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THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everyone, welcome to our case management conference in the Zantac MDL. Our last conference, as you all may remember, was July 28th, so it has been a little while. We had hoped that we would have you here in person today, that was the plan, but in light of the Delta variant and developments with the pandemic, the Court deemed it most prudent to continue, at least for purposes of this case management conference, to hold it remotely.

It is the Court's intention to get you here in person, and I think I may have an idea about when we can do that. The reason that we didn't go forward in person is because of the Court's concern relating to developments since we last were together with the Delta variant and didn't want to take any risk given that we have all been so careful up until now.

I'm sorry you are not here in this big courtroom, it is just me and Pauline, but $I$ know you are all out there and I am glad to be with you even though it is remote.

I look forward to today's case management conference. I know we are going to have a number of interesting and relevant topics, as we always do. We are going to be discussing the registry, which is always helpful to get the update on how that is going. It is such an integral part of this MDL, and I look forward to getting an update on that.

We are going to hear how the bellwether selection process is going. You may recall that in PTO -- let me pull
that up -- 65, which was the second amended order establishing case management schedule, the Court had indicated that it was not addressing two topics, and that was the schedule for discovery relating to bellwether trials and any motions for summary judgment. The Court had concluded and memorialized that in the pretrial order, that the parties would work with the special master to determine if an agreement could be reached as to these issues and/or proposed Daubert schedule.

I indicated that the Court may issue a pre-trial order specific to these issues at a later date. The Court also indicated that it intended to issue an order at a later date setting forth the bellwether trial schedule.

So, I look forward to getting an update pursuant to that pre-trial order on that topic as well, and then we will hear, as we have on most every case management conference that we have had, at least the recent ones, the State/Federal coordination.

I want to thank counsel again for the updates I have been getting in the past and providing the Court with all of the information relating to the other cases that are going on around the country and the other judges. You gave me the contact information, and $I$ have been able to, in a second round of calls -- I have had previous calls based on earlier updates you have given me, but as a result of the last update, I reached out again to a number of the judges, and had very
productive conversations with Judge Bennett in Tennessee, Judge Kelly in New York, Judge Stokes, also in Tennessee, and I am grateful that filed on the docket was the notice to me of the reassignment of the coordination of the trial judge in California.

I now understand that Judge Grillo is the judge who has been reassigned as to the coordination of the California cases, and so, I intend to reach out to Judge Grillo and speak to Judge Grillo, as I have with the other judges, to simply introduce myself, and they have all been very appreciative of that, and to answer any questions that they may have about the MDL, to learn a little bit about what is going on in the State cases and really just to establish a relationship, and to discuss areas that there may be for efficiencies, coordination, and all with the idea that there is the proper use of resources for the benefit of the lawyers, the litigants, and that the Courts are all aware of what each other is doing.

So, it is really kind of an information sharing, and I have found that the State Court judges have been very, very grateful to my overtures to reach out, to introduce myself, and to simply answer any questions that they may have. So that has been very fruitful and really has been facilitated by your updating the Court as to what is happening nationwide, so I very much appreciate that and think that it has led to very useful communication between the judges.

I note that one of the regrets of not having an in-person today was that we lost the opportunity to have the LDC members come in person because I know from our last case management we had discussed that, in coordination with the case management conference here in person, that we would try to organize an event with the LDC members in person, so that is something that, regrettably, we can't do in person today.

I look forward to simply postponing it until the date when everybody is comfortable and I am comfortable having you come in person.

I note, however, that a number of the LDC members are on the agenda today. I am most grateful for that. I think the lead counsel and others who have continued to mentor and facilitate the instrumental role that the LDC members are playing in this case -- I am aware of the role they are playing, even though I don't necessarily see them always at the hearings. I always do like to see them at the hearings because, as $I$ have said to lead counsel, even if it is just a small part, even if it is just a little statement that you make at the case management conference, a lot of little times that you appear before the Court amounts to big time, and it gets you more comfortable being in front of a judge in a proceeding, and I think that that is just really good for your growth and professional development.

And again, $I$ am very pleased and grateful to the
leadership for facilitating the role that the LDC members have always played in the case and, in fact, are playing today and presenting. That is a very important part of this case as well.

What I will memorialize in the order, but just wanted to let you know, and this is based on conversations through the special master with lead counsel, it looks like October 4th is shaping up to be a good day for hearings on the recent Motions to Dismiss that were filed as to the latest round of master complaints, and so, unless I hear otherwise -- and again, you don't necessarily have to pull out calendars or anything of that nature during our case management conference.

Our special master, Jamie Dodge, will get back to me to confirm, but $I$ am looking at October 4th, at 11:00 o'clock as the hearing date for the Motions to Dismiss. I will wait for her to confirm that that in fact works for all of the attorneys who will be arguing those Motions to Dismiss.

And then, there has been discussion of Science Day, that is something that has been on the topic of discussions that I have had with the special master about an appropriate day that the Court could have a presentation on Science Day, and I think, based on input that $I$ have received -- and again, I will wait to get confirmation of that -- but I am looking now at December 2 nd and December 3rd, and I am thinking also that that would be a perfectly appropriate time, barring any
unforeseen circumstances from the standpoint of the pandemic, that that could be in person.

I think that is an opportunity that the Court would greatly benefit from having you in person as $I$ know that the subject matter is dense and complex, and I know I speak for Pauline as well in saying that it would be a lot easier to have you in person for Science Day.

So, I am thinking that, whether it is the 2 nd or the 3rd, we can iron out those details, but that would be when we would have a Science Day presentation, and perhaps we could coordinate at the same time a case management conference. So, whether it is our next case management conference, or it is just another case management conference, we could consider doing that as well.

And lastly, we could also consider having the LDC members come so that we can organize an event in person with respect to the LDC members.

That is what $I$ am thinking. I don't think we need to get into any more logistics about that for purposes of this case management conference other than to say that $I$ will follow up with the special master following the case management conference to confirm that those dates do work.

Then I will get something out in an order, so at least it is memorialized on the record and will be in the court file, and those are some things for us to look forward to on the
horizon.
So, without any further ado, let me ask if our first presenters can turn on their screens and unmute themselves and give a presentation on what looks to be the first topic of registry. So, thank you so much.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Good morning, your Honor.
MR. PULASKI: Good morning, your Honor.
MS. DAILY: Good morning, your Honor.
MS. MCGLAMRY: Good morning.
THE COURT: Good morning. How is the new little baby?
MS. MCGLAMRY: Good, thank you.
THE COURT: Good, good, glad to hear that. Okay.
I look forward to your presentation, not only for my benefit, but we have about 149 or so participants on the call, so I am sure that they are also eagerly awaiting the update on one of our favorite topics, the registry.

MS. MCGLAMRY: I think I will get started with just some general registry information. As your Honor knows, the registry provides a number of benefits to both Plaintiffs and Defense in this litigation. There are currently over 140,000 claimants in the registry representing individuals from all over the country in every state.

A few of these benefits include the record retrieval process for ordering proof of use and proof of injury records for claimants, the production process headed by the retailers
providing for loyalty program records and prescription records, and a tolling agreement allowing both the registrants, their attorneys, and the Defendants and their attorneys to efficiently move forward in this litigation without currently having the need to litigate all non-diverse claims in every state across the nation.

Further, the data that has been collected from the Census Plus forms and the registry is currently being used to help both sides further discussions for a streamlined bellwether process and may prove to be extremely useful in future settlement discussion purposes, and you will hear more about bellwether, obviously, a little bit later today.

Today I would like to focus on the record retrieval processes provided by Lexitas and the retailers, which both are managed in part by LMI, which is the service provider chosen by both the Plaintiffs and the Defense in this litigation to host the registry data.

Just kind of by the numbers, Lexitas is the service provider handling the production of medical records showing proof of use and proof of injury, and to date there have been approximately 58,146 record orders that have been placed through this process, and 37,197 records produced to both Plaintiffs and Defense.

Lexitas is continuing to receive record requests from claimants' firms, and we would encourage all claimants'
attorneys to take advantage of this aspect of the registry and to contact Lexitas if they have not already done so to set up an account and start ordering records.

LMI is handling the coordination of the data on records between the retailers and the claimants as it relates to the production of loyalty program records and the prescription records from various retailers across the country. Some numbers on that is, as of Monday, 6,249 claimants have submitted a retailer record request form; 3,538 claimants have been submitted to retailers for record pulls, for a total of 6,068 requests submitted by LMI since most claimants are requesting from more than one retailer.

LMI will be submitting the next round of requests to retailers today. As you know, they do a monthly pull.

So, LMI has received records for 2,667 claimants totaling 4,157 retailer files, and this does not include files that were received on September 10th, which LMI has not yet processed, and this does not include no record statements, which we are still in the process of reviewing to determine volume, and since a lot of those were produced as pdf's with multiple claimants per document still need to be separated out.

The majority of the retailers have responded to requests and are current within 30 days of receiving the request, and LMI continues to receive files on a rolling basis from them.

I would like to inform the Plaintiffs' Bar that over the coming days LMI will be making retailer records available to Plaintiffs' firms and will provide notice to each of your firms when records for your clients are available with instructions for accessing those records.

There has been a slight data issue, a pdf problem that the parties are working out for some of those records, and that is why there are certainly more requests than records that have come through, so if not everyone receives their records by the end of the week, you might be part of that issue, and the parties are conferring this week, in the next two days, to resolve that issue.

And Adam -- Mr. Pulaski can certainly speak more to that if the Court has any questions.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Ms. McGlamry, that was very helpful, and there are a lot of numbers to keep track of. That is why we are going to have a transcript, so I can go back and review all of those numbers. So, thank you.

MS. McGLAMRY: You are welcome.
MS. DAILY: Good morning, your Honor, I am Hope Daily from Williams and Connolly. We represent Pfizer, but $I$ will be speaking today on behalf of all the brands.

Like Ms. McGlamry and many others presenting today, I am a proud member of the Leadership Development Committee, and part of my role in this litigation has involved working on the
registry, so I am happy to provide the Court with an update on that today.

The brands have really been working on two different processes as it relates to the registry. The first is Defendant mapping or product usage identification; and the second is the delinquency and deficiency process outlined in PTO 38.

To start with Defendant mapping, the brands have been reviewing the filed Plaintiffs' Census Plus forms, and requesting that they be voluntarily dismissed from cases in which the Plaintiff's product usage information indicates that they do not have a viable claim against them. So, to use Pfizer as an example, if a Plaintiff states in their Census Plus form that they began using over-the-counter brand Zantac in 2015, we know that Pfizer is not a proper Defendant because it stopped selling the product in 2006.

So, the purpose of this process is, of course, to help narrow which Defendants could have potentially manufactured or sold the Ranitidine products that each Plaintiff used, and therefore, to give the parties and the Court a better sense of the size of the litigation and to help us know how to better target our resources.

This process has been quite productive so far. The brands reviewed the Census Plus forms of approximately 700 Plaintiffs, and of those, we identified 350 cases in which it
appears that at least one of the brands should be dismissed based on lack of product usage. As an initial step for those 350 cases, we just informally reached out to Plaintiffs' counsel and asked that they voluntarily drop the respective brand or brands, and that informal reach out was really quite successful. In about two-thirds of those 350 cases the respective brands were indeed dropped or Plaintiffs' counsel came back and provided an explanation for declining to do so, such as there being a mistake in the Plaintiff's Census Plus form.

After that initial reach out, there were about 120 cases outstanding for which the requesting brands had not been dropped, so just last month, at the beginning of August, the brand submitted a dismissal list pursuant to pretrial order 52 that outlined those 120 cases, as well as the brand or brands requesting dismissal and the basis for doing so.

Again, Plaintiffs' counsel has been very responsive to that. Of those 120 cases, there are only about 40 cases that remain outstanding, and by that $I$ mean that the requesting brands have not been dropped nor has an explanation been provided. We plan to reach out to counsel in those cases in the very near term and we will certainly coordinate with Special Master Dodge and Plaintiffs' lead counsel when we do so.

So, that is where things stand on the

Defendant mapping front, and as I mentioned, this process is very much ongoing. We have reviewed the product usage data for about 700 Plaintiffs. We plan to review the data for the remaining Plaintiffs in the very near term and we expect that we will submit another dismissal list pursuant to PTO 52 in the next month or two certainly.

The other process that has been ongoing is the deficiency and delinquency process as outlined in PTO 38. I provided the Court with a brief update on this now several months ago, in December of last year, and since that time, the process has continued in very much the same way. LMI has sent out several additional rounds of delinquency and deficiency notices.

The most recent round of notices went out this past July, July 26 th, and we just received an updated report from LMI of the delinquencies and deficiencies that remain outstanding since those notices were sent out. So we are in the process of reaching out to Plaintiffs' counsel for those cases to meet and confer and we are hopeful that all of the outstanding delinquencies and deficiencies will be resolved through that informal meet and confer process.

All that is to say that the deficiency and delinquency process has been going smoothly. The parties have been working very well together to get these issues resolved outside of court and we are hopeful that it will continue that way.

That brings me to the end of my registry update for today. I thank the Court for its time, and I welcome any questions that the Court might have.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Daily, that was very helpful, very interesting to understand. It's a question I often ask Special Master Dodge, how is the mapping going, how is the deficiency process going, how is -- to Ms. McGlamry's point, the document retrieval.

So, these are all questions that I am always asking and your presentations are right on point in terms of what is of interest to the Court in terms of how the registry is working, and I am assuming to all of the viewers here today to understand just exactly what the net result of the intricacies of this structure is and how it is designed to operate, and that in all respects it seems as if it is operating as it is intended.

It is not without its hiccups and difficulties, I am certainly aware of that, and any time you are trying a relatively new process, and the registry I think, at least in this form, is relatively new, you learn and maybe there will be ways in which it will be done in a different fashion next time, but I really admire the commitment that both of you and lead counsel have made.

It wouldn't work if there wasn't that commitment because it is a lot of time. I know it's a resource intensive
endeavor financially and time-wise, and so $I$ can only imagine that it is of utmost importance that the intended results are experienced by both sides of the litigation given everything that has been put into it. So, I thank you for the update.

A hard act to follow, Mr. Pulaski and Mr.
Petrosinelli, but dare you step into the arena to supplement anything that your very able cocounsel have presented to the Court?

MR. PULASKI: No, your Honor, I think Ms. McGlamry and Ms. Daily made Mr. Petrosinelli's and my job very easy today, so I have nothing further to add at this point.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Your Honor, Joe Petrosinelli here, and nothing further to add for me.

THE COURT: Okay, good job. Thank you. I have no questions and very much appreciate the update, so, thank you.

MS. MCGLAMRY: Thank you, your Honor.
MS. DAILY: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. If we could have counsel who are going to be presenting on the topic of bellwethers and the Bellwether selection process, I look forward to hearing your reports as well. Good morning to all of you.

I neglected -- you have all been very good about it, but state your name before you are speaking so Ms. Stipes can ensure that she gets your name with your comments for the record.

MS. ZOUSMER: Good morning, your Honor, this is Julia Zousmer, counsel for BI, introducing the topic of Bellwether selection on behalf of the Defendants. It is nice to see you again and be here today, albeit virtually.

As the Court mentioned at the outset of this conference, Your Honor entered pretrial 65 in June directing the parties to work with Special Master Dodge to determine if agreement could be reached as to discovery relating to Bellwether trials, Motions for Summary Judgment, and/or a proposed post Daubert schedule.

The Court provided its vision in PTO 65 that Bellwether trials be conducted within nine to 12 months following Daubert rulings and required the parties to begin discussions regarding the process for selection of Bellwether personal injury cases on July lst, and to complete this process and plan by October 1 st, to be refined and amended for good cause as appropriate until final Bellwether selection following the Court's general causation Daubert ruling.

