 13 & 25 / 15 & 26 / 22 & 27 / 17\end{array}$ |
| 3434 [1] $2 / 7$ | affirmation [1] 21/25 <br> after [3] 24/9 24/13 27/13 | 27/18 28/24 28/24 30/15 |
| 3rd [1] 31/3 | after [3] 24/9 24/13 27/13 <br> afternoon [9] 3/9 3/11 3/13 | ask [7] 17/19 20/19 25/5 25/17 27/14 27/24 30/7 |
| 4 | 3/14 3/15 3/17 3/19 3/23 4/3 | asked [5] 6/4 13/16 $17 / 4$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4000[1] \quad 1 / 19 \\ & 404-572-4600[1] \\ & 4365[1] \quad 2 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | ```again [6] 11/3 11/23 20/17 28/22 30/8 30/20 against [2] 15/17 17/18``` | $\begin{array}{\|lllll} 17 / 11 & 19 / 14 \\ \text { asking } & {[6]} & 4 / 25 & 5 / 6 & 6 / 9 \\ 10 / 17 & 10 / 22 \end{array}$ |


| A | business [2] 28/8 29/21 | completed [2] 8/1 10/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| aspects [1] 11/21 | C | completeness [1] 7/12 <br> complex [1] 22/13 |
| assume [1] 17/17 | ```CA [1] 2/3 call [3] 28/10 28/14 28/20 Camp [1] 1/15 can [42] can't [5] 13/17 23/3 25/5 25/6 25/7``` | compliant [1] 9/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { assuming [3] } & 19 / 7 & 26 / 5 & 26 / 11\end{array}$ |  | computer [1] 5/23 |
| Atlanta [1] 1/25 |  | conceivable [1] 5/2 |
| attached [1] 22/15 |  | concerned [1] 26/1 |
| attacked [1] 5/4 |  | concluded [1] 31/10 |
| authority [1] 29/18 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on }[2] \begin{array}{c} 13 / 12 \\ {[3]} \\ 5 / 12 ~ \\ \hline \end{array}{ }^{[2 / 12} \end{aligned}$ |
| B | candidly [1] 26/23 | conducted [5] 5/18 8/24 9/1 |
| baby's [1] 25/8 | carefully [1] 24/6 | confer [8] 8/4 17/1 17/5 |
| $\begin{array}{clllll} \text { back [16] } & 5 / 2 & 6 / 4 & 7 / 21 & 9 / 14 \\ 9 / 16 & 13 / 4 & 15 / 5 & 16 / 4 & 16 / 25 \end{array}$ | case [8] $1 / 3$ 3/1 $10 / 4$ 10/23 | 19/3 21/15 22/21 23/9 28/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} \\ 17 / 23 & 18 / 2 & 18 / 5 & 18 / 14 & 24 / 16\end{array}$ | 11/21 22/12 22/25 24/7 | conference [2] 1/8 3/3 |
| 26/20 29/25 | cases [3] 11/19 22/23 29/15 | conferrals [1] 6/24 |
| background [1] 6/20 | categories [1] 19/25 | confers [1] 5/ |
| baseline [1] 18/12 | category [1] 10/19 | confirmed [1] 19/ |
| basis [1] 19/4 | Centre [1] 1/18 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { CONLEE [3] } & 1 / 14 \\ \text { Conll }\end{array}$ |
| be [46] | cert [2] 24/21 2 certain [1] 8/19 | Connolly [1] $1 / 21$   <br> consent [3] $24 / 9$ $24 / 12$ $29 / 17$ |
| BEACH [3] 1/2 1/5 2/7 | certification [9] 7/11 7/18 | considered [1] 23/24 |
| Beach/Ft [1] 2/7 <br> because [10] 6/3 8/23 12/2 | 8/2 9/13 9/22 11/11 11/18 | contemporaneous [1] 24/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 16 & 15 / 24 & 18 / 21 & 18 / 22 & 20 / 5\end{array}$ | 24/11 26/24 | contend [1] 17/8 |
| 23/24 26/20 | certify [1] 31/1 | contest [1] 9/22 |
| been [19] 4/21 4/24 5/17 | challenge [2] 11/1 | context [4] 5/6 13/15 13 |
| 6/23 6/24 7/19 8/1 8/3 8/12 | change [7] 5/6 6/12 6/12 | 17/3 |
| 8/18 14/2 14/7 14/8 14/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}6 / 13 & 15 / 24 & 17 / 9 & 24 / 12\end{array}$ | continue [4] 21/15 24/9 |
| 19/18 19/20 25/19 28/9 28/10 | changed [2] 6/10 15/25 <br> charts [1] 19/25 | 24/12 26/8 |
| before [4] $1 / 8$ 11/22 20/11 | Chicago [1] 1/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { conversation [2] } & 4 / 4 & 19 / 1\end{array}$ |
|  | CHRISTOPHER [2] 2/1 3/21 | conversations [3] 3/4 |
| $\text { behalf [4] } 3 / 10 \quad 3 / 12 \quad 3 / 24$ | cigar [1] 25/8 | 26/11 |
| 23/22 | Cira [1] 1/18 | corner [1] 9/19 |
| behaviors [2] 12/17 24/20 | clarifications [2] | correct [8] 4/19 7/7 |
| being [9] 5/4 5/18 6/4 6/6 |  | $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { 8/12 } & 8 / 22 & 23 / 7 & 25 / 23 & 31 / 12\end{array}$ |
| 6/22 9/14 18/23 21/6 25/2 | clarified [1] | correctly [1] 7/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { believe [4] } 6 / 6 \text { 18/14 } \\ & 24 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | $19 / 6$ | $26 / 8$ |
| better [2] 3/6 22/16 | class [21] 4/7 4/19 4/24 6/7 | counsel [2] 3/7 23/8 |
| beyond [2] 6/8 13/10 | 6/9 11/8 $11 / 1111 / 12$ 11/15 | couple [2] 9/8 9/10 |
| birth [1] 25/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 17 & 11 / 18 & 12 / 2 & 12 / 18 & 12 / 22 \\ 22 / 23 & 24 / 11 & 24 / 21 & 24 / 21\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { course [1] } & 4 / 17 & & \\ \text { Court [9] } & 1 / 1 & 2 / 6 & \text { 9/23 } & 15 / 22\end{array}$ |
| bit [7] 5/3 10/1 $15 / 17$ 16/25 | $\begin{array}{lll} 22 / 23 & 24 / 11 & 24 / 21 \\ 26 / 24 & 27 / 2 & 30 / 14 \end{array}$ | COURT [9] $1 / 1 \quad 2 / 6$ 9/23 $15 / 22$ <br> 17/10 18/10 18/19 28/18 |
| 25/18 $27 / 3$ 27/5 | classes [6] 4/7 4/8 4/1 | $31 / 17$ |
| blame [1] 20/17 | 4/12 4/13 4/18 | Courts [1] |
| blown [1] 27/4 | clear [7] 5/17 6/12 8/2 | critical [1] 13/1 |
| Boehringer [1] 3/20 | $20 / 2 \text { 21/11 29/22 29/23 }$ | current [1] 5/15 |
| both [6] 7/22 8/22 11/17 | clearer [1] 22/16 | currently [1] 6/25 |
| 17/23 25/18 29/6 | client [1] 20/19 | custodial [1] 22/19 |
| box [1] 9/19 boxes [1] 16/20 | clients [1] 9/4 | cut [1] 29/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { boxes [1] } & 16 / 20 \\ \text { brand [2] } & 3 / 14 & 3 / 16\end{array}$ | clock [1] 21/19 | cutoff [1] 24/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { brand [2] } & 3 / 14 & 3 / 16 \\ \text { brief [6] } & 10 / 8 & 21 / 21 & 27 / 5\end{array}$ | close [4] 23/9 28/8 29/21 | CVS [1] 12/24 |
| brief [6] 10/8 21/21 27/5 | close [4] 23/16 28/8 2 |  |
| 27/24 29/20 29/24 | closes [1] | D |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { briefed [1] } & 22 / 11 & \\ \text { briefing [19] } & 6 / 19 & 13 / 15\end{array}$ | co [4] $12 / 3$ 12/4 $12 / 16$ 13/9 | D.C [1] 1/22 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { briefing } & {[19]} & 6 / 19 & 13 / 15 \\ 15 / 16 & 16 / 21 & 16 / 22 & 20 / 6 & 22 / 3\end{array}$ | co-morbidities [4] 12/3 12/4 | Damages [1] 20/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 16 & 16 / 21 & 16 / 22 & 20 / 6 & 22 / 3 \\ 23 / 11 & 23 / 13 & 23 / 14 & 25 / 12\end{array}$ | 12/16 13/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { date [4] } & 22 / 23 & 23 / 23 & 25 / 19\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 11 & 23 / 13 & 23 / 14 & 25 / 12 \\ 25 / 22 & 26 / 10 & 26 / 16 & 27 / 4 & 27 / 9\end{array}$ | collate [1] 19/2 | 31/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 22 & 26 / 10 & 26 / 16 & 27 / 4 & 27 / 9 \\ 28 / 22 & 29 / 21 & 31 / 6 & & \end{array}$ | collecting [1] 15/14 | day [3] $26 / 15$ 28/19 $31 / 4$ |