I am happy to report today that the parties have been having these discussions and exchanging proposals, and I have had the opportunity to work with Mr. Bayman and Mr. Petrosinelli and the others on the Defense team on this important part of the framework for the future of the MDL.

The parties are currently working through big picture concepts for the process and plan, such as where the pool would
be drawn from and whether it should be limited to Florida claimants, of which I understand there are about 9,000 currently, or whether it should be broader than that.

One aspect of picking a Florida pool would be that there would be no issues with regard to lexicon waivers or the ability to subpoena witnesses live to trial. We are making progress and working towards agreement on these big picture issues.

Unless the Court has any questions about that, I will turn it over to Ms. Boldt to talk about another one of these areas related to potential random selection of the pool.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Zousmer, and good morning, Ms. Boldt.

MS. BOLDT: Good morning, your Honor, Paige Boldt for Plaintiffs and the LDC. I am here to give an update about another threshold concern, which is more of the narrowing down and selection of the Bellwether pool. Obviously, the principal goal of the Bellwether process is to select cases that are representative of thousands of persons in the MDL, and so that results in these initial trials can be illustrated and inform the parties and the court.

There is generally two ways to narrow Bellwether pools, random selection of cases and the other being parties intentionally selecting them, with most MDLs utilizing a hybrid of these methods to balance out the pros and cons of each.
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Parties selection of bellwethers is often a reasonable tool because the parties' attorneys are in the best position to know the true scope and issues of a litigation's participants. However, selection comes at the expense of representativeness as both sides will select bellwethers favorable to them and can end up selecting outliers as your trial cases.

So, when the first case is tried, if it is chosen by the opposing party, it is easier to ignore the resulting verdict and the parties may be hesitant to rely on it for settlement resolution purposes. In this litigation with our multiple cancer injuries, each of the bellwethers must be as representative as possible.

So we turn to the random selection which, on the other hand, is the only statistically valid method of a truly representative pool. However, Judge Eldon Fallon of the Eastern District of Louisiana has previously written that random selection "can be problematic" because "there is no guarantee that the cases selected to fill the trial selection pool will adequately represent the major variables."

So, in order to leverage the pros of both random selection and party selection, MDLs opt to a hybrid of random selection of Plaintiffs to fill Bellwether pools and then having both sides deselect them there to make sure they adequately represent the litigation. In MDLs like Abilify, Benicar, Talcum Powder, and Zimmer hips, Bellwether pools were
randomly populated and both sides deselected down to those that were ultimately tried.

Additionally, both closer in time and physical location to your Honor, the Northern District of Florida's 3M earplugs MDL has also utilized this combination of random sampling and deselection, but specifically for the cases participating in that MDL's census. As your Honor has already heard about this morning, the Court's incentivizing Zantac Plaintiffs has led to very successful participation in the Zantac census registry. This robust demographic data about Plaintiffs from across the country has already been a guide at many steps in this litigation thus far and would be the best use for this Bellwether process.

But rather than both sides scouring 140,000 cases in the registry, we have agreed that a smaller sampling of this data would effectively represent the total pool of registry participants, and from there, both sides would be able to winnow down to the cases that are most relevant for the Court's attention.

After identifying cases that would qualify based on certain injuries and threshold issues, like Ms. Zousmer identified, we would utilize a Microsoft randomizer program and submit unique identifiers like an lmi ID number for the software to generate a list of randomly selected, statistically significant participants, somewhere between five and

20 percent.
From there, both sides would go through a selection/deselection process to pull out the outliers from that pool. And the two steps would guarantee statistically representative Bellwethers that are also characteristic of the major variables in this litigation and allow both sides to rely upon the results of future Bellwether verdicts in trials.

So, that is the update for the overall selection idea of the threshold issue that the parties have agreed about, and with the Court's permission, I am going to transition to Mikal Watts and Andrew Bayman for the status of the meet and confers on the remaining topics.

THE COURT: Okay, wonderful, thank you, Ms. Boldt. I appreciate that update.

MR. WATTS: Good morning. This is Mikal Watts. I do want to tell the Court that Paige Boldt has done a great job on this issue, and she is the person that runs the Plaintiffs' Bellwether committee meetings every week, which is pretty cool.

Judge, on the meet and confer, basically I drafted up a proposed Bellwether order, all the coleads got in with their thoughts. We sent it over. They sent back one big spread about when trials were going to happen. Of course, the last scheduled deposition is on December 4 th, so I wanted December 5 th to be the first trial, and they wanted it sometime in Joe Biden's fourth term, converting him into Franklin

Roosevelt or something.
So, we squeezed, squeezed, squeezed, and we are getting there. The bottom line is, we have gone back and forth with three different drafts, two different responses.

Special Master Dodge has led us through a myriad of meetings and pushed us, which she has done great. We made a lot of progress yesterday. We had about an hour long call with Special Master Dodge, Mr. Petrosinelli, Mr. Bayman and I, together with Mr. Pulaski, and we realize there is not a whole lot of air between us anymore.

They need to go back and confer with their clients to get client approval about the concepts that we are talking about. We scheduled a Zoom call for next Monday at 4:00 o'clock, we scheduled a followup call for next Tuesday from the airport where I am headed to Brussels to take depositions.

We have every reason to believe that we are going to get you either an agreed order by October 1st, or if there are just a couple of sticking points, it will be an order that looks the same with some minor exceptions where we say $X$ and they say Y, I say December 5th, they say the fourth term of the Biden administration, whatever it is. But we are down to that kind of thing.

All the big picture topics, we are shockingly pretty much in agreement, so $I$ am very bullish on it, and I think Mr.

Bayman will back me up. So I will cede the floor to him.
THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
MR. BAYMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Andrew Bayman on behalf of Boehringer Ingelheim and the Defendants for this purpose.

I agree with Mr. Watts, I think we conceptually have a lot of agreement on certain parts of this. I think there are some threshold issues which still need to be resolved, and they are important, obviously: What is the pool you are going to draw from, how many in the pool, what is the sequencing of events, when certain things are provided.

Obviously, as was reflected earlier in the presentation by -- the excellent presentation by Ms. McGlamry and Ms. Daily, it is important that we have good data from the census and so this true-up process, which is the one we have been using, is important so that there is proof of use and proof of use of particular products, that certain other things by claimants are vetted, such as claimants who have cancer before having taking Zantac, for example, just certain claimants who we would agree would not be part of a pool.

That work that is being done now is very important to what we are going to be doing ultimately, but I do agree with Mr. Watts that I think, while we differ on certain time periods, how long to do this versus this, we differ on some of the sequencing of events, I think overall in the framework we
are not all that far apart. We are going to continue to keep talking. As Mr. Watts mentioned, we have dates on the calendar, and I share his optimism that we would either present to you a joint proposal on October 1, or competing proposals with just the issues in dispute, if you would, or the time periods in dispute, and then allow you to hear us after that and make an ultimate decision.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I guess what $I$ am hearing is that there is largely, in important respects, meeting of the minds on kind of the structure and the process for selecting potential Bellwether cases, but where there may be disagreement is on certain deadlines that relate to what, kind of like the pretrial and trial date, sort of the discovery deadlines and other pretrial deadlines before you actually get to the actual trial date of the Bellwether trial?

Is that mainly where -- I am not committing you to that, but $I$ am just wanting to make sure $I$ understand. MR. WATTS: Judge, if I could, Mikal Watts. I think you said it right and when Mr. Bayman and Mr. Petrosinelli and I were on the phone yesterday, we kind of separated what we call the big structural issues about how you get from 140,000 cases down to a manageable number where you are trying four, five six, seven, eight of them, whatever you decide you want to do, and I think we are there.

It is largely using the Microsoft randomizer process
to get from 140,000 to some very small subset of that, and then you have a series of additional information as parties select, deselect, select, deselect.

So, to use the example $I$ was using, Vioxx, you don't have a marathon runner being the Plaintiff pick and a 350-pound guy blaming Vioxx for his heart attack being the Defense pick. So that selection, deselection.

I have done this before, and this order that we sent largely is the work of Kirkland and Ellis who talked me into it in the Syngenta corn case and it works great. It gets rid of the outliers. I think Mr. Bayman actually came up with, or Mr. Petrosinelli yesterday, if we are in the middle of discovery and we realize we have a marathon runner and a 350 pound heart attack, you know, that we can deselect those out and quit spending resources.

So, those big structural issues on how to do it, I think we are getting there, subject to client approval.

What we are going to have disputes about, and we are going to work them out $I$ think, but is timing, and a lot of that is, if the Court were to tell us what day you want to have the trial, we could reconstruct it from there, but your order said nine to 12 months. Of course, I heard six months and he said 15 months. We are getting down to that.

I think we are close from the standpoint of how much time from the time a Plaintiff is selected as the Bellwether
trial Plaintiff, how much time do we need between that selection date and the time of trial, there is some disagreement on that. We also brain stormed yesterday different ways that we could close the gap between the two of us. I think Mr. Bayman said it right. Kind of a light went off yesterday that we are not that far apart.

MR. BAYMAN: The only thing I would add, your Honor, is, I do think certainly the structural issues have to be resolved in the beginning and issues about sequencing.

We believe that we would be entitled to certain information in advance of the randomization to help us, that the Plaintiffs want to do randomization and then winnow the pool down. So, there are things like that structurally that still need to be worked out, but I think Mr. Watts is right.

When we look at a lot of when they provide certain information in their plan and when we are saying we want it, there is not a lot of difference. I think that we can continue to keep discussing and are optimistic that we can bridge these issues, or if not, certainly narrow them for your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Just out of curiosity, although the plan may speak to it, in the deselection process, is it envisioned that one side or the other would have sole discretion to do that or is it based on -- would it be based on objective criteria?

MR. WATTS: So, the way we have it -- Mikel Watts
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again. I'm sorry, Judge.
The way we have it structured right now is pretty much a deselection for whatever reason you choose. We have the randomization, of course we have to do it for every one of the cancers in the case, so we have so many of each kind of cancer, but then we take what is a very large number, use the randomizer to select a set percentage of it. Whether that be 5 percent, 10 percent, 15 percent, or 20 percent, it is not really important. Then at and that point in time, based on the information that is in the census already, you have a deselection to get down to a smaller number.

Then you set up a series of increasing burdens on the Plaintiff from the standpoint of providing additional information as the selection, deselection process goes down so that -- and I think it was Mr. Agneshwar who said we don't want to spend a ton of money on something that is not going to end up being a trial Plaintiff.

So, we are trying to structure a lot of that work from the standpoint of $I$ give them a medical authorization for a set number of Plaintiffs so that we can begin the process of ordering medical records well before Daubert.

That way, when you make your rulings on Daubert and we know what is going, we are not wasting another six months to just start collecting medical records and the like.

But the answer to your question is, as we go from a
large number and winnow it through selection, deselection, it's largely each side can do it for whatever reason they choose to in their advocacy roles of trying to get rid of the outliers. By going from deselection to selection, deselection to selection, my experience has been that you get rid of the outliers and you try cases that look like the top of the bell curve that are representative.

MR. BAYMAN: We proposed a two-step strike process where you would strike at the beginning so you didn't waste the time and the money on doing discovery on a Plaintiff that either side knew wasn't going to be a representative Plaintiff in the end, and then strike at the end before trial, which is, I think, more typical.

What we are talking about saves spending time and money on Plaintiffs that either side or both sides know is not going to be a Bellwether Plaintiff in the end for the kind of reasons Mr. Watts described.

THE COURT: How much information do you think you will already have at that point, whatever that point is, at some point, through the registry that would result in, you know, not quite the same burden as if you are just beginning a case anew, and asking -- getting initial disclosures and doing your first set of -- I mean, where do you think you would be with the viable potential pool of Bellwether claimants based on just the ordinary workings of the registry and the winnowing process
that is going on and the medical record retrieval and things of that nature?

How much of a head start would that give you as to a pretty good sampling, and by what date? How does that all match up with Daubert and with this ultimate selection?

MR. WATTS: Mikel Watts. I think that the registry is critical to what we are trying to do. I think it will be the standard in every future MDL. The reason is, is we have so much information already that allows us to start this process, and then the cleansing process that you heard with respect to the registry will go on, and we need that to happen as the winnowing is going, right.

But inevitably you get a bomb that goes off, somebody gets a medical record and it turns out your star Plaintiff served 14 years in the pen, and you have this and so you are trying to take that out. Or you have somebody that said they didn't have a family history of a particular kind of cancer, and then they had a bunch of family history of that same cancer, so I would want to deselect that.

So, a lot of that information is already in the registry. The initial vetting would be based -- largely based on demographics. I suspect the Plaintiffs wouldn't be desiring to have their first Bellwether Plaintiff be a 98 year old. At the same time, Mr. Bayman may want to strike the five year old pediatric case.

So that will happen, but the idea is we are trying to have the winnowing happen prior to Daubert to a certain extent so that we are not wasting a ton of resources, and then after Daubert, immediately after Daubert, we start what is either a three-month or a four-month specific case discovery process on a number of the cases that are left.

Mr. Petrosinelli suggested, and I agree, that let's say we start that process off with the Plaintiff's deposition, and bad things happen in depositions from time to time, so we may want to kill a case as a Bellwether right off, or they determine that it is the equivalent of the marathon runner on Vioxx, so they want to kill the case right off.

If we are going to have that deselection ultimately, why would we waste the resources to continue to go through the discovery process? I thought Mr. Petrosinelli had a really good idea there.

THE COURT: So --
MR. WATTS: But the concept is that we would order the records well in advance so that we are not waiting on records when it is time to do the case specific discovery.

THE COURT: So, is the vision, then, that there would be actually identified cases at the time of Daubert, and that based on the Daubert rulings, you would go to that universe of cases you have selected and maybe pull some out, maybe not?

MR. WATTS: Sure. Let me use the example of just
cancers. If the Court says the following 12 cancers survive and everything else doesn't, of course we do not want to spend any time or resources trying to get you Bellwether cases on something you said didn't get past general Daubert. But we will already have the records, and that is the one potential for resources that are expended that somebody could say is wasted, is if we order a bunch of records on a bunch of cases and you say that cancer doesn't survive Daubert, well then all those records and the expense of that has been to some argument wasted.

But what we don't want to do is, we don't want to waste the resources on case specific discovery before we know which cases we are going to be trying to set up a Bellwether Plaintiff for.

MR. BAYMAN: Your Honor, if I might just chime in to your prior question. We think the registry information is important, but the CPFs are limited to basic personal information about product usage, injury alleged, and what are the, what Mr. Watts calls the structural issues still in debate is, when do we get fact sheets.

Our view is the fact sheets are important for doing the vetting prior to the randomization, such as medical background, other medical problems, diagnoses, concomitant medications, lifestyle information like smoking, alcohol, caffeine, other drugs, more information about health care
providers and pharmacies, more information than the CPFs provide in the registry.

So, that is one of the structural issues we are discussing is, our plan would be to get the fact sheets as part of that vetting process, again before Daubert, but to do that, vet those, and then as soon as your Daubert ruling hits we do the randomization. The Plaintiffs say randomize first, then later provide the fact sheets and other information, so that is one of the issues that we are still debating.

THE COURT: Is your proposal -- again, when I say proposal, I use that loosely just based on what you said.

Would it be every claimant would fill out a fact sheet, or how would you decide who, under your scenario, would fill out a fact sheet?

MR. BAYMAN: I think that is where we would be open to discussions with the Plaintiffs, whether it might be some percentage of the pool. First you have to decide on the pool, is the pool all Florida residents or is the pool broader than that.