| $\begin{array}{ccc}28 / 22 & 29 / 21 & 31 / 6 \\ \text { riefly [1] } & 13 / 2\end{array}$ | collection [1] 7/15 | days [7] 17/2 18/20 18/21 |
| briefly [1] 1/8 | come [2] 17/23 30/16 | 19/8 23/11 26/22 27/16 |
| built [1] 12/7 | comment [1] 23/8 | deadline [3] 24/1 24/2 24/ |
| bull's [1] 8/16 | communications [1] 20/16 | deadlines [2] 24/10 24/11 |
| burden [4] 14/24 14/25 24/23 | company [1] 18/23 | deal [2] 17/23 25/14 |
| 28/24 | compel [12] 15/6 15/21 15/22 | dealt [1] 26/24 |
| burdensome [1] 14/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 23 & 17 / 21 & 18 / 10 & 19 / 5 & 20 / 11 \\ 20 / 12 & 21 / 20 & 22 / 4 & 28 / 13 & \end{array}$ | December [2] 22/23 31/3 |
|  | 20/12 21/20 22/4 28/13 | December 2021 [1] 22/23 |


| D | does [4] 4/12 25/11 28/2 | $12 / 24 \quad 13 / 25 \quad 20 / 1 \quad 25 / 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dechert [1] 1/17 | doing [3] 9/6 13/11 16/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { examples [3] 11/19 12/13 } \\ & 13 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| decide [1] 27/2 | don't [22] 4/23 9/18 10/7 | exchange [1] 21/12 |
| decision [1] 26/25 | 11/3 11/13 11/16 11/24 16/6 | Executive [1] 2/2 |
| declarations [2] 14/25 28/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 11 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 9 & 18 / 6 & 19 / 8\end{array}$ | exists [3] 16/5 16/13 16/ |
| Defendant [1] 15/5 | $22 / 24 \quad 23 / 5 \quad 24 / 1 \quad 29 / 7 \quad 29 / 25$ | exit [1] 30/7 expanded [1] 5/21 |
| DEFENDANTS [8] 1/17 $3 / 14$ |  | expect [1] $21 / 14$ |
| $3 / 16 ~ 3 / 22 ~ 4 / 6 ~ 17 / 22 ~$ $26 / 14$ | 19/20 26/16 26/21 30/10 | expectations [1] $21 / 17$ |
| Defendants' [1] 28/13 | double [1] 29/23 | expecting [1] 21/1 |
| Defense [5] 15/3 16/12 16/21 | down [2] 10/6 30/15 | expeditiously [1] |
| 28/8 30/12 | dozen [1] 16/6 | expert [1] 8/3 |
| Defense's [2] 22/7 23/16 | Drive [2] 1/11 2/2 | explain [1] 5/3 |
| define [2] 15/22 17/1 | due [2] 28/14 28/16 <br> during [5] 17/4 21/14 22/2 | explore [1] $25 / 6$   <br> extent [6] $11 / 4$ $13 / 8$ $16 / 8$ |
| demonstrate [1] 12/21 | 23/8 30/21 | 22/13 24/17 25/16 |
| depend [1] 2 | E | extra [2] 27/3 27/10 <br> eyes [1] 8/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lr} \text { dependent [1] } & 29 / 11 \\ \text { deposition [1] } & 25 / 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { each [7] } 14 / 23 \\ & 19 / 12 \\ & 19 / 16 \end{aligned} 23 / 4 \quad 26 / 15$ | F |
| detail [1] 15/11 | earlier [1] 4/5 | Facebook [1] 14/ |
| determined [1] 5/25 | easily [1] 13/1 | facilitate [1] |
| develop [5] 12/1 $12 / 6$ 12/10 | Eastern [2] 28/15 29/2 easy [1] 13/6 | fact [2] 13/7 24/3 <br> factor [2] 17/13 25/25 |
| 12/16 28/25 <br> developing [2] | economic [3] 4/10 4/18 12/22 | factors [4] $14 / 7$ 17/6 $17 / 9$ |
| developing [2] 13/3 DEVEREAUX [4] 1/23 | efficient [1] 12/9 | 19/23 |
|  | eight [1] 26/22 | facts [7] 11/2 |
| 5] 5/ | either [6] 4/22 8/20 11/10 | 12/10 12/15 13/2 21/1 |
| $17 / 10 \quad 23 / 23$ | 16/13 18/15 28/24 | fair [2] 14/23 24/4 |
| didn't [4] 7/10 16/18 17/11 | electronic [1] 7/17 | far [3] 6/3 6/8 19/17 |
| 18/24 | ELIZABETH [2] 1/10 3/9 | fast [1] 19/8 |
| Diego [1] | else [7] 3/18 4/1 15/1 17/14 | feasible [1] 26/22 |
| different [4] 10/18 18/22 | 30/10 30/16 30/22 | February [1] 8/13 |
| 19/1 19/1 | email [2] 5/23 7/16 | Federal [1] 31/16 |
| digest [1] 18/19 | emails [1] 12/24 | feel [2] 15/25 25/2 |
| disagree [2] 16/2 22/24 | encompassed [1] | FEGAN [19] 1/10 3/10 |
| disagreement [2] 21/24 21/25 | end [3] 14/13 26/9 26/17 <br> energy [1] 20/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 5 / 7 & 5 / 9 & 7 / 7 & 8 / 17 & 13 / 5 & 14 / 10 \\ 15 / 19 & 16 / 23 & 18 / 2 & 18 / 12 & 24 / 16 \end{array}$ |
| disclose [1] 11/13 | engaged [1] 24/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 24/25 } & 26 / 25 & 28 / 4 & 30 / 4 & 30 / 20\end{array}$ |
| disclosed [1] 13/24 <br> discovery [16] 1/8 3/4 7/12 | enough [2] 19/9 26/8 | FeganScott [1] 1/11 |
| 11/7 11/18 16/14 22/22 23/10 | entitled [3] 16/13 20/15 | figure [3] 10/7 11/9 20/16 |
| 24/3 24/9 24/10 24/13 2 | 21/1 | figuring [1] 14/18 |
| 28/14 28/21 30/14 | entry [1] 11/6 | file [3] 20/11 27/22 29/17 |
| discrepancy [1] 23/25 | ESI [18] 5/22 6/1 $7 / 6$ 7/14 | files [1] 22/19 |
| discuss [2] 6/20 7/10 | 7/15 8/7 8/9 8/19 8/19 8/25 | fill [1] 16/20 |
| discussed [1] 19/21 | 9/4 9/5 9/19 11/20 11/23 | finally [1] 31/4 |
| discussing [5] 8/13 22/2 | 12/9 12/21 13/8 | find [8] 12/4 14/12 16/18 |
| 28/9 28/11 30/13 | ESQ [6] 1/10 1/14 1/17 1/20 | 24/18 25/3 25/7 25/9 28/19 |
| discussion [2] 7/5 13/18 | 1/23 2/1 | fine [4] 10/14 10/18 22/1 |
| disproportionate [2] 10/17 | essence [4] 15/6 22/17 22/21 | 27/17 |
| 10/22 | 23/1 | finish [1] 23/5 |
| dispute [6] 4/5 8/6 11/2 11/7 20/7 28/21 | $\begin{array}{rrrr} \text { even [6] } & 5 / 24 & 13 / \\ 22 / 20 & 22 / 25 & 24 / 12 \end{array}$ | Finken [3] 8/4 16/5 21 <br> Finken's [1] 21/9 |
| DISTRICT [2] 1/1 $1 / 1$ | ever [2] 6/8 20/21 | first [8] 5/19 15/2 15/8 |
| diver [1] 24/19 | every [5] 9/19 9/19 9/19 | 15/16 15/19 16/12 17/22 |
| DIVISION [1] 1/2 | 11/6 12/24 | 20/15 |
| DLA [1] $2 / 1$ | everybody [3] 9/20 23/3 | five [3] 14/12 28/17 29/22 |
| do [30] 10/22 11/22 $12 / 4$ |  | FL [2] 1/5 2/7 |
| 13/13 14/19 14/20 16/23 17/2 | everyone [2] 4/1 8/15 | flexibility [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 3 & 18 / 14 & 19 / 2 & 20 / 10 & 22 / 7\end{array}$ | everything [2] 9/11 9/13 | $\text { flip [1] } 21 / 8$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}22 / 8 & 23 / 14 & 23 / 14 & 23 / 15 & 23 / 15\end{array}$ | everywhere [2] 10/2 10/12 | Floor [1] 1/12 |
| 23/17 $24 / 1 \begin{array}{lllll} & 24 / 22 & 25 / 2 & 25 / 21\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { everywhere [2] } \\ & \text { evidence [1] } 28 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | FLORIDA [1] 1/1 |
| 25/24 26/20 27/1 27/9 27/17 | evidenced [1] 12/19 | focus [1] 10/25 |
|  | evidencing [1] 13/25 | following [7] 26/16 26/17 |