Once you decide on the pool, then I think we would be open to discussions with the Plaintiffs about what percentage would be required to file the fact sheets, provide the fact sheets as part of the vetting process while we are gathering the medical records and the authorizations.

That is why we are continuing to have discussions
about how this all can be sequenced, and $I$ think that is a term I used earlier, but other than the timing of certain deadlines, the sequencing is something that is still being discussed among the parties.

MR. WATTS: Our view on the fact sheet issue is as follows: Number one, the old way of MDL thinking is if the Defendants are having to do work, why shouldn't the Plaintiffs have to do work? So you make 150,000 people fill out fact sheets, it creates an extraordinary waste of resources. I can't over emphasize the millions and millions and millions of dollars it takes to fill out fact sheets for 140,000 people.

So, what we have done is, the order that we have proposed and submitted, and I don't think there is a lot of push back, would take a snapshot of what is in the census as of a particular date. The present date that is in the order is September 21. Now, why is that in there?

Number one, it is probably not lost on the Court that September two years ago is when all this broke with an FDA thing, so there are all sorts of Statute of Limitations issues and everything like that.

So, the presumption is that people that are going to go into the registry for purposes of pooling are getting into the registry right now, and there is a reason for that, so that gives you a protection from the standpoint of Bellwether selection, and that is what $I$ call the anti-sandbagging
protection. We don't have a situation where somebody has kept their very worst cases out because they have fear of losing them to the Statute of Limitations.

So, we take a picture of what is in the registry, and for example, last week I put every case I've got into the registry except for two, and the reason for that is, in these discussions I wanted it to be clear that we are not having a situation where the Plaintiffs are playing some game of poker where we're keeping out the bad ones, putting in the good ones, trying to stack the deck and the like.

So, with that representation, and I have every reason to believe, based on what I have seen from the registry, that every law firm in the case is either going in the registry, going to State Court, whatever they are doing, but they are not picking and choosing.

So, because of that, as a matter of just statistical significance, you have so many cases, 140,000 of them, there is no way to jerrymander the system. So, that makes the Microsoft randomizer that the Kirkland and Ellis law firm talked me into in a case with 200,000 Plaintiffs make all the sense in the world. You let the randomizer come in and select or deselect what in some cases could be 99 percent of the cases. You still have 1,400 cases, which statistically is going to be representative of the 140,000 .

What you have done is, you have just saved the
resources of filling out Plaintiff fact sheets for 138,600 people who are never going to be the Bellwether anyway, and so it serves no purpose.

Now, once you get to that 1400 , then we have selection, deselection, and as -- then we've got the secondary issue of how much work, how much resources are we going to expend prior to Daubert in order to save time.

So, we have this winnowing process and you have the Plaintiff provide more information in the form of a Plaintiff fact sheet. Originally what we have got going is, the first thing you have to do is, you have to show up with a medical authorization so we can get the records ordered because -- the LDC member that was talking about some people say $X$, but their prescription records don't back it up, this kind of thing.

So we get those ordered immediately, we get the records ordered through authorization. All that process of collecting the backup data while we are getting down to a manageable number takes place before your Honor rules on general causation Daubert, and then immediately after your Honor rules on general causation Daubert, we start this intensive case specific discovery, taking depositions, etc. which, as you know, is very, very expensive.

During that process Mr. Petrosinelli said, hey, let's save some more resources, give everybody a pull so we are not wasting resource on somebody we know is not going to be a

Plaintiff.
It has really been a good discussion from the standpoint of how do we get ready for trial as quickly as we can, pursuant to the Court's order after Daubert, but at the same time not waste an incredible amount of resources in ways that -- frankly, past Bellwether selection orders have made the mistakes in the past that we have learned from, and we are not going to waste the money or the time, more specifically, that it takes to get 140,000 people through a fact sheet process, a deficiency process, dismissal processes. I have seen that over and over and over again in MDLs and I think that both sides generally agree it is a giant waste of time and money.

MR. BAYMAN: To be clear, your Honor, we are not going to be asking for 140,000 fact sheets. To be clear, this is something that is subject to further discussion, and the end number may not be that far off. The difference is, we say do that on the front end, do the vetting, do the winnowing, then have randomization ready to go, and we start discovery as soon as you rule on Daubert.

The Plaintiffs say do the randomizer, narrow the pool, then winnow for five months, then we get -- so, again, some of it is how you sequence it, and that is what we are trying to work through, and $I$ know that Mr. Watts said, you know, we are depending on statistical significance to make reasonable decisions about the distribution of the cases. That holds true
for the distributions of the cancers among the Zantac users.
So, we are -- you know, we are continuing to, as they say, debate these, and I think with more discussions, I continue to remain optimistic that if we don't have an agreement, we can get pretty close, because I don't think the numbers are going to be that far off in what we are looking at. MR. WATTS: I agree.

MR. McGLAMRY: Your Honor, this is Mike McGlamry. I add this only because $I$ think that what $I$ am hearing also on this, and also just from knowing what is going on with this, is, number one, thank you for taking such an interest in putting together a Bellwether plan because it is critical to us and our clients. And I would say this, that at some level I hope we don't sort of generate unintended consequences.

We have done, I think -- and you heard earlier from others about the registry, about how wonderful that has been, and as a result, 140,000 some odd people are participating, which is unheard of, and in every other litigation 92 percent of those people we would not know about at this point. But we can't create a process that then sort of ruins all of that by requiring 140,000 people to do a bunch of other things because, as others have already said, how expensive this process has been at this point.

So, at some level it's sort of let's don't let form overdue substance because at some level we have all done, you
know, getting ready for a Bellwether trial and doing this process and we don't need to have, because we have such a wonderful registry, that everybody, and the Court particularly, have spent so much time doing and putting together, be an impediment to getting where we need to go as quickly as we can go.

I always tell this to the special master, and she rarely listens to me, but $I$ will say it for this purpose. At some level, your Honor, you need to tell us when you want the trial, and as Mr. Watts indicated, we'll back all of those things up because, in my experience, the lawyers, which I know we have on both sides of this, we will get this thing done.

The randomizer is one of the best ways to do that because you are kind of cutting through some of the chaff, and I think we, and I think this is true on both sides -- once your Honor, as you have been doing, pay attention to this and the timing, because the rest of this stuff is going to play itself out, we will get it figured out. We always do.

And so don't let either one of us say, oh, we need to do all these things to slow this process down. It needs to happen, in our opinion, quicker rather than later, and so we ask you to sort of tell us what to do.

Secondly, and I will end this because this is really somewhat unrelated, but $I$ have somewhat of an interest in this, I want to thank you for letting the LDC and next gen members
participate in this in a meaningful way. They are already, as Mr. Watts indicated, as critical to this litigation as there ever is.

We all know that old guys like Andy and I cannot do the work that is required in this without a tremendous amount of resources, and as you have already seen today, and you will see as we go on, and you have seen before in these things, that the LDC and next gen lawyers are great. They are smarter than any of us could ever be, and we appreciate the fact that you are allowing them to shine, to get in front of the Court and not just be behind the scenes telling us old people what to do, that they are actually in the front lines, and we appreciate that.

Thank you, your Honor.
MR. BAYMAN: Your Honor, I would echo that. I am not as old as Mr. McGlamry, but I cannot do this without the help of Ms. Zousmer, who knows our plan and the Plaintiffs' plan in detail inside and out and continues to provide me with the information that I need.

I will say though, again, we are not looking for 140,000 fact sheets. I think the thinking behind our plan was, don't do a lot of work prior to your Daubert rulings because some cancers may be eliminated.

Under the Plaintiffs' plan, we could be working on cases in the winnowing process that ultimately do not survive
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Daubert because they have that work being done before Daubert, whereas we would be getting the fact sheets, vetting the pool, winnowing it down, and then we would be prepared to go as soon as your Daubert ruling to have randomized picks and we could start.

I just wanted to make that clear.
I think we can -- we are obviously proceeding in good faith. Mr. Watts and I have tried cases in various places under different kinds of plans, and I think we have a good team of leads that are very involved, Mr. Petrosinelli, Mr. Pulaski, Mr. Agneshwar. We have our LDC members who are supporting us and I, again, remain optimistic that if it is not an agreed plan, it is one that has limited things for you to decide.

Obviously, we are working -- to Mr. McGlamry's point, we are mindful of pretrial order 65, and what you said your vision is for a trial, and we propose a trial within 12 months, and the Plaintiffs propose a trial within six months. So, again, we are mindful of your Honor's instructions.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, there is a lot there, so thank you. Gosh.

Well, a couple of takeaways. I don't know, Mr. Watts, you are not included among the old guy club, so maybe that's a good thing for you. Sorry, Mr. Bayman, you were thrown in there with Mr. McGlamry if you didn't want to be there. Clearly undisputed throughout everyone's comments is that

Ms. Boldt and Ms. Zousmer and all of the other LDCs are amazing. The MDL could not go forward without you, so that is like an undisputed -- if there was a summary judgment motion on that the movant would win, undisputed.

Look, I am not going to prejudge anything. I think you know me well enough to know that $I$ want to hear from -from both sides. I look forward to getting the plan on October 1st, pursuant to the pretrial order.

I would say that, you know, great in terms of reaching agreement, that is always a good thing. It is good on so many levels, not just because it would, arguably, make my job easier, but because it reflects a joint investment in what it is that you are putting together, and this is a very important part of the MDL, and you have the expertise.

So, look, there is going to be a degree of deference that I will afford to your collective thinking. It is not to say I am not going to ask questions because $I$ am curious, and I know enough to ask the questions, but I don't know a lot. So, I am going to wait until I get it, and if you disagree, if there are areas that you disagree, that is fine.

We have had many steps of the way in this MDL going back to previous orders on how the discovery was going to go forward and how the Motions to Dismiss were going to be briefed, and I try to always get your input. If there is not agreement on the written submission, if I feel I need to hear
more, we will come back together and I will ask why do you say this, why this many fact sheets, why this date, so I understand it, and then $I$ will make the best determination $I$ can as to which plan or which version of both.

So, you will continue to be heard, but this actually turned out to be incredibly helpful. I didn't really think of it in terms of your laying the groundwork for me then to be able to receive the October lst submission with a more informed level of understanding, and you can be sure that if I have more questions you will be right back here to answer them. So, this is all very, very helpful.

You know, I am not here to say fact sheets, good, bad, how many. No, I am not going to do that right now. I will say in my role as a committee member, as the chair, actually, of the MDL subcommittee, and I have been at enough conferences to know that $I$ do understand that is the old way of doing things, not to say it's obsolete, but facts sheets have been around. I have heard some of the benefits that come from the fact sheets and I have certainly heard some of the negative aspects.

I guess primarily what comes to mind is sort of the voluminous nature of some of them, 50 plus pages, and it's time consuming and it's resource intensive, not to say that in certain instances it is not accounted for, but it seemed to be a reason why everybody was embracing the registry and the Census and the Census Plus.

I can tell you when $I$ would let others know, whether it is on the committee or conferences, that the Census and Census Plus didn't exceed five pages, the jaws dropped. They couldn't believe the progress that had been made from the 50 pages.

Now, I understand when you get closer to trial you need more information. In a non-MDL you would be doing your interrogatories, your request for production, your request for admissions. So, whether you envision -- how you envision whether there is going to be a fact sheet, if so, how many, how that interplays with traditional discovery, you will tell me that and $I$ want to understand your thinking.

But this all sounds very good. I thank you for your commitment to working together. It is just really a hallmark of what $I$ place such importance on. It doesn't mean that $I$ expect you always to agree, but I do expect you to work together and to realize where you disagree, so you can really hone in on areas and make the job -- I don't want to say easier for me, but it is better for you, because if you are clear with me about where you don't agree, then that is where $I$ am going to devote my attention, and in all other respects, you are kind of getting what you are presenting and what you want where there is agreement.

Sometimes, when the parties go sideways and they just get angry with each other, even though in substance it is such
a small area of disagreement, because of personalities or -you know, you lose sight and it just becomes a mess for the Court, and the Court ends up making bad decisions as a result of that.

So, help the Court make a good decision about how this plan goes down. Whether it is what the Plaintiffs want or the Defense wants, or some hybrid, just help me make a good decision so at least it is clean, it is clear, it gets you to where you need to be. Maybe there is a difference of a month or two, but it is really important that you help me out in that regard. It sounds like you are doing everything you need to do to do that.

I have no other questions or comments, and thank all of you for your collective work on this important area of the case.

MR. WATTS: Thank you, Judge.
MR. BAYMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. MCGLAMRY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Lastly, we have the state and Federal update. If we could have counsel appear and state your name for the record as you present.

MR. HUYNH: Good afternoon, your Honor, Tommy Huynh. I am a member of the LDC and represent Sanofi, but am speaking for all the brands today.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. HUYNH: Your Honor, as you are aware from our slide deck and update at the last status conference in July, there were at that time State Court cases pending in California, Tennessee, Texas, Illinois, New York, Baltimore, and New Mexico.

The number of filed cases and Plaintiffs in those jurisdictions have not changed significantly since the last CMC, but I do want to note that seven Tennessee cases were recently removed to Federal Court following the dismissal of certain brand Defendants for lack of product use. So there are now 51 cases pending in Tennessee instead of 58.

What has changed since the last CMC is there have been State Court cases filed by at least five Plaintiffs who were part of the MDL's census registry. Two of these Plaintiffs filed their cases in Illinois State Court, one in Missouri, and two in Pennsylvania. Other Plaintiffs who were not in the registry have also filed cases in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania and Missouri are new State Court jurisdictions with Zantac cases. Defendants removed the cases in Missouri and Illinois filed by three Plaintiffs and moved to stay those proceedings pending transfer to this MDL.

The judge assigned to the case pending in the Eastern District of Missouri is Judge Sarah Pitlyk. The Illinois case was just remanded earlier today. In Pennsylvania the two Plaintiffs just filed their complaints two days ago, on

September 13th, so they remain pending there at this time.
Your Honor, turning to the possibility of Federal/State Court coordination briefly, we think that looking at where the various Zantac litigations stand, there are opportunities for coordination between this MDL and the state Courts. The complementary case schedules in certain state Court jurisdictions in fact allow for this type of coordination.

In this MDL, Daubert motions on general causation are due May 9, 2022, and briefing closes in July 2022. By comparison, in Tennessee, for example, general causation expert disclosures for Plaintiffs and Defendants are due in February and April 2022, respectively. Similarly, in California, expert discovery begins in April 2022, expert and dispositive motions are due in August, and the hearing on these motions is set for September 2022 .

There is also a Texas state Court case pending before Judge Robert Vargas. Unlike Tennessee and California, however, that case is still on an earlier track than the MDL. It has Daubert and summary judgment motions due April 11, 2022, and a May 2022 trial date.

Finally, I understand from your opening remarks that your Honor already has the names and contact information for the assigned state Court judges. We are happy to continue to provide your Honor with contact information for newly assigned

State Court judges to help facilitate any coordination the judges determine is appropriate.

With that, $I$ don't have anything further, your Honor, and Mr. Agneshwar and I are happy to answer any questions you may have.

THE COURT: Thank you. I found that the chart that you had provided last time with the PowerPoint was helpful. So, to the extent that you want to continue to update that so it becomes sort of a running updated summary of the different cases, I think that would probably be prudent because it would keep me current with all of the cases.

I made note of it, and I know I will have the transcript, but I did find that the chart that you provided last time was helpful, and I actually worked off of that when I made my calls to the judges whom I have reached thus far.

MR. HUYNH: Yes, we are happy to do that for you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Great, thank you, I appreciate that.
MR. KRAUSE: Your Honor, Adam Krause for the Plaintiffs. I believe I can make ours fairly brief.