| ```documents [2] 7/8 7/18 Dodge [1] 26/6``` | exactly [3] $3 / 6$ 11/2 12 | $27 / 19 \quad 27 / 20 \quad 27 / 23 \quad 28 / 15$ |


| F | had [6] 4/4 6/9 13/8 16/6 | ch [1] 29/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| foot [1] 10/6 | 19/21 20/16 | inclined [1] 27/9 |
| for a [1] 3/3 | half [ | $[2] \quad 7 / 6 \quad 8 / 7$ |
| foregoing [1] 31/12 | handle [1] 3/6 | individuals [1] 11/12 |
| formal [1] 23/14 <br> formally [1] 20/ | happen [1] 30/19 | infer [1] 11/9 |
| formally [1] 20/ forth [1] 26/20 | happened [2] 17/1 30/21 | inform [1] 11/25 |
| forum [1] 6/1 | happy [2] 12/12 19/9 | information [17] 6/22 11/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { forward [6] } 6 / 7 & 6 / 19 & 13 / 19\end{array}$ | has [18] 4/20 6/1 6/5 6/23 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}18 / 4 & 18 / 13 & 18 / 20 & 19 / 8 & 20 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 19/4 31/4 31/6 | 7/16 8/1 8/18 9/20 14/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}21 / 11 & 21 / 14 & 22 / 14 & 22 / 18 & 25 / 4\end{array}$ |
| found [1] 20/24 | 14/21 15/4 15/22 15/25 17/1 | 26/7 26/14 27/12 28/9 28/10 |
| four [3] 16/20 26/15 27/16 | 18/22 19/17 26/21 30/21 | Ingelheim [1] 3/20 |
| four-day [1] 26/15 | hasn't [1] 19/19 | initial [1] 27 |
| frame [2] 14/22 16/21 | have [83] | injury [2] 4/13 4/1 |
| framed [1] 14/21 | haven't [5] 10/1 10/11 15/12 | Instead [2] 17/6 18/2 |
| frankly [1] 6/8 | 24/6 24/14 | interested [1] 11/22 |
| Friday [5] 27/12 27/22 28/17 | having [6] 8/3 8/21 24/23 | involve [1] 4/13 |
| 28/17 29/22 | 25/9 30/13 31/4 | involves [2] 4/10 4/11 |
| front [1] 9/23 | haystack [1] 14/12 | ironic [1] 21/8 |
| Ft [1] 2/7 | he [2] 9/17 20/1 | is [214] |
| full [6] 15/18 23/11 25/12 | health [2] 13/12 17/4 | isn't [5] 5/4 12/2 13/24 |
| 27/4 28/25 29/21 | hear [2] 12/12 19 | 18 21/2 |
| fully [1] 11/4 | hearing [10] 3/5 14/20 27/23 | issue [14] 6/25 7/24 |
| fulsome [1] 30/13 | $\begin{array}{lll} 28 / 20 & 28 / 21 & 29 / 16 \\ 30 / 14 & 30 / 22 & 31 / 10 \end{array}$ | 17/23 21/21 22/3 22/10 23/14 |
| fundamental [2] 9/2 9/2 | hearings <br> [1] $16 / 6$ | $24 / 6$ |
| further [1] 25/21 | heavily [1] 27/1 | issued [2] 7/3 7/7 |
| G | held [1] 9/14 | issues [11] 3/6 8/13 10 |
| GA [1] 1/25 | help [2] 11/25 27/5 | 11/18 16/7 20/6 22/13 26/8 |
| gave [6] 16/15 18/4 27/19 | helpful [6] 11/5 11/21 13/18 | 26/24 30/15 30/25 |
| 27/20 27/21 27/21 | 15/12 27/4 27/8 | it [91] |
| general [1] 24/8 | helps [1] 10/25 | it's [4] 11/17 17/13 17/13 21/8 |
| generally [1] 11/14 | her [3] 16/9 16/9 | 21/8 |
| get [14] 3/6 6/14 9/9 14/13 | here [19] 3/2 5/5 6/20 $7 / 9$ | J |
| $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 2 & 16 / 1 & 19 / 7 & 19 / 22\end{array} 21 / 5$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 14 / 21 & 16 / 11 & 16 / 15 & 16 / 15 \end{array}$ | joins [1] 14/15 |
| 21/14 26/16 27/25 29/20 31/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 16 / 17 & 16 / 18 & 16 / 25 & 22 / 17 & 30 / 9 \end{array}$ | joint [2] 26/9 26/20 |
| gets [1] 14/23 | 30/10 | jointly [2] 23/15 23/1 |
| getting [4] 29/21 $31 / 6$ | high [2] 8/17 11/5 | JUDGE [4] 1/9 9/23 20/13 |