On behalf of the liaisons for State and Federal Court, I wanted to report that we are in communication with California, Tennessee, Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas. In speaking with those State Court lawyers, I can report that each of those lawyers representing those Plaintiffs
feel that the coordination is going smoothly. Our view here in the MDL is the same. Each of the lawyers have told us that they would like to proceed with their autonomy.

I know you spoke with Judge Bennett and Judge Stokes in Tennessee, and by doing so you probably learned that each of these State Court cases are on different tracks. Many are just starting, they are in their infancy, some are further along with trial dates already established, as Mr. Huynh just said, down in Texas.

I don't think anyone would disagree that the epicenter of this case is here in this courtroom. I know Mr. Huynh suggested that State Court judges be -- coordinate with the MDL, and I think that is important. I think you reaching out is great with this coordination, just note that some of these cases are very far along, again, some of these Texas Court cases, and others don't even have judges assigned to them yet.

So, I think that particularly in New York, there are some cases that don't have judges assigned to them, but they are at various stages.

And lastly, $I$ just wanted to report that there are additional State Court cases that I do know are going to be filed in several jurisdictions coming up. I don't know how many there are, but there are ones that will be additionally filed in the upcoming weeks, and I wanted to keep you apprised that, in talking to some of the State Court counsel, they have
notified me that they are going to file a few more in the upcoming weeks going forward.

THE COURT: Okay, great. Thank you so much, Mr.
Krause.
MR. MATTHEWS: David Matthews for the Plaintiffs, your Honor, and I think between Mr. Huynh and Mr. Krause, they have covered everything adequately. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Terrific. Thank you.
MR. AGNESHWAR: Your Honor, Anand Agneshwar for the Defendants. Same, nothing to add beyond Mr. Huynh's presentation.

THE COURT: Great. I think you did it last time, but when you update the chart, include the case numbers. I know when $I$ called one judge, he actually didn't even know what -it wasn't clear what case the judge had. I can't remember whether I had it on the chart. We found it, and I was able to let the judge know. So the case numbers are important.

Look, I recognize that the State Court cases will be on their own track and, you know, look, they do things differently in State Court and Federal Court and they do things differently from one State Court to another State Court, or from one judge to another judge. So, you are never going to have perfect alignment and coordination, however you choose to define coordination.

I don't think anybody can quarrel with there being
open lines of communication, and to the extent that there could be efficiencies and coordination, again, that never hurts, and probably in all likelihood always helps, but I certainly realize we are different animals, each of us, because of the nature of our cases.

An MDL is different than having one case or 43 cases or 58 cases; State Court is different than Federal Court. So, we are not necessarily going to see uniformity I guess. I don't want anybody to confuse coordination and collaboration and communication, sort of one size fits all uniformity. Certainly that is not my mission.

It is just a very different approach that I have, which is just to introduce myself and to let them know who I am, and what the MDL is doing and answer any questions, and again, see what is happening in State Court, and have us share information.

Again, I think it all enures to the benefits of the litigants, and that is the idea. It is not about power grabbing or usurping authority of anybody, whether it be the lawyers or the judges. It is about ultimately what is in the best interest of the cases that are before the different judges and how can this be done in the most efficient and equitable manner.

So, getting these updates certainly help me, and as I say, the judges really do appreciate the calls. Many of them
have said they have never really received a call from a Federal judge in an MDL before, and they just were really appreciative of it.

So, I credit you with keeping that as a primary focus of this case because it doesn't go unnoticed. People appreciate it, other judges appreciate it. So, thank you.

I think that is the last matter on the agenda, so we probably are ready to conclude at this point.

I think we have become more efficient with our conferences. We are almost at an hour, maybe went a little bit over an hour, not by as much as I have gone over before, so I will call that a good thing. I am sure it is good for you as well.

So, everybody be well. Thank you for the time and preparation that you gave to presenting such an informative conference for the Court's benefit and those who are observing here today. I will get some orders out in the next couple of days, once $I$ hear confirmation from our special master with respect to the dates I spoke about for Science Day and for the Motions to Dismiss and anything else the Court may want to hear on.

With that, we will conclude the case management conference and everybody be well and remain safe.
(Thereupon, the hearing was concluded.)
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|  | 2 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. AGNESHWAR: [1] 50/8 | 2,667 [1] 11/15 | 6,068 [1] 11/11 |
| MR. BAYMAN: [8] 24/2 27/6 | 20 percent [2] 22/1 28/8 | 6,249 [1] 11/8 |
| 29/7 32/14 33/14 37/12 40/14 | 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG [1] | 60654 [1] 2/16 |
| 45/16 | 1/3 | 6333 [1] 2/17 |
| MR. HUYNH: [3] 45/21 45/25 | 200,000 [1] 35/20 | 64112 [1] 1/23 |
| 48/15 | 20005 [1] 2/3 | 65 [4] 4/1 18/6 18/11 41/15 |
| MR. KRAUSE: [1] 48/18 | 2006 [1] 13/16 |  |
| MR. MATTHEWS : [1] 50/4 | 2015 [1] 13/15 | 7 |
| MR. McGLAMRY: [2] 38/7 | 202-434-5567 [1] 2/3 | 700 [2] 13/24 15/3 |
| 45/17 | 2021 [2] 1/5 53/4 | 713-664-4555 [1] 1/12 |
| MR. PETROSINELLI: [2] 9/5 | 2022 [7] 47/10 47/10 47/13 | 725 [1] 2/2 |
| 17/11 | 47/14 47/16 47/20 47/21 | 7706 [1] 1/16 |
| MR. PULASKI: [2] 9/6 17/8 | 21 [1] 34/16 | 77098 [1] 1/12 |
| MR. WATTS: [9] 22/14 25/17 | 210-447-0500 [1] 1/20 | 78249 [1] 2/13 |
| 27/24 30/5 31/17 31/24 34/4 | 210-448-0500 [1] 2/13 | 78257 [1] 1/19 |
| 38/6 45/15 | 212-836-8011 [1] 2/7 | 8 |
| MS. BOLDT: [1] 19/13 | 250 [2] 1/22 2/6 | 8 |
| MS. DAILY: [3] 9/7 12/19 | 26th [1] 15/15 | 8011 [1] $2 / 7$ |
| 17/16 | 2700 [1] 1/23 | 816-760-2700 [1] 1/23 |
| MS. MCGLAMRY: [5] 9/8 9/10 | 28th [1] 3/3 | 9 |
| 9/16 12/18 17/15 | 2925 [1] 1/11 | 9 |
| MS. ZOUSMER: [1] 17/25 | 2nd [2] 7/24 8/8 | 9,000 [1] 19/2 |
| THE COURT: [24] 2/21 9/9 | 3 | 92 percent [1] 38/18 |
| 9/11 12/14 16/3 17/13 17/17 | 3 | 98 [1] 30/23 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 11 & 22 / 12 & 24 / 1 & 25 / 7 & 27 / 19\end{array}$ | 3,538 [1] 11/9 | 99 [1] 35/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 17 & 31 / 16 & 31 / 20 & 33 / 9 & 41 / 18\end{array}$ | 30 [1] 11/23 |  |
| 45/18 45/24 48/5 48/17 50/2 | 300 [1] 1/15 | A |
| 50/7 50/11 | 30309 [1] 2/9 | Abilify [1] 20/24 |
| 1 | 30326 [1] 1/16 $312-995-6333 ~[1] ~$ | ability [1] 19/6 <br> able [5] 4/22 17/7 |
| /s [1] 53/5 | 3391 [1] 1/15 | 43/8 50/16 |
| 0 | 3434 [1] 2/21 | about [41] 3/10 5/11 5/12 |
| 0500 [2] 1/20 2/13 | 350 $26 / 13$ | $\begin{array}{lllllllll}7 / 20 & 8 / 19 & 9 / 14 & 10 / 12 & 14 / 6 \\ 14 / 11 & 14 / 18 & 15 / 3 & 17 / 22 & 19 / 2\end{array}$ |
|  | 350-pound [1] 26/5 | 19/9 19/10 19/15 21/8 21/10 |
| 1 | 353 [1] 2/16 | 22/9 22/22 23/7 23/12 23/13 |
| 1,400 [1] 35/23 | 37,197 [1] 10/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}25 / 21 & 26 / 18 & 27 / 9 & 29 / 14 & 32 / 18\end{array}$ |
| 10 [1] 28/8 | 38 [2] 13/7 15/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 25 & 33 / 21 & 34 / 1 & 36 / 13 & 37 / 25\end{array}$ |
| 100 [1] 1/19 | 3M [1] 21/4 | 38/16 38/16 38/19 44/20 45/5 |
| 10019 [1] 2/6 | 3rd [2] 7/24 8/9 | 51/18 51/20 52/19 |
| 10th [1] 11/17 | 4 | above [1] 53/2 |
| 11 [1] 47/20 | 4 | accessing [1] 12/5 |
| 1180 [1] 2/9 | 4,157 [1] 11/16 | account [1] 11/3 |
| 119 [1] 2/12 | 40 [1] 14/18 | accounted [1] 43/23 |
| 11:00 o'clock [1] 7/14 | 404-523-7706 [1] 1/16 | across [3] 10/6 11/7 21/11 |
| 12 [4] 18/12 26/22 32/1 | 404-572-4600 [1] 2/10 | act [1] 17/5 |
| 41/16 | 43 [1] 51/6 | actual [1] 25/14 |
| 120 [3] 14/11 14/15 14/18 | 4555 [1] 1/12 | actually [8] 25/14 26/11 |
| 12th [2] 2/2 2/16 | 4600 [1] 2/10 | 31/22 40/12 43/5 43/14 48/14 |
| 138,600 [1] 36/1 | 4717 [1] 1/22 | 50/14 |
| 13th [1] 47/1 | 4:00 o'clock [1] 23/14 | ADAM [4] 1/10 $1 / 21 \quad 12 / 13$ |
| 14 [1] 30/15 | 4th [3] 7/7 7/14 22/23 | 48/19 |
| 140,000 [12] 9/20 21/14 |  | add [5] 17/11 17/13 27/7 |
| 25/21 $26 / 1 \begin{array}{lllll} & 34 / 11 & 35 / 17 & 35 / 24\end{array}$ | 5 | 38/9 50/10 |
| 37/9 37/14 38/17 38/21 40/21 | 5 percent [1] 28/8 | additional [4] 15/12 26/2 |
| 1400 [1] 36/4 | 50 [2] 43/21 44/4 | 28/13 49/21 |
| 149 [1] 9/14 | 51 [1] 46/11 | additionally [2] 21/3 49/23 |
| 15 [2] 1/5 26/23 | 52 [2] 14/14 15/5 | addressing [1] 4/3 |
| 15 percent [1] 28/8 | 5567 [1] 2/3 | adequately [3] 20/19 20/24 |
| 150,000 [1] 34/8 | 55th [1] $2 / 6$ | 50/7 |
| 16 [1] 53/4 | 561-803-3434 [1] 2/21 | administration [1] 23/22 |
| 1600 [1] 2/9 | 5726 [1] 2/12 | admire [1] 16/22 |
| 1725 [1] 1/11 | 58 [2] 46/11 51/7 | admissions [1] 44/9 |
| 1st [5] 18/15 18/16 23/18 | 58,146 [1] 10/21 | ado [1] 9/2 |
| 42/8 43/8 | 5th [2] 22/24 23/21 | advance [2] 27/11 31/19 <br> advantage [1] 11/1 |