| 29/21 31/6 | history [1] 26/19 | 24/8 |
| $\begin{array}{cllllllll}\text { give } & {[16]} & 6 / 21 & 8 / 2 & 10 / 8 & 11 / 4 \\ 12 / 13 & 16 / 9 & 19 / 4 & 20 / 22 & 21 / 13\end{array}$ | Hold [1] 23/3 | just [25] 4/1 4/25 5/2 5/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 13 & 16 / 9 & 19 / 4 & 20 / 22 & 21 / 13 \\ 26 / 2 & 26 / 13 & 26 / 15 & 27 / 10 & 27 / 15\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { holding [3] } & 16 / 4 & 18 / 5 & 25 / 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 5 / 21 & 6 / 12 & 8 / 15 & 9 / 5 \\ 10 / 7\end{array}$ |
| $26 / 2 \quad 26 / 13 \quad 26 / 15 \quad 27 / 10 \quad 27 / 15$ | HON [1] 2/6 | $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 10 & 10 / 22 & 12 / 12 & 13 / 17\end{array}$ |
| given [3] giv | honestly [1] 17/15 | 17/19 18/21 19/6 19/17 $21 / 8$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { given [3] } & 9 / 12 & 18 / 3 & 26 / 19 \\ \text { giving [5] } & 9 / 20 & 9 / 21 & 16 / 4\end{array}$ | Honor [42] | 23/11 23/24 24/14 24/23 26/4 |
| giving [5] $9 / 20$ 9/21 $16 / 4$ $16 / 516 / 16$ | HONORABLE [1] 1/8 | 28/10 30/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 5 & 16 / 16 \\ \text { go [13] } & 5 / 7 & 6 / 4 & 9 / 16 & 9 / 23\end{array}$ | hope [1] 21/11 |  |
| go [13] 5/7 6/4 9/16 9/23 | hoping [1] | K |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 18 & 15 / 2 & 15 / 8 & 15 / 16 & 15 / 19 \\ 16 / 12 & 24 / 2 & 24 / 4 & 25 / 9 & \end{array}$ | how [17] 5/12 5/17 8/5 9/1 | Kanner [1] 1/14 |
| 16/12 $24 / 2$ goes [1] g/25 | $11 / 20 \quad 12 / 4 \quad 14 / 22 \quad 17 / 16 \quad 19 / 12$ | kind [4] 11/1 11/9 13/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { goes [1] } & 8 / 25 \\ \text { going [23] } & 6 / 7 & 6 / 19 & 9 / 20\end{array}$ | $19 / 15 \text { 21/2 21/19 21/21 26/19 }$ | 17/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { going } & {[23]} & 6 / 7 & 6 / 19 & 9 / 20 \\ 10 / 8 & 10 / 12 & 10 / 13 & 13 / 19 & 13 / 19\end{array}$ | 27/1 27/2 27/13 | King [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 8 & 10 / 12 & 10 / 13 & 13 / 19 & 13 / 19 \\ 14 / 9 & 14 / 10 & 16 / 18 & 18 / 6 & 18 / 9\end{array}$ | hundred [1] 5/16 | knocked [1] 20/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 9 & 14 / 10 & 16 / 18 & 18 / 6 & 18 / 9\end{array}$ |  | know [17] 4/23 13/16 1 |
| 20/9 20/25 22/2 22/5 22/6 | I | $\begin{array}{llll}16 / 6 & 16 / 13 & 16 / 16 \quad 17 / 8 \quad 17 / 9\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 12 & 25 / 5 & 25 / 18 & 27 / 1 & 29 / 20\end{array}$ | I may [1] 30/8 | 19/12 20/16 20/20 20/25 21/1 |
|  | I'll [1] 30/7 | 21/20 22/6 $22 / 24$ 30/18 |
| good [11] 3 3/9 $3 / 11$ | I'm [1] 27/20 | knowing [4] 11/1 15/17 $20 / 4$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}3 / 17 & 3 / 19 & 3 / 23 & 4 / 3 & 21 / 10\end{array}$ | identified [1] 7/19 | $25 / 15$ |
| $30 / 3$ 31/5 got [2] $9 / 13$ | identify [5] 5/1 9/4 16/3 |  |
| got [2] 9/13 17/6 | 17/20 25/13 | L |
| gotten [1] 15/12 <br> grounds [1] 15/5 | identifying [1] 19/13 | LA [1] 1/15 |
| GSK [1] 3/24 | IL [1] 1/12 | labeled [1] 20/ |
|  | illness [1] 14/3 | large [1] 5/24 |