| A | amount [2] 37/5 40/5 | $44 / 21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| advocacy [1] 29/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { amounts [1] } 6 / 21 \\ & \text { ANAND [2] } 2 / 450 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | attorneys [5] 7/17 10/3 10/3 11/1 20/2 |
| afford [1] 42/16 | and to [1] 13/21 | August [2] 14/13 47/15 |
| $\begin{array}{cllll} \text { after }[7] & 14 / 11 & 21 / 20 & 25 / 6 \\ 31 / 3 & 31 / 4 & 36 / 19 & 37 / 4 & \end{array}$ | and/or [2] $4 / 8$ 18/9 | authority [1] 51/19 |
| afternoon [2] 45/22 45/25 | ANDREW [3] 2/8 22/11 $24 /$ | authorizati |
| again [19] 4/18 4/25 6/25 | Andy [1] 40/4 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { a/10 } & 7 / 22 & 14 / 17 & 18 / 4 & 28 / 1\end{array}$ | anew [1] | authorizatio |
| $33 / 5$ 33/10 $37 / 11 \quad 37 / 21 \quad 40 / 20$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { angry [1] } & 44 / 25 \\ \text { animals [1] } & 51 / 4 \end{array}$ | autonomy [1] 49/3 <br> available [2] 12/2 12/4 |
| 41/12 $51 / 17$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { another [7] } & 8 / 13 & 15 / 5 & 19 / 10\end{array}$ | Avenue [2] 1/11 1/22 |
| against | 19/16 28/23 50/21 50/22 | awaiting [1] 9/15 |
| $\text { agenda [2] 6/12 } 52 / 7$ | answer [6] 5/11 5/21 28/25 | aware [4] 5/17 6/15 16/18 |
| AGNESHWAR [5] 2/4 28/15 | 43/10 48/4 |  |
| 41/11 48/4 50/9 |  | B |
| ago [3] 15/10 $34 / 18$ 46/25 | Antonio [2] 1/19 2/13 | baby [1] 9/10 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc} \text { agree }[8] & 24 / 6 & 24 / 20 & 24 / 22 \\ 31 / 7 & 37 / 12 & 38 / 7 & 44 / 16 & 44 / 20 \end{array}$ | Antonil     <br> any [16] $3 / 13$ $4 / 4$ $5 / 11$ | back [13] 7/13 12 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { agreed [4] } & 21 / 15 & 22 / 9 & 23 / 18\end{array}$ | 7/25 8/19 9/2 $12 / 1416 / 2$ | 22/21 23/3 23/11 $24 / 1$ 34/14 |
| 41/12 | 16/18 19/9 32/3 40/9 48/1 | 36/14 39/10 42/22 43/1 43/10 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { agreement [10] } & 4 / 7 & 10 / 2 & 18 / 8\end{array}$ | 48/4 51/14 | background |
| 19/7 23/25 24/7 38/5 42/10 | anybody [3] 50/25 | backup [1] |
| $42 / 2544 / 23$ | anymore [1] 23/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { bad [4] } & 31 / 9 & 35 / 9 & 43 / 12 & 45 / 3\end{array}$ |
| air [1] 23/10 | anyone [1] | balance [1] |
| airport [1] 23/15 | anything [5] 7/11 17/7 42/5 | Baltimore [1] |
| albeit [1] 18/ | 8/3 52/20 | Bar |
| alcohol [1] 32/24 | nyway [1] 36/2 | barring [1] 7 |
| alignment [1] 50/23 | apart [2] 25/1 27/6 | based [14] |
| all [49] 3/1 3/3 3/14 $3 / 16$ | pear [2] 6/21 45/20 | 14/2 21/20 27/23 27/23 28/9 |
| $4 / 19$ 5/10 5/15 5/17 7/16 | appears [1] 14/1 | $29 / 24$ |
| 9/21 10/5 10/25 12/18 12/22 | $22 / 1440 / 940 / 12 \quad 48 / 18 \text { 51/ }$ | basic [1] 32/17 |
| 15/19 15/22 $16 / 9 \quad 16 / 12 \quad 16 / 15$ | $52 / 6 \quad 52 / 6$ | basically [1] 22 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 18 & 17 / 21 & 17 / 22 & 22 / 20 \\ 23 / 24 & 25 / 1 & 30 / 4 & 32 / 8 \\ 3 / 18 / 18\end{array}$ | appreciative [2] 5/10 52/2 | basis [2] 11/24 14/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} 23 / 24 & 25 / 1 & 30 / 4 & 32 / 8 & 33 / 18 \\ 34 / 1 & 34 / 18 & 34 / 19 & 35 / 20 & 36 / 1 \end{array}$ | apprised [1] 49/24 | BAYMAN [11] $2 / 8$ 18/21 $22 / 11$ |
| 38/20 38/25 39/10 39/20 40/4 | approach [1] 51/12 | 23/8 $24 / 1124 / 3 \quad 25 / 19$ 26/11 |
| 42/1 $43 / 11 \quad 44 / 13 \quad 44 / 21 \quad 45 / 13$ | appropriate [4] 7/20 7/25 | 27/5 30/24 41/23 |
| 45/24 48/11 50/8 51/3 51/10 |  | [3] |
| 51/17 | approval [2] 23/12 26 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { BEACH [3] } & 1 / 2 & 1 / 5 & 2 / 21 \\ \text { Beach/Ft [1] } & 2 / 21\end{array}$ |
| alleged [1] 32/18 | approximately [2] $13 / 24$ | because [30] 3/11 |
| allow [3] 22/6 25/6 47/7 | April [3] 47/13 47/14 4 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 13 / 15 & 16 / 25 & 20 / 2 & 20 / 17 & 35 / 2\end{array}$ |
| allowing [2] 10/2 40/10 | April 11 [1] 47/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 16 & 36 / 12 & 38 / 5 & 38 / 9 & 38 / 12\end{array}$ |
| allows [1] 30/9 | April 2022 [1] 47/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 21 & 38 / 25 & 39 / 2 & 39 / 11 & 39 / 14\end{array}$ |
| almost [1] 52/10 | are [162] | $\begin{array}{llllll}39 / 17 & 39 / 23 & 40 / 22 & 41 / 1 & 42 / 11\end{array}$ |
| along [2] 49/7 49/15 | are in [1] 26/12 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 42 / 12 & 42 / 17 & 44 / 19 & 45 / 1 & 48 / 10\end{array}$ |
| already [13] 11/2 21/7 21/11 | area [2] 45/1 45/14 | 51/4 52/5 |
| 28/10 $29 / 19$ 30/9 30/20 32/5 | areas [4] 5/14 19/11 $42 / 20$ | become [1] 52/9 |
|  | 44/18 | becomes [2] 45/2 48/9 |
| $\begin{array}{clllll}\text { also [12] } & 4 / 10 & 5 / 2 & 7 / 24 & 8 / 15 \\ 9 / 15 & 21 / 5 & 22 / 5 & 27 / 3 & 38 / 9\end{array}$ | arena [1] 17/ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { been [41] } & 3 / 4 & 3 / 14 & 4 / 19 & 4 / 22\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 15 & 21 / 5 & 22 / 5 & 27 / 3 & 38 / 9 \\ 38 / 10 & 46 / 17 & 47 / 17\end{array}$ | arguably [1] 42/11 | 5/7 5/10 5/19 5/22 5/22 7/18 |
| $\begin{array}{cc}\text { 38/10 } & 46 / 17 \\ \text { although [1] } & 47 / 17 \\ \text { a }\end{array}$ | arguing [1] 7/17 | 7/19 10/7 10/20 10/21 11/10 |
| although [1] 27/20 <br> always [12] 3/20 3/2 | argument [1] 32/9 | 12/6 13/3 13/8 13/23 14/12 |
| always [12] 3/20 3/21 6/16 | Arnold [1] 2/5 | 14/17 14/20 14/20 15/7 15/23 |
| $6 / 17$ 7/2 $16 / 9$ 39/7 $39 / 18$ 42/10 42/24 44/16 51/3 | around [2] 4/21 43/17 | 15/23 17/4 17/22 18/19 $21 / 11$ |
| $\text { am [39] } 3 / 17 \quad 5 / 2 \quad 6 / 9 \quad 6 / 12$ | as [94] | 24/16 29/5 32/9 37/2 38/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}6 / 15 & 6 / 25 & 7 / 14 & 7 / 23\end{array}$ | ask [6] 9/2 16/6 39/22 42/17 | 38/23 39/16 43/15 43/17 44/4 |
|      <br> $/ 18$ $9 / 15$ $12 / 20$ $12 / 24$ $13 / 1$ | 42/18 43/1 | 46/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 9 & 16 / 12 & 16 / 17 & 18 / 19 & 19 / 15\end{array}$ | asked [1] 14/4 | before [17] $1 / 8$ 6/21 17/23 |
| 22/10 23/15 23/25 25/8 25/16 | asking [3] 16/9 29/22 37/14 | 24/19 25/14 $26 / 8$ 28/21 29/12 |
| 25/17 38/9 40/15 42/5 42/17 | aspect [2] 11/1 19/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 12 & 33 / 5 & 36 / 18 & 40 / 7 & 41 / 1\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}42 / 17 & 42 / 19 & 43 / 12 & 43 / 13\end{array}$ | aspects [1] 43/19 | 47/17 51/21 52/2 52/11 |
| 44/20 45/23 45/23 51/14 | assigned [5] 46/22 47/24 | began [1] 13/14 |
| 52/12 | 47/25 49/16 49/18 | begin [2] 18/14 28/20 |
| amazing [1] 42/2 | assuming [1] 16/12 | beginning [4] 14/13 27/9 |
| amended [2] 4/1 18/16 <br> among [3] 34/3 38/1 41/22 | attack [2] 26/6 26/14 | beginning so [1] 29/9 begins [1] 47/14 |


| B | burden [1] 29 | choose [3] 28/3 29/2 50/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| behalf [4] 12/22 18/3 24/4 | burdens [1] | choosing [1] 35/15 |
| 48/21 | C | circumstances [1] 8/1 |
| behind [2] 40/11 40/21 <br> being [11] 6/22 10/8 14/9 | caffeine [1] 32/25 | City [1] 1/23 |
| 19/23 24/21 26/5 26/6 28/17 | calendar [1] 25/3 | claim [1] 13/1 |
| $34 / 3$ 41/1 50/25 | calendars [1] 7/ | claimant [1] 33/ |
| believe [5] 23/17 27/10 | California [6] $47 / 13 \quad 47 / 18 \quad 48 / 2$ | claimants [1 |
| 35/12 44/4 48/20 | call [8] 9/14 23/7 23/13 | 11/21 19/2 24/18 24/18 24 |
| bell [1] 29/6 | 23/14 25/21 34/25 52/1 52/12 | 29/24 |
| bellwether [34] 3/24 4/4 | called [1] 50/14 | claimants' [2] 10/25 10/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}4 / 12 & 10 / 10 & 10 / 12 & 17 / 20 \\ 18 / 9 & 18 / 12\end{array}$ | calls [5] 4/23 4/23 32/19 | claims [1] 10/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 9 & 18 / 12 & 18 / 15 & 18 / 17 & 19 / 17 \\ 19 / 18 & 19 / 22 & 20 / 22 & 20 / 25\end{array}$ | 48/15 51/25 | Clark [1] 2 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 18 & 19 / 22 & 20 / 22 & 20 / 25 \\ 13 & 22 / 7 & 22 / 18 & 22 / 20 \end{array}$ | came [2] 14/8 26/11 | clean [1] 45/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 15 & 26 / 25 & 29 / 16 & 29 / 24\end{array}$ | can [30] 3/10 8/9 8/16 9/3 | cleansing [1] 30/ |
| 30/23 31/10 32/3 32/13 34/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 13 & 12 / 17 & 17 / 1 & 17 / 23 & 19 / 20\end{array}$ | clear [7] 35/7 37/13 |
| $36 / 2$ 37/6 38/12 39/1 | 20/5 20/17 26/14 27/17 27/18 | 41/6 44/19 45/8 50/15 |
| bellwethers [5] 17/19 20/1 | 7/4 | Clearly [1] 41/25 |
| 20/5 20/11 22/5 | 38/5 $39 / 541 / 7$ 43/3 43/9 | client [2] 23/12 26 |
| benefit [4] 5/16 8/4 9/14 | 44/1 44/17 48/20 48/24 | client approval [1] |
| 52/16 | can deselect [1] | clients [3] 12/4 23/11 38/13 close [3] 26/24 27/4 38/5 |
| ```benefits [4] 9/19 9/23 43/18 51/17``` | can't [4] 6/7 34/10 $38 / 20$ | closer [2] 21/3 44/6 |
| Benicar [1] 20/25 | 50 | closes [1] 47/ |
| Bennett [2] 5/1 49/4 | cancer [6] 20/11 $24 / 18$ 28/5 | club [1] 41/22 |
| best [5] 20/2 21/12 39/13 | cancers [5] 28/5 32/1 32/1 | cocounsel [1] 17/7 |
| 43/3 51/21 | 38/1 40/23 | coleads [1] 22/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { better [3] } & 13 / 20 & 13 / 21 & 44 / 19 \\ \text { between [8] } & 5 / 25 & 11 / 5 & 21 / 25\end{array}$ | cannot [2] 40/4 40/1 | collaboration [1] 5 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccccl}\text { between [8] } & 5 / 25 & 11 / 5 & 21 / 25 \\ 23 / 10 & 27 / 1 & 27 / 4 & 47 / 5 & 50 / 6\end{array}$ | care [1] 32 | collected [1] 10/7 |
| $\begin{array}{rllll}23 / 10 & 27 / 1 & 27 / 4 & 47 / 5 & 50 / 6 \\ \text { beyond } & \text { [1] } & 50 / 10\end{array}$ | careful [1] 3/14 | collecting [2] 28/24 36/17 |
| beyond [1] 50/10 BI [1] 18/2 | CAROLINE [1] 1/14 | collective [2] 42/16 45/14 |
| BI [1] 18/2 Biden [1] 23/22 | case [46] 1/3 1/8 $3 / 2$ 3/8 | combination [1] 21/5 |
| Biden [1] 23/22 Biden's [1] $22 / 25$ | 3/18 4/2 4/15 6/3 6/4 6/15 | come [7] 6/3 6/10 8/16 12/9 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 's [1] } & 22 / 25 \\ 8 / 15 & 6 / 21\end{array}$ | 6/20 7/2 7/3 7/12 8/11 8/12 | 35/21 43/1 43/18 |
| $22 / 21 \quad 23 / 24 \quad 25 / 21 \quad 26 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{llll}8 / 13 & 8 / 20 & 8 / 21 & 20 / 7 \\ 26 / 10\end{array}$ | comes [2] 20/4 43/20 |
| bit [3] 5/12 10/12 52/10 | 28/5 29/21 30/25 31/5 31/10 | comfortable [3] 6/9 6/9 6/22 |
| blaming [1] 26/6 | $\begin{array}{llll}31 / 12 & 31 / 20 & 32 / 12 & 35 / 5 \\ 35 / 20 & 36\end{array}$ | coming [2] 12/2 49/22 |
| Boehringer [1] 24/4 | 35/20 $36 / 21$ 45/15 46/22 | comments [3] 17/24 41/25 |
| BOLDT [7] 2/11 19/10 19/13 | 46/23 47/6 $47 / 17$ 47/19 49/11 | 45/13 |
| 19/14 22/13 22/16 42/1 | 50/13 50/15 50/17 51/6 52/5 | commitment [3] 16/22 16/24 |
| bomb [1] 30/13 | 52/22 | 44/14 |
| both [23] 9/19 10/2 10/9 | cases [60] | committee [4] 12/24 22/1 |
| 10/14 10/16 10/22 16/22 17/3 | causation [5] | 43/14 44/2 |
| 20/5 20/20 20/23 21/1 21/3 | cause [1] 18/17 | committing [1] 25/16 communication [4] 5/25 48/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}21 / 14 & 21 / 17 & 22 / 2 & 22 / 6 & 29 / 15\end{array}$ | $\text { cede [1] } 24 / 1$ | $51 / 151 / 10$ |
| 37/11 $39 / 12$ 39/15 $42 / 7$ 43/4 | census [15] 10/8 13/9 13/13 | comparison [1] |
| bottom [1] 23/3 | 13/24 14/9 21/7 21/10 24/15 | competing [1] |
| brain [1] 27/3 | 28/10 $34 / 14 \quad 43 / 25 \quad 43 / 25 \quad 44 / 2$ | complaints [2] |
| brand [5] 13/14 $14 / 5$ 14/14 | $4 / 3$ 46/14 |  |
| 14/15 46/10 | certain [14 | complete [1] 18/15 |
| brands [11] 12/22 13/3 $13 / 8$ | $24 / 11 \text { 24/17 24/19 24/23 }$ | $\text { complex [1] } 8 / 5$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 24 & 14 / 1 & 14 / 5 & 14 / 7 & 14 / 12\end{array}$ | $25 / 12 \quad 27 / 10 \quad 27 / 15 \quad 31 / 2 \quad 34 / 2$ | $\text { concept [1] } 31 / 18$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}14 / 15 & 14 / 20 ~ 45 / 24\end{array}$ | 43/23 46/10 47/6 | concepts [2] 18/25 23/12 |
| bridge [1] 27/18 | certainly [11] 12/8 12/13 | conceptually [1] 24/6 |
| brief [2] 15/9 48/20 | 14/22 15/6 16/18 27/8 27/19 | concern [2] 3/12 19/16 |
| briefed [1] 42/24 | $43 / 19 \text { 51/3 51/11 51/24 }$ | conclude [2] 52/8 52/22 |
| briefing [1] 47/10 | certify [1] 53/1 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { concluded [2] } & 4 / 5 & 52 / 24\end{array}$ |
|  | chaff [1] 39/14 | concomitant [1] 32/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { brings [1] } & 16 / 1 & \\ \text { broader [2] } & 19 / 3 & 33 / 18\end{array}$ | chair [1] 43/14 | conducted [1] 18/12 |
| broader [2] 19/3 33/18 <br> broke [1] 34/18 | changed [2] 46/7 46/ | confer [4] 15/19 15/21 22/19 |
|  | characteristic [1] 22/5 | 23/11 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Brussels [1] } & 23 / 15 \\ \text { bullish [1] } & 23 / 25\end{array}$ | chart [4] 48/6 48/13 50/13 | conference [18] 1/8 3/2 3/3 |
| bullish [1] 23/25 <br> bunch [4] 30/18 32/7 32/7 | 50/16 | 3/8 3/18 4/15 6/5 6/20 7/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { bunch [4] } 38 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | Chicago [1] 2/16 chime [1] 32/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 8 / 11 & 8 / 12 & 8 / 13 & 8 / 20 & 8 / 22 \\ 18 / 6 & 46 / 2 & 52 / 16 & 52 / 23 \end{array}$ |


| C | curve [1] 29/7 | deposition [2] 22/23 31/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { conferences [3] } 43 / 15 \text { 44/2 } \\ & 52 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | cutting [1] | depositions [3] 23/16 31/ |
|  | D | described [1] |
| conferring [1] confers [1] $22 / 11$ | D.C [1] 2/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { deselect [6] } & \text { 20/23 } & 26 / 3 & 26 / 3\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { confirm [3] } & 7 / 14 & 7 / 16 & 8 / 22\end{array}$ | DAILY [5] 2/1 12/20 16/ <br> 17/10 24/14 | $26 / 14 \quad 30 / 19 \quad 35 / 21$ <br> deselected [1] 21/1 |
| confirmation [2] 7/23 52/18 confuse [1] 51/9 | dare [1] 17/6 | deselection [12] 21/6 22/3 |
| Connolly [2] $2 / 2$ | data [10] 10/7 10/17 11/4 | 26/7 27/21 28/3 28/11 28/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { cons [1] 19/25 } & \\ \text { conle }\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 / 6 \text { 15/2 15/3 21/10 21/16 } \\ & 24 / 1436 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29/1 29/4 } 29 / 4 \quad 31 / 13 \quad 36 / 5 \\ & \text { designed [1] } 16 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| consequences [1] 38/14 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { date [14] } & 4 / 10 & 4 / 11 & 6 / 8 & 7 / 15\end{array}$ | desiring [1] 30/22 |
| Consider [2] 8/13 8/15 | 10/20 25/13 25/15 27/2 $30 / 4$ | detail [1] 40/18 |
| consuming [1] 43/22 <br> contact [4] 4/22 11/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 15 & 34 / 15 & 43 / 2 & 47 / 21 & 53 / 4\end{array}$ | details [1] 8/9 |
| contact [4] 4/22 11/2 $47 / 25$ | dates [4] 8/22 25/2 49/8 | determination [1] |
| continue [9] $3 / 7 \begin{array}{lllll}\text { c }\end{array}$ |  | determine [5] 4/7 11/19 18/7 |
| 27/17 31/14 38/4 43/5 47/24 | 18/18 28/21 28/22 30/5 31/2 | development [2] 6/24 $12 / 24$ |
| /8 | $31 / 4$ 31/4 31/22 31/23 32/4 | developments [2] 3/6 3/12 |
| continues [2] 11/24 40/18 | $32 / 8 \quad 33 / 5 \quad 33 / 6$ 36/7 36/19 | devote [1] 44/21 |
| continuing [3] 10/24 33/25 | 36/20 37/4 37/19 40/22 41/1 | diagnoses [1] 32/23 |
| 38/2 | 41/1 41/4 47/9 47/20 | did [2] 48/13 50/12 |
| conversations [2] 5/1 7/6 | Daubert because [1] 41/1 | didn't [9] 3/11 3/13 29/9 |
| converting [1] 22/25 | David [1] | 30/17 32/4 41/24 43/4 |
| cool [1] 22/18 | $8 / 7 \text { 8/10 26/20 52/19 }$ | differ [2] 24/23 24/24 |
| coordinate [3] 8/11 14/22 | days [5] $11 / 23$ 12/2 $12 / 11$ | difference [3] 27/17 37/16 |
| coordination [16] 4/17 5 | 46/25 52/18 | 45/9 |
| 5/7 5/14 6/4 11/4 47/3 47 | deadlines [4] 25/12 25/13 | different [13] 13/3 16/21 |
| 47/8 48/1 $49 / 1$ 49/14 50/23 | 25/14 34/2 | 23/4 23/4 $27 / 4$ 41/9 $48 / 9$ |
| 50/24 51/2 51/9 | debate [2] 32/19 38/3 | 49/6 51/4 51/6 51/7 51/12 |
| corn [1] 26/ | debating [1] 33/9 | 51/21 |
| correct [1] 53/1 | December [6] 7/24 7/24 15/10 | differently [2] 50/20 50/21 |
| could [20] 4/7 7/21 8/2 8/10 | 22 | difficulties [1] |
| 8/13 8/15 13/18 17/18 18/8 | December 4th [1] 22/23 |  |
| 25/18 $26 / 21 \quad 27 / 4 \quad 32 / 6 \quad 35 / 22$ | December 5th [2] 22/24 23/21 | $\begin{array}{\|rr\|} \hline \text { disagree [4] } & 42 / 19 \\ 44 / 17 & 49 / 10 \end{array}$ |
| 40/9 40/24 41/4 42/2 45/20 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { decide [5] } & 25 / 23 & 33 / 13 & 33 / 17\end{array}$ | disagreement [3] 25/11 27/3 |
|  | 33/20 41/13 | 45/1 |
| couldn't [1] | decision [3] $25 / 7$ 45/5 45/8 | disclosures [2] 29/22 47/12 |
| counsel [15] 4/18 | decisions [2] 37/25 45/3 | discovery [14] 4/4 18/8 |
| $14 / 23 \quad 15 / 18 \quad 16 / 23 \quad 1$ | deck [2] 35/10 46/2 | 25/13 26/12 29/10 31/5 31/15 |
| $45 / 20$ 49/25 | declining [1] 14/8 | 31/20 32/12 36/21 37/18 |
| counter [1] | deemed [1] 3/7 | 42/22 44/11 47/14 |
| country [4] 4/21 9/22 11/7 | Defendant [4] 13/5 13/8 | discretion [1] 27/23 |
| country [4] 1/21 9/22 | 13/15 15/1 | discuss [1] 5/14 |
| country has [1] 21/11 | Defendant mapping [1] 15/1 | discussed [2] 6/4 |
| couple [3] 23/19 41/21 5 | DEFENDANTS [10] $2 / 110 / 3$ | discussing [3] 3/21 27/18 |
| course [5] 13/17 22/22 26/22 | 13/18 18/3 $24 / 4$ 34/7 46/10 | 33/4 |
| 28/4 32/2 | 46/19 47/12 50/10 | discussion [4] 7/18 10/11 |
| court [64] | Defense [6] 9/20 10/16 10/23 | 37/2 37/15 |
| Court's [8] 3/9 3/12 18/18 | 8/22 26/6 45/7 | discussions [9] 7/19 10/9 |
| 21/8 21/18 22/10 37/4 52/16 | deference [1] 42/15 | 18/14 $18 / 20$ 33/16 $33 / 21$ |
| courtroom [2] 3/15 49/11 | deficiencies [2] 15/16 15/20 <br> deficiencies will [1] 15/20 | Dismiss [5] 7/9 7/15 7/17 |
| Courts [2] 5/17 47/6 | deficiency [6] 13/6 15/8 | $42 / 23 \quad 52 / 20$ |
| covered [1] 50/7 | 15/12 15/22 16/7 37/10 | dismissal [5] 14/14 14/1 |
| CPFs [2] 32/17 33/1 | define [1] 50/24 | 15/5 37/10 46/9 |
| create [1] 38/20 | degree [1] 42/15 | dismissed [2] 13/10 14/1 |
| creates [1] 34/9 | delinquencies [2] 15/16 | dispositive [1] 47/14 |
| credit [1] 52/4 | 15/20 | dispute [2] 25/5 25/6 |
| criteria [1] $27 / 24$   <br> critical [3] $30 / 7$ $38 / 12$ $40 / 2$ | delinquency [4] 13/6 15/8 | disputes [1] 26/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { citical [3] } \\ & \text { rriosity [1] } \\ & \hline \text { 27/20 } \end{aligned}$ | 15/12 15/22 | distribution [1] 37/25 |
| curious <br> [1] <br> 42 | Delta [2] 3/6 3/13 | distributions [1] 38/1 |
| current [2] 11/23 48/11 | demographic [1] 21/1 | DISTRICT [6] 1/1 1/2 1/9 |
| currently [5] 9/20 10/4 10/8 | demographics [1] 30/22 | 20/16 21/4 46/23 |
| 18/24 19/3 | dense [1] 8/5 | diverse [1] 10/5 |
|  | depending [1] 37/24 | DIVISION [1] 1/2 |



| F | great [9] 22/16 $23 / 6$ 26/10 | him [2] 22/25 24/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Franklin [1] 22/25 | 40/8 42/9 48/18 49/14 50/3 | hips [1] 20/25 |
| frankly [1] 37/6 | greatly [1] 8/4 | $\begin{array}{lrrrr}\text { his [2] } & 25 / 3 & 26 / 6 & \\ \text { history } & {[2]} & 30 / 17 & 30 / 18\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { front [5] } 6 / 22 \quad 15 / 1 \quad 37 / 17 \\ & 40 / 1040 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | Grillo [3] 5/6 5/8 5/9 | hits [1] 33/6 |
| fruitful [1] 5/22 | groundwork [1] 43/7 | hold [1] 3/8 |
| Ft [1] 2/21 | growth [1] 6/23 | holds [1] 37/2 |
| further [8] 9/2 10/7 10/9 | guarantee [2] 20/18 22/4 | HON [1] 2/20 |
|  | Guerra [2] 1/18 2/11 | hone [1] 44/18 |
| future [4] 10/11 18/23 22/7 | guess [3] 25/8 43/20 51/8 | Honor [38] |
| 30/8 [4] 10/11 | guide [1] 21/11 | 12/20 17/9 17/12 17/1 |
|  | guy [2] 26/6 41/22 | 18/1 18/6 19/14 |
| G | guys [1] 40/4 | 24/3 27/7 27/19 32/15 |
| GA [2] | H | 0 37/13 |
| game [1] 35/8 | had | $\begin{array}{lllllll}45 / 22 & 46 / 1 & 47 / 2 & 47 / 23 & 47 / 25\end{array}$ |
| gap [1] 27/4 | 4/23 4/25 6/4 7/20 14/12 | 48/3 48/17 48/19 50/6 50/9 |
| gathering [1] 33/23 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 18 / 21 & 23 / 7 & 30 / 18 & 31 / 15 & 42 / 21\end{array}$ | Honor's [1] 41/18 |
| gave [2] $4 / 2152 / 15$ | 44/4 48/7 50/15 50/16 | HONORABLE [1] 1/8 |
| gen [2] 39/25 40/8 <br> general [7] 9/18 18/18 32 | hallmark [1] 44/14 | hope [3] $2 / 1112 / 20 \quad 38 / 14$ |
| $36 / 19 \quad 36 / 20 \quad 47 / 9 \quad 47 / 11$ | hand [1] 20/14 | hoped [1] 3/4 |
| generally [2] 19/22 37/1 | handling [2] 10 | hopeful [2] 15/19 15/25 |
| generate [2] 21/24 38/14 | happen [6] 22/22 30/11 31/1 | horizon [1] 9/ |
| get [37] 3/9 3/21 7/13 7/23 | 31/2 31/9 39/21 | host [1] 10 |
| 8/19 8/23 9/17 15/24 23/12 | happening [2] 5/23 51/15 | hour [3] 23/7 52/ |
| 23/18 25/14 25/21 26/1 28/11 | happy  <br> $48 / 5$ $48 / 16$ | Houston [1] 1/12 <br> how [35] 3/22 3/24 9/10 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 3 & 29 / 5 & 30 / 13 & 32 / 3 & 32 / 4\end{array}$ | hard [1] 17/5 | $13 / 21 \quad 16 / 6 \quad 16 / 6 \text { 16/7 } 16 / 11$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 20 & 33 / 4 & 36 / 4 & 36 / 12 & 36 / 15\end{array}$ | has [40] 3/4 5/7 5/21 5/22 | $\begin{array}{llll}16 / 14 & 24 / 10 & 24 / 24 & 25 / 21\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 15 & 37 / 3 & 37 / 9 & 37 / 21 & 38 / 5 \\ 39 / 12 & 39 / 18 & 40 / 10 & 42 / 19\end{array}$ | 5/24 7/18 7/19 10/7 11/15 | 26/16 26/24 27/1 29/18 30/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}39 / 12 & 39 / 18 & 40 / 10 & 42 / 19 \\ 42 / 24 & 44 / 6 & 44 / 25 & 52 / 17\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 17 & 12 / 6 & 12 / 14 & 12 / 25 & 13 / 23\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll}30 / 4 & 33 / 13 & 34 / 1 & 36 / 6 & 36 / 6\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}42 / 24 & 44 / 6\end{array} 4^{4 / 25} 52 / 17$ |  | 37/3 37/22 38/16 38/22 42/22 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { gets [5] 6/21 17/24 } & 26 / 10\end{array}$ | 15/23 17/4 19/9 20/16 $21 / 5$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 42 / 23 & 43 / 13 & 44 / 9 & 44 / 10 & 44 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 30/14 45/8 | 21/7 21/9 $21 / 11 \quad 22 / 16$ 23/5 | 45/5 49/22 51/22 |
| getting [15] 3/23 4/13 4/19 | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 23 / 6 & 29 / 5 & 32 / 9 & 35 / 1\end{array}$ |  |
| 23/3 26/17 $26 / 23$ 29/22 34/22 | $38 / 16 \quad 38 / 22 \quad 41 / 13 \quad 46 / 12$ | however [5] <br> 47/18 50/23 |
|  | $47 / 19 \quad 47 / 23$ | hurts [1] 5 |
| $44 / 22$ 51/24 | Hausman [1] 2/1 | HUYNH [5] 2/5 45/22 49/8 |
| giant [1] 37/12 | have [153] | $49 / 1150 / 6$ |
| give [6] 9/4 13/20 19/15 | having [11] 6/1 6/9 8/4 8/15 |  |
| 28/19 30/3 36/24 | $10 / 5 \quad 18 / 20 \quad 20 / 23 \quad 24 / 19 \quad 34 / 7$ | hybrid [3] 19/24 20/21 45/7 |
| given [3] 3/14 4/24 17/3 | 35/7 51/6 | hybrid of [1] 20/21 |
| gives [1] 34/24 |  |  |
| glad [2] 3/17 9/12 | head [1] 30/3 | I |
| go [18] 3/11 12/17 $22 / 2$ | headed [2] 9/25 23/1 |  |
| 23/11 $28 / 25$ 30/11 $31 / 14$ | health [1] 32/25 | $\text { I've [1] } 35 / 5$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 23 & 34 / 22 & 37 / 18 & 39 / 5 & 39 / 6\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { hear [10] } & 3 / 24 & 4 / 15 & 7 / 10\end{array}$ | ID [1] 21/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 40 / 7 & 41 / 3 & 42 / 2 & 42 / 22 & 44 / 24 \\ 52 / 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 9 / 12 & 10 / 11 & 25 / 6 & 42 / 6 & 42 / 25\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { idea [6] } & 3 / 10 & 5 / 15 & 22 / 8 & 31 / 1\end{array}$ |
| 52/5 | 52/18 52/20 | 31/16 51/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { goal [1] } & 19 / 18 & & \\ \text { goes [3] } & 28 / 14 & 30 / 13 & 45 / 6\end{array}$ | heard [7] 21/8 26/22 30/10 | identification [1] 13/ |
| goes [3] going [58] | 38/15 43/5 43/18 43/19 | identified [3] 13/25 21/22 |
| going [58] ${ }_{\text {gone [2] }}$ 23/3 52/11 | hearing [6] 7/15 17/20 25/8 | 31/22 |
| gone [2] $23 / 3$ 52/11 | 38/9 47/15 52/24 | identifiers [1] |
| good [39] 3/1 6/23 7/8 9/6 | hearings [3] 6/17 6/17 7/8 | identifying [1] 21/20 |
| 9/7 9/8 9/9 9/10 9/11 9/12 |  | ignore [1] 20/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 12 & 12 / 20 & 17 / 14 & 17 / 21 & 17 / 22\end{array}$ | help [10] 10/9 13/17 13/21 | $\text { IL [1] } 2 / 16$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 1 & 18 / 17 & 19 / 12 & 19 / 14 & 22 / 15 \\ 24 / 3 & 24 / 14 & 30 / 4 & 31 / 16 & 35 / 9\end{array}$ | 27/11 40/16 $45 / 5 \quad 45 / 7 \quad 45 / 10$ | Illinois [5] 46/4 4 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 3 & 24 / 14 & 30 / 4 & 31 / 16 & 35 / 9 \\ 37 / 2 & 41 / 7 & 41 / 9 & 41 / 23 & 42 / 10\end{array}$ | $48 / 1 \quad 51 / 24$ | $46 / 20 \quad 46 / 23 \quad 48 / 23$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 2 & 41 / 7 & 41 / 9 & 41 / 23 & 42 / 10 \\ 42 / 10 & 43 / 12 & 44 / 13 & 45 / 5 & 45 / 7\end{array}$ |  | illustrated [1] 19/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 10 & 43 / 12 & 44 / 13 & 45 / 5 & 45 / 7 \\ 45 / 22 & 45 / 25 & 52 / 12 & 52 / 12\end{array}$ | helpful [7] 3/21 12/16 | illustrated [1] $19 / 20$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}45 / 22 & 45 / 25 & 52 / 12 & 52 / 12 \\ \text { Gosh [1] } & 41 / 20\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccl}43 / 6 & 43 / 11 & 48 / 7 & 48 / 14\end{array}$ | imagine [1] 17/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Gosh [1] } & 41 / 20 \\ \text { got [4] } & 22 / 20 & 35 / 5 & 36 / 5\end{array}$ | $\text { her [1] } 7 / 16$ | immediately [3] 31/4 $36 / 19$ |
| got [4] $36 / 10$ | here [13] $3 / 5$ 3/9 3/15 $6 / 5$ | impediment [1] 39/ |
| $36 / 10$ grabbing [1] 51/19 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}16 / 12 & 17 / 12 & 18 / 4 & 19 / 15 & 43 / 10\end{array}$ | importance [2] 17/2 44/15 |
| grabbing [1] 51/19 Grand [1] 1/22 | 43/12 49/1 49/11 52/17 | important [15] 7/3 18/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Grand [1] } & 1 / 22 & & \\ \text { grateful [4] } & 5 / 3 & 5 / 20 & 6 / 12\end{array}$ | hesitant [1] 20/9 | 24/9 $24 / 14 \quad 24 / 16$ 24/21 $25 / 9$ |
| $\underset{\text { grateful [4] 5/3 }}{6 / 3} \mathbf{5 / 2 0} 6 / 12$ | hey [1] 36/23 | 28/9 32/17 $32 / 21$ 42/13 45/10 |
|  | hiccups [1] 16/17 | 45/14 49/13 50/17 |