| guessing [1] 15/4 | nesses [1] 19/1 | last [6] 5/19 14/11 15/25 <br> 17/1 26/3 26/4 |
| H | important [5] 14/6 16/1 | lead [1] 12/8 |
| ha [1] 25/9 | 17/22 25/13 25/25 | least [4] 8/13 14/17 $17 / 19$ |




| R | secrets [2] 11/13 11 | [3] 6/25 14/21 22/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| representatives [3] 4/7 <br> 11/12 24/22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { see [3] } 20 / 12 \quad 22 / 10 \quad 22 / 1 \\ & \text { seeing [1] } 21 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|ccccc} \hline \text { sorts }[6] & 11 / 20 & 12 / 15 & 13 / 1 \\ 14 / 1 & 16 / 7 & 24 / 20 & & \end{array}$ |
| representing [1] 3/13 | seeking [4] 15/6 15/23 21/20 | sounds [2] 21/22 23/16 |
| request [15] $4 / 20 \quad 4 / 22 \quad 6 / 22$ | seem [2] 28/2 28/4 | 8/19 9/4 9/5 18/22 19/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}6 / 25 & 7 / 1 & 8 / 9 & 8 / 18 & 8 / 19 & 8 / 20\end{array}$ | seems [2] 14/13 26/7 | 19/15 19/15 |
| $9 / 10$ $30 / 2$ | sense [4] 6/21 12/11 $12 / 14$ | SOUTHERN [1] 1/1 |
| requested [5] 6/9 6/23 7/11 | 1 | space [1] 29 |
| 7/20 15/23 | se | Spalding [1] 1/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { requests [9] } & 4 / 6 & 4 / 16 & 5 / 3\end{array}$ | sequencing [3] 6/12 25/1 | speaking [1] 4/23 |
| 5/10 5/10 7/4 7/6 7/8 8/7 | $25 / 25$ sequential [3] | $\begin{array}{\|cccc\|} \text { special [7] } & 3 / 5 & 4 / 4 & 19 / \\ 21 / 15 & 26 / 5 & 28 / 11 & 28 / 18 \end{array}$ |
| require [1] 17/17 <br> required [3] 8/8 | 27/9 | specific [1] 11/21 |
| resolution [1] 28 | sequentially [1] 23 | specifically [2] 5/3 7/20 |
| resolve [1] 9/23 |  | staff [1] 28/19 |
| respect [2] 7/14 19/21 | seven [4] 18/20 18/21 19/8 | standard [1] 6/7 |
| respond [5] 8/8 12/11 13/20 |  | standby [1] 4/1 |
| 16/22 17/25 | shakes [1] 21/25 | start [6] 3/7 4/13 15/2 |
| response [8] 6/13 9/14 9/15 | she [2] $21 / 15$ $21 / 16$ <br> short [2] $18 / 15 \quad 29 / 10$  | \|starting [1] |
| 9/25 15/12 19/10 27/22 28/16 | shorter [1] 22/15 | state [1] 5/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { responses [2] 9/10 } & 16 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { should [4] } & 15 / 2 & 15 / 19 & 20 / 7\end{array}$ | States [2] 1/1 1/9 |
| review [1] 26/21 | 24/4 [4] 15/2 15/19 20/7 | status [1] 3 |
| right [7] 4/3 8/16 9/8 9/11 | shouldn't [1] 14/20 | STEPHEN [2] 1/23 3/20 |
| 16/8 21/16 isk [6] 12 | SHOWALTER [27] 1/20 3/16 | still [4] 7/24 8/6 |
| /9 17/13 19/23 | 3/17 3/25 4/15 6/21 7/2 8/10 | 22/25 |
|  | 11/6 12/12 15/8 16/8 19/7 | Stipes [2] 2/6 31/16 |
| road [1] 30/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 13 & 21 / 18 & 22 / 8 & 23 / 5 & 24 / 18\end{array}$ | store [1] 7/17 |
| ROBIN [1] $2 / 6$ | 25/20 26/2 27/11 28/2 29/2 | straight [1] 9/6 |
| Rood [1] 30/1 | 29/13 30/3 30/8 30/25 | straightforward [1] |
| ROSENBERG [3] 1/3 2/6 $24 / 8$ | Showalter's [1] 24/15 | Street [4] 1/15 1/18 1/21 |
| routine [1] 22/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { side [5] } \\ & 28 / 24 \end{aligned} \text { /4 8/5 14/23 28/ }$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1 / 24 \\ \text { strongly [1] } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { rule [5] } \\ 10 / 18 \end{array} \quad 9 / 129 / 15 \text { 9/22 } 9 / 24$ | sides' [1] 7/22 | stuff [1] 10/14 |
| ruled [2] | Signature [1] 31 | subject [1] 7/5 |
| ruling [1] 26/18 | significantly [1] 6/5 | submission [2] 22 |
| S | simply [1] 22/14 | 29/18 |
| SACHSE [8] $1 / 17$ 3/23 8/2 8/4 | simultaneously [2] 23/15 | subset [1] |
| 16/5 20/17 21/23 29/8 | 23/17 [1] 8/13 | succinct [1] 18/18 |
| said [7] 12/18 15/7 | since [1] | Suite [2] 1/24 2/ |
| 18/8 25/2 29/21 29/23 | single [2] 12/24 23/8 | supplement [1] 28/23 |
| same [2] 18/22 21/10 | sky [1] 24/19 | supplemental [1] 29/1 |
| San [1] 2/3 | smoke [1] 25/6 | supposed [1] 16/15 |
| Sanofi [1] 3/22 | smoker [4] 12/19 14/1 14/16 | sure [10] 4/10 4/1 |
| satisfied [3] 29/3 29/4 29/6 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 / 16 \text { 14/10 21/17 21/24 } 26 \\ & 26 / 1930 / 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| say [12] 10/6 12/1 14/10 |  |  |
| 17/11 17/12 18/8 18/23 23/13 | Snapchat | T |
| 23/20 25/5 27/11 27/20 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}  & / 8 & 11 / 8 & 11 / 17 & 12 / 15 & 12 / 16 \end{array}$ |  |
| say maybe [1] 12/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 13 / 13 & 13 / 17 & 14 / 6 & 14 / 19 & 14 / 22 \end{array}$ | $\text { take [4] } 19 / 124$ |
| saying [4] 10/11 18/21 20/9 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}15 / 5 & 15 / 12 & 17 / 15 & 18 / 14 & 19 / 1\end{array}$ | 29/18 |
| 24/18 | 20/3 21/16 $21 / 25$ 24/11 $25 / 5$ | taken [1] 23/25 |
| says [1] 9/13 | 25/11 26/13 30/16 31/5 | takes [1] 26/19 |
| schedule [3] 6/5 6/19 28/19 | social [11] 3/3 5/5 5/21 7/6 | taking [2] 12/17 22/20 |
| Science [1] 31/4 <br> scope [9] 5/4 5/20 5/24 6/22 | 7/14 7/16 8/8 8/21 12/20 | talk [6] 13/9 13/15 14/22 |
| scope [9] 5/4 5/20 5/24 6/22 <br> 8/20 8/25 15/11 22/6 28/24 | 14/1 15/14 | 15/1 19/9 23/3 |
| search [40] | some [17] 4/7 7/1 8/6 10/2 | talking [5] 4/9 5/24 13/14 |
| searched [7] $7 / 19$ 13/7 $13 / 8$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 2 & 11 / 10 & 11 / 19 & 12 / 13 & 15 / 13\end{array}$ | 18/4 22/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll}14 / 8 & 18 / 24 & 19 / 13 & 19 / 16\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 17 & 20 / 10 & 25 / 1 & 25 / 7 & 27 / 10\end{array}$ | target [1] 4/16 |
| searches [7] 5/13 5/17 8/24 | somebody [4] 24/18 24/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { teams [1] } 18 / 24 \\ & \text { tee [1] } 14 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 9/5 14/4 17/3 19/19 | $24 / 19 \quad 25 / 8$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { tell [10] } & 11 / 1 & 11 / 2 & 11 / 24\end{array}$ |
| searching [7] 5/20 10/3 10/5 12/9 14/11 15/15 16/10 | something [8] 7/12 17/14 | 16/9 16/15 20/11 20/23 22/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { second [2] } & 18 / 2 & 20 / 8 \\ \text { secondarily } & {[1]} & 25 / 14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 / 2 \quad 23 / 15 \quad 23 / 15 \quad 23 / 17 \quad 23 / 20 \\ & 25 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 24 / 7 & 26 / 23 \\ \text { ten [9] } & 15 / 25 & 17 / 2 & 17 / 5 \end{array}$ |