| I | it's [7] $16 / 5$ 16/25 $29 / 1$ | $16 / 25 \text { 20/3 26/14 28/23 29/15 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in-person [1] 6/2 | $\begin{array}{ccccc}38 / 24 & 43 / 17 & 43 / 21 & 43 / 22 \\ \text { its [3] } & 16 / 2 & 16 / 17 & 18 / 11\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 29 / 20 & 32 / 12 & 36 / 22 & 36 / 25 \\ 37 / 23 & 37 / 23 & 38 / 2 & 38 / 19 \end{array} 39,$ |
| incentivizing [1] 21/8 | itself [1] 39/17 |  |
| include [4] 9/23 <br> $50 / 11 / 16$ $11 / 18$ | J | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 42 / 9 & 42 / 18 & 42 / 18 & 43 / 12 & 43 / 16\end{array}$ |
| included [1] 41/22 | Jamie [1] 7/13 | $44 / 1$ 45/2 48/12 49/4 49/11 49/21 49/22 50/13 50/14 |
| increasing [1] 28/12 | jaws [1] 44/3 | 50/17 50/19 51/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { incredible [1] } & 37 / 5 \\ \text { incredibly [1] } & 43 / 6\end{array}$ | jerrymander [1] 35/18 | knowing [1] 38/10 |
| indeed [1] 14/7 | job [5] 17/10 17/14 22/16 | knows [2] 9/18 40/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { indeed } \\ \text { indicated [5] } & 4 / 2 & 4 / 9 & 4 / 11\end{array}$ | 42/11 44/18 | KRAUSE [5] 1/21 1/21 48/19 |
| 39/10 40/2 | Joe [2] 17/12 22/25 | 50 |
| indicates [1] 13/11 | joint [2] 25/ <br> JOSEPH <br> [1] | L |
| $\begin{array}{lr}\text { individuals [1] } & \text { 9/21 } \\ \text { inevitably [1] } & 30 / 13\end{array}$ | judge [26] $1 / 9$ 5/1 5/1 5/2 | lack [2] 14/2 46/10 |
| infancy <br> [1] <br> 49/7 | 5/4 5/6 5/6 5/8 5/9 6/22 | large [2] 28/6 29/1 |
| inform [2] 12/1 19/20 | 20/15 $22 / 19$ 25/18 $28 / 1145 / 16$ | largely [5] 25/9 25/25 26/9 |
| informal [2] 14/5 15/21 | 46/22 $46 / 23$ 47/18 $49 / 449 / 4$ | 29/2 30/21 |
| informally [1] 14/3 | $50 / 2252 / 2$ | $3 \text { 15/10 22/22 35/5 } 46$ |
| information [25] 4/20 4/22 | judges [16] 4/21 4/25 5/9 | 46/7 $46 / 12$ 48/7 48/14 50/12 |
| 5/18 9/18 13/11 26/2 27/11 | 5/19 5/25 47/24 48/1 48/2 | $52 / 7$ / |
| $\begin{array}{llll}27 / 16 & 28 / 10 & 28 / 14 & 29 / 18 \\ 30 / 20 & 32 / 16 & 32 / 18 & 32 / 24\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 48 / 15 & 49 / 12 & 49 / 16 & 49 / 18\end{array}$ | lastly [3] 8/15 45/19 49/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 20 & 32 / 16 & 32 / 18 & 32 / 24 \\ 32 / 25 & 33 / 1 & 33 / 8 & 36 / 9 & 40\end{array}$ | 51/20 51/21 51/25 52/6 | later [5] 4/10 4/11 10/12 |
| $44 / 7$ 47/23 47/25 51/16 | judges to [1] 48/1 | 33/8 39/21 |
| informative [1] 52/15 | judgment [4] 4/5 18/9 42 | latest [1] 7/9 |
| informed [1] 43/8 | JULIA [2] 2/15 18/1 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { lawyers [7] } & 5 / 16 & 39 / 1\end{array}$ |
| Ingelheim [1] 24/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { July [6] } & 3 / 3 & 15 / 15 & 15 / 15\end{array}$ | 48/24 48/25 49/2 51/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { initial [5] } 14 / 2 \text { 14/11 19/20 } \\ & 29 / 2230 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | 18/15 46/2 47/10 | laying [1] 43/7 |
| injuries [2] 20/11 | July 26th [1] 15/ | LDC [13] 6/3 6/6 6/11 6/14 |
| injury [4] 9/24 10 | July 28th [1] 3/3 | 7/1 8/15 8/17 19/15 36/13 |
| 32/18 | June [1] 18/6 | 39/25 40/8 41/11 45/23 |
| input [2] 7/22 42/24 | jurisdictions [4] 46/7 46/19 | LDCs [1] 42/1 |
| inside [1] 40/18 | 47/7 49/22 | lead [5] 6/13 6/18 7/7 14/23 |
| instances [1] 43/23 | jurisdictions with [1] 46/19 just [43] 3/16 5/13 6/18 | $16 / 22$ leadership [2] |
| instead [1] 46/11 | $6 / 196 / 23 \quad 7 / 5 \quad 8 / 13 \quad 9 / 17$ | $\text { leads [1] } 41 / 10$ |
| instructions [2] 12/5 41/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 18 & 14 / 3 & 14 / 13 & 15 / 15 & 16 / 13\end{array}$ | learn [2] 5/12 16/20 |
| instrumental [1] 6/14 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 10 / 19 & 24 / 19 & 25 / 5 & 25 / 17 & 27 / 20\end{array}$ | learned [2] 37/7 49/5 |
| integral [1] 3/22 <br> intend [1] 5/8 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 28/24 } & 29 / 21 & 29 / 24 & 31 / 25\end{array}$ | least [7] 3/7 4/16 8/23 14/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { intended [3] } & 4 / 11 & 16 / 16 & 17 / 2\end{array}$ | 32/15 33/11 35/16 35/25 | 16/19 45/8 46/13 |
| intensive [3] 16/25 36/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}38 / 10 & 40 / 11 & 41 / 6 & 42 / 11 & 44 / 14\end{array}$ | least five [1] 46/13 |
| 43/22 [3] 16/25 36/21 | 44/24 45/2 45/7 46/24 46/25 | led [3] 5/24 21/9 23/5 |
| on [1] 3/9 | 49/6 49/8 49/14 49/20 51/12 | left [1] 31/6 |
| [1] 3/9 | 51/13 52/2 | let [10] 3/25 7/6 9/2 31/25 |
| interest [4] 16/11 38/11 | K | 35/21 38/24 39/19 $44 / 1$ 50/17 |
| 39/24 51/21 | Kansas [1] | let's [3] 31/7 36/24 |
| interesting [2] 3/19 16/5 | Kaye [1] 2/5 | let's save [1] 36/24 |
| interplays [1] 44/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { keep [5] } & 12 / 16 & 25 / 1 & 27 / 18\end{array}$ | letting [1] 39/25 |
| interrogatories [1] 44/8 intricacies [1] 16/13 | 48/11 49/24 | level [5] 38/13 38/24 38/25 |
| intricacies [1] 16/13 | keeping [2] 35/9 52/4 | 39/9 43/9 |
| introduce [3] 5/10 $51 / 13$ | Kelly [1] 5/2 | levels [1] 42/1 |
| introducing [1] 18/2 | kept [1] 35/1 | leverage [1] 20/ |
| investment [1] 42/12 | kill [2] 31/10 31/12 | Lexitas [4] 10/14 10/18 |
| involved [2] 12/25 41/10 | $\text { kind [13] 5/18 } 10 / 18 \text { 23/23 }$ | $10 / 2411 / 2$ |
| iron [1] $8 / 9$ is [237] | 25/10 $25 / 12$ 25/20 $27 / 5 \quad 28 / 5$ | LIABILITY [1] 1/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { is [237] } \\ \text { issue [9] } & 4 / 9 & 4 / 11 & 12 / 6\end{array}$ | 29/16 30/17 36/14 39/14 | liaisons [1] 48/21 |
|  | 44/21 | lifestyle [1] 32/24 |
| $12 / 10$ $36 / 6$ | kinds [1] 41/9 | light [2] 3/5 27/5 |
| issues [18] 4/8 4/10 15/24 | King [2] 2/8 2/15 | like [19] 6/17 7/7 10/13 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { 19/5 } & 19 / 8 & 20 / 3 & 21 / 21 & 24 / 8\end{array}$ | Kinsman [1] 1/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 1 & 12 / 23 & 20 / 24 & 21 / 21 & 21 / 23\end{array}$ |
| 25/5 25/21 26/16 27/8 27/9 | Kirkland [2] 26/9 35/19 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 25 / 12 & 27 / 13 & 28 / 24 & 29 / 6 & 32 / 24\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 7 / 19 & 32 / 19 & 33 / 3 & 33 / 9 & 34 / 19\end{array}$ | knew [1] 29/11 | 34/20 35/10 40/4 42/3 45/11 |
| it [135] | know $[45]$ $3 / 16$ $3 / 19$ $6 / 3$ $7 / 6$ <br> $8 / 4$ $8 / 5$ $11 / 14$ $13 / 15$ $13 / 21$  | likelihood [1] 51/3 |



| M | 28/20 29/1 $31 / 6$ 34/6 34/17 | $5 / 17 \quad 8 / 20 \quad 15 / 7 \quad 19 / 23 \quad 20 / 13$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| much... [15] 15/2 15/11 | $\begin{array}{ccccc}36 / 18 & 37 / 16 & 38 / 11 & 46 / 6 & \\ \text { numbers } & {[7]} & 10 / 18 & 11 / 8 & 12 / 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 24 / 17 & 25 / 14 & 27 / 22 & 32 / 23 \\ 32 / 25 & 33 / 8 & 34 / 2 & 38 / 18 & 38 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 15 & 23 / 25 & 26 / 24 & 27 / 1 & 28 / 2\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { numbers } \\ 12 / 18 & 38 / 6 & 50 / 13 & 50 / 17\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 42 / 1 & 44 / 21 & 44 / 25 & 45 / 13 & 46 / 16\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 29 / 18 & 30 / 3 & 30 / 9 & 36 / 6 \\ 39 / 4 & 30 / 3 & 52 / 11 \end{array}$ | NW [1] $2 / 2$ | 52/6 |
| multiple [2] | NY [1] $2 / 6$ | others [7] 6/13 12/23 18/22 |
| must [1] 20/11 | 0 |  |
| my [12] 5/20 9/13 $12 / 25$ 16/1 | O'clock [2] 7/14 23/14 | our [23] 3/2 3/3 6/3 7/12 |
| 17/10 29/5 39/11 $42 / 11$ 43/14 | objective [1] 27/24 | $7 / 13 \quad 8 / 12 \quad 9 / 2 \quad 9 / 16 \quad 13 / 22$ |
| 44/21 48/15 51/11 | observing [1] 52/16 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 20 / 10 & 32 / 21 & 33 / 4 & 34 / 5 & 38 / 13\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { myriad [1] } & 23 / 5 \\ \text { myself [3] } & 5 / 10 & 5 / 20\end{array}$ | obsolete [1] 43/17 |  |
| myself [3] 5/10 5/20 | obviously [6] 10/12 19/1 | 49/1 51/5 52/9 52/18 |
| N | 24/9 24/12 41/7 41/14 | ours [1] 48 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { name [3] } 17 / 23 & 17 / 24 & 45 / 21 \\ \text { names [1] } 47 / 23\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rrrrr}\text { October [7] } & 7 / 7 & 7 / 14 & 18 / 16 \\ 23 / 18 & 25 / 4 & 42 / 7 & 43 / 8 & \end{array}$ | out [40] 3/16 4/25 5/8 5/20 <br> 7/11 8/9 8/23 11/21 12/7 |
| narrow [4] $13 / 18$ 19/22 | October 4th [1] 7/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 3 & 14 / 5 & 14 / 11 & 14 / 21 & 15 / 12\end{array}$ |
| nat/20 [4] | odd [1] 38/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 14 & 15 / 17 & 15 / 18 & 19 / 25 & 22 / 3\end{array}$ |
|  | off [8] 27/6 30/13 31/8 | 26/14 $26 / 19$ 27/14 $27 / 20$ |
|  | 31/10 31/12 $37 / 16$ 38/6 48/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 14 & 30 / 16 & 31 / 24 & 33 / 12\end{array}$ |
| nation [1] 10/6 | Official [2] 2/20 53/5 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}33 / 14 & 34 / 8 & 34 / 11 & 35 / 2 & 35 / 9\end{array}$ |
| nationwide [1] 5/23 nature [4] 7/12 30/ | often [2] 16/6 20/1 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 36 / 1 & 39 / 18 & 39 / 18 & 40 / 18 & 43 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 51/5 | oh [1] 39/1 | 45/10 49/13 52/17 |
| NE [1] | Okay [9] 9/12 17/14 | outliers [5] 20/6 22/3 26/11 |
| near [2] 14/22 15/4 | /8 27/20 41/19 | outlined [3] 13/6 14/15 15/8 |
| necessarily $51 / 8$ | old [8] 30/23 30/24 34/6 | outset [1] 18/5 |
| need [17] $8 / 18$ 10/5 11/21 | 40/4 40/11 40/16 41/22 43/16 once [4] 33/20 $36 / 4 \quad 39 / 15$ | outside [1] 15/24 <br> outstanding [4] 14/12 14/19 |
| 23/11 24/8 27/1 27/14 30/11 | $52 / 18$ | $15 / 17 \quad 15 / 20$ |
| $42 / 25 \quad 44 / 7 \quad 45 / 9 \quad 45 / 11$ | one [25] 6/1 9/16 11/12 14/1 | over [12] 9/20 9/22 12/1 |
| needs [1] 39/20 | 19/4 19/10 22/21 24/15 27/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 14 & 19 / 10 & 22 / 21 & 34 / 10\end{array}$ |
| negative [1] | 28/4 32/5 33/3 33/9 34/6 | 37/10 37/11 37/11 52/11 |
| neglected [1] 17/22 | $34 / 17$ 38/11 39/13 39/19 | $52 / 11$ |
| net [1] 16/13 | 41/13 $46 / 15$ 50/14 50/21 | over-the-counter [1] 13/1 |
| never [4] 36/2 50/22 5 | 50/22 51/6 51/10 | overall [2] 22/8 24/25 |
| 52/1 | ones [4] 4/16 35/9 35/9 | overdue [1] 38/25 |
| new [10] $2 / 6$ 5/2 9/10 $16 / 19$ | 49/23 | overtures [1] 5/20 |
| 16/20 46/4 46/5 46/18 48/23 | ongoing [2] | own [1] 50 |
| 49/17 | only [6] 9/13 14/18 $20 / 14 \text { 27/7 38/9 }$ | P |
| newly [1] 47/25 | open [3] 33/15 33/21 51 | P.C [1] 1/14 |
| next [10] 8/12 11/13 12/11 | opening [1] 47/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { pages [3] } & 43 / 21 & 44 / 3 & 44 / 5\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 6 & 16 / 21 & 23 / 13 & 23 / 14 & 39 / 25 \\ 40 / 8 & 52 / 17 & & & \end{array}$ | operate [1] 16/14 |  |
| 40/8 52/17 | operating [1] 16/15 | PALM [3] 1/2 1/5 2/21 |
| nice [1] 18/3 | opinion [1] 39/21 | pandemic [2] 3/6 8/ |
| nine [2] 18/12 26/22 | opportunities [1] 47/5 | part [12] 3/22 6/19 7/3 |
| no [10] 1/3 11/18 17/9 17/14 |  | 10/15 12/10 12/25 18/23 |
| 19/5 20/17 35/18 36/3 43/13 | 18/21 | 24/20 33/4 33/23 42/14 46 |
| 45/13 |  | participants [4] 9/14 20/3 |
| non [2] 10/5 44/7 | opt [1] 20/21 | $21 / 17 \quad 21 / 25$ |
| non-diverse [1] 10/5 | optimism [1] 25/3 | participate [1] 40 |
| non-MDL [1] 44/7 | optimistic [3] 27/18 38/ | participating [2] 21/7 38 |
| Northern [1] 21/4 | -41/12 | participation [1] 21/9 |
| note [5] 6/1 6/11 46/8 48/12 | order [22] 4/1 4/6 4/9 4/11 | particular [3] 24/17 30/1 |
| 49/14 | 4/14 7/5 8/23 14/14 20/20 | 34/15 |
|  | 22/20 23/18 23/19 26/8 26/21 | particularly [2] 39/3 49/17 |
| $50 / 10$ | 31/18 $32 / 7$ 34/12 $34 / 15$ 36/7 | parties [17] 4/6 12/7 12/11 |
| notice [2] 5/3 12/3 | 37/4 41/15 42/8 | 13/20 15/23 18/7 18/13 18/19 |
| notices [3] 15/13 15/14 | ordered [3] 36/12 36/15 | 18/24 19/21 19/23 20/1 20/9 |
| 15/17 | 36/16 | 22/9 26/2 34/4 44/24 |
| notified [1] 50/1 | ordering [3] 9/24 11/3 28/21 | parties' [1] 20/2 |
| now [12] 3/14 5/6 7/23 15/9 | orders [4] 10/21 37/6 42/22 | parts [1] 24/7 |
| 24/21 $28 / 2$ 34/16 $34 / 23$ 36/4 | 52/17 | party [2] 20/8 20/21 |
| 43/13 44/6 46/11 | ordinary [1] 29/25 | past [5] 4/19 15/14 32/4 |
| number [17] 3/19 4/25 6/11 | organize [2] 6/6 8/16 | 37/6 37/7 |
| 9/19 21/23 25/22 28/6 28/11 | Originally $[1]$ $36 / 10$  <br> other [23] $4 / 20$ $4 / 21$ $5 / 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pauline [4] } 2 / 20 \text { 3/16 8/6 } \\ & 53 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |


| P | plan [17] 3/5 14/21 15/3 | ably [5] 34/17 48/1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pay [1] 39/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 16 & 18 / 25 & 27 / 16 & 27 / 21 & 33 / 4\end{array}$ | 49/5 51/3 52/ |
| pdf [1] 12/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}40 / 24 & 41 / 13 & 42 / 7 & 43 / 4 & 45 / 6\end{array}$ | problem [1] $12 / 6$ <br> problematic [1] 20/17  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { pdf's [1] } & 11 / 20 \\ \text { Peachtree } & \text { [2] } & 1 / 15 & 2 / 9\end{array}$ | plans [1] 41/9 | problematic ${ }^{\text {problems [1] 32/23 }}$ |
| Peachtree [2] $1 / 15$ <br> pediatric [1] $30 / 25$ | play [1] 39/17 | proceed [1] 49/3 |
| pediatric [1] 30/15 | played [1] 7/2 | proceeding [2] 6/22 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { pending [6] } & 46 / 3 & 46 / 11 & 46 / 21\end{array}$ | playing [4] 6/15 6/16 7/2 | proceedings [2] |
| 46/22 47/1 47/17 | 35/8 [1] 6/25 | process [50] 3/25 9/24 9/25 |
| Pennsylvania [5] 46/16 46/17 | eased [1] 6/25 | $\begin{array}{llllllllllll} \\ 10 / 10 & 10 / 22 & 11 / 19 & 13 / 6 & 13 / 17\end{array}$ |
| 46/18 46/24 48/23 | PLLC [1] 1/11 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}13 / 23 & 15 / 1 & 15 / 7 & 15 / 8 & 15 / 11\end{array}$ |
| people [11] 34/8 34/11 34/21 | plus [8] 10/8 13/9 13/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 18 & 15 / 21 & 15 / 23 & 16 / 7 & 16 / 19\end{array}$ |
| 36/2 36/13 37/9 38/17 38/19 | 13/24 14/9 43/21 43/25 44/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 20 & 18 / 14 & 18 / 16 & 18 / 25\end{array}$ |
| 38/21 40/11 52/5 | point [11] 16/8 16/10 17/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 18 & 21 / 13 & 22 / 3 & 24 / 15 & 25 / 10\end{array}$ |
| per [1] 11/21 | 28/9 29/19 29/19 29/20 38/19 | 25/25 27/21 28/14 28/20 29/8 |
| percent [7] 22/1 28/8 28/8 | 38/23 41/14 52/8 | 29/25 30/9 $30 / 10$ 31/5 $31 / 8$ |
| 28/8 28/8 35/22 38/18 | points [1] 23/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 15 & 33 / 5 & 33 / 23 & 36 / 8 & 36 / 16\end{array}$ |
| percentage [3] 28/7 33/17 | poker [1] 35/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 23 & 37 / 9 & 37 / 10 & 38 / 20 & 38 / 22\end{array}$ |
| 33/21 | [20] 18/25 19/4 19/11 | 39/2 39/20 40/25 |
| perfect [1] 50/23 | 19/17 20/15 20/19 21/16 22/4 | process is [1] |
| perfectly [1] 7/25 | 24/9 24/10 24/20 27/13 29/24 | processed [1] 11/18 |
| perhaps [1] 8/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 33 / 17 & 33 / 17 & 33 / 18 & 33 / 18 \end{array}$ $33 / 20 \quad 37 / 20 \quad 41 / 2$ | processes [3] 10/14 13/4 |
| periods [2] 24/24 2 |  |  |
| permission [1] 22/10 | pools [3] 19/23 20/22 20/25 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { product [7] } & 13 / 5 & 13 / 11 & 13 / 16\end{array}$ |
| person [14] 3/5 3/9 3/11 $6 / 2$ | Pope [1] 1/14 | 14/2 15/2 32/18 46/10 |
| 6/3 6/5 6/6 6/7 6/10 8/2 8/4 8/7 8/16 22/17 | populated [1] 21/1 | production [4] 9/25 |
| 8/7 8/16 22/17 | Porter [1] 2/5 | 11/6 44/8 |
| personalities [1] | position [1] | productive [2] 5/1 13/23 |
| persons [1] 19/19 | possibility [1] 47/2 | products [3] 1/5 13/19 $24 / 17$ |
| PETROSINELLI [11] 2/1 17/6 | possible [1] 20/12 | professional |
| 17/12 18/22 23/8 25/19 26/12 | post [1] 18/10 | program [3] 10/1 11/6 21/22 |
| 31/7 31/15 36/23 41/10 | postponing [1] 6/8 | progress [3] 19/7 23/7 44 |
| Petrosinelli had [1] | potential [4] 19/11 25/11 | proof [6] 9/24 9/24 10/20 |
| Petrosinelli's [1] 17/10 | /24 32/5 | $10 / 20$ 24/16 24/1 |
| Pfizer [3] 12/21 13/13 13/15 | potentially [1] | proper [2] 5/15 |
| pharmacies [1] 33/1 | pound [2] 26/5 26/13 | proposal [3] 25/4 33/1 |
| phone [1] 25/20 | power [1] 51/18 |  |
| physical [1] 21/3 | power [1] 51/18 <br> PowerPoint [1] 48 | proposals [2] 18/20 25/4 <br> propose [2] 41/16 41/17 |
| pick [2] 26/5 26/6 | pre [2] 4/9 4/14 | proposed [5] 4/8 18/10 22/20 |
| picking [2] 19/4 35/15 | pre-trial [2] 4/9 4/14 | 29/8 34/13 |
| picks [1] 41/4 | prejudge [1] 42/5 | pros [2] 19/25 20/20 |
| ```picture [4] 18/24 19/7 23/24 35/4``` | preparation [1] 52/15 | protection [2] 34/24 35/1 |
|  | prepared [1] 41/3 | proud [1] 12/24 |
| Pierce [1] | prescription [3] 10/1 11/7 | prove [1] 10/ |
| place [2] 36/18 44/ | 36/14 | provide [9] 12/3 13/1 $27 / 15$ |
|  | present [3] 25/3 34/15 45/21 | 33/2 33/8 33/22 36/9 40/18 |
| places [1] 41 | presentation [7] 7/21 8/10 | 47/25 |
| Plaintiff [17] | 9/4 9/13 24/13 24/13 50/11 | provided [8] 10/14 14 |
| 26/5 26/25 27/1 28/13 28/17 | presentation by [1] 24/13 | 14/21 15/9 18/11 $24 / 11$ 48/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 10 & 29 / 11 & 29 / 16 & 30 / 14\end{array}$ | presentations [1] 16/10 | 48/13 |
| 30/23 32/14 36/1 36/9 36/9 | presented [1] 17/7 | provided its [1] 18/1 |
| $37 / 1$ | presenters [1] 9/3 | provider [2] 10/15 10/19 |
| Plaintiff's [3] | presenting [5] 7/3 12/23 | providers [1] 33/1 |
| 31/8 | 17/19 44/22 52/15 | provides [1] 9/19 |
| PLAINTIFFS [34] 1/10 9/19 | presumption [1] 34/21 | providing [3] 4/19 10/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 16 & 10 / 23 & 13 / 25 & 15 / 3 & 15 / 4\end{array}$ | pretrial [7] 4/6 14/14 18/6 | 28/13 |
| 19/15 20/22 21/9 21/11 $27 / 12$ | 25/13 25/14 $41 / 15$ 42/8 | prudent [2] 3/7 48/10 |
| 28/20 29/15 30/22 33/7 33/16 | pretty [5] 22/18 23/24 28/2 | PTO [5] 3/25 13/7 15/5 15/8 |
| 33/21 34/7 35/8 35/20 37/20 | $30 / 4$ 38/5 | 18/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllll} & 41 / 17 & 45 / 6 & 46 / 6 & 46 / 13 & 46 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { previous [2] } \\ \text { previously } & \text { 4/23 } & 42 / 22 \\ 20 / 16\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}46 / 16 & 46 / 20 & 46 / 25 & 47 / 12\end{array}$ | primarily [1] 43/20 | $\text { pull [6] } 3 / 25 \text { 7/11 }$ |
| 48/20 48/25 50/5 | primary <br> [1] 52/4 | $22 / 3 \quad 31 / 24 \quad 36 / 24$ |
|  | principal [1] 19/17 <br> prior [5] 31/2 32/16 32/22 <br> 36/7 40/22 | ```pulls [1] 11/10 purpose [4] 13/17 24/5 36/3 39/8``` |


| P | receiving [1] 11/23 | requiring [1] 38/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| purposes [5] 3/7 8/19 10/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recent [3] } 4 / 16 \text { 7/8 } 15 / 14 \\ & \text { recently [1] } 46 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { residents [1] } & 33 / 18 \\ \text { resolution [1] } & 20 / 10 \end{array}$ |
| pursuant [5] 4/13 $14 / 14$ 15/5 | recognize [1] 50/18 | resolve [1] 12/12 |
| pursuant $32 / 8$ [5] $4 / 1314 / 1415 / 5$ | reconstruct [1] $26 / 21$ | resolved [4] 15/20 15/24 |
| push [1] 34/14 | record [13] 8/24 9/23 10/13 <br> 10/21 10/24 11/9 11/10 11/18 | $24 / 8 \quad 27 / 9$ <br> resource |
| pushed [1] 23/6 | $17 / 25 \quad 30 / 1 \quad 30 / 14 \quad 45 / 21 \quad 53 / 2$ | resourc $43 / 22$ |
| put [2] 17/4 35/5 | records [27] 9/24 10/1 10/1 | resources [14] 5/15 13/22 |
| $\left.\begin{array}{lllll}\text { putting } \\ 42 / 13\end{array}\right] \quad 35 / 9 \quad 38 / 12 \quad 39 / 4$ | 10/19 $10 / 22$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 26 / 15 & 31 / 3 & 31 / 14 & 32 / 3 & 32 / 6\end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 7 & 11 / 15 & 12 / 2 & 12 / 4 & 12 / 5\end{array}$ | 32/12 34/9 36/1 36/6 36/24 |
| Q | 12/7 12/8 12/9 28/21 28/24 | 37/5 40/6 |
| qualify [1] 21/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 19 & 31 / 19 & 32 / 5 & 32 / 7 & 32 / 9 \\ 33 / 24 & 36 / 12 & 36 / 14 & 36 / 16\end{array}$ | respect [3] 8/17 30/10 52/19 |
| quarrel [1] 50/25 | refined [1] 18/16 | respective [2] 14/4 14 <br> respectively [1] 47/13 |
| question [3] 16/5 28/25 32/16 | reflected [1] 24/12 | respects [3] 16/15 25/ |
| questions [13] 5/11 5/21 | reflects [1] 42/1 | 44/21 [1] |
| 12/14 16/3 16/9 17/15 19/9 | regard [2] 19/5 45/11 | responded [1] 11/22 |
| 42/17 $42 / 18 \quad 43 / 10 \quad 45 / 13$ 48/4 | regarding [1] 18/14 | responses [1] 23/4 |
| 51/14 | registrants [1] 10/2 | responsive [1] 14/17 |
| questions about [1] 19/9 | registry [35] 3/21 9/5 9/16 | rest [1] 39 |
| quicker [1] 39/21 | 9/18 9/19 9/21 10/8 10/17 | result [5] 4/24 16/13 29/20 |
| quickly [2] 37/3 39/5 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}11 / 1 & 13 / 1 & 13 / 4 & 16 / 1 & 16 / 11\end{array}$ | 38/17 45/3 |
| quit [1] 26/14 | 16/19 21/10 21/15 21/16 | resulting [1] |
| quite [3] 13/23 14/5 29/21 | 29/20 29/25 30/6 30/11 30/21 | results [3] 17/2 19/20 2 |
| R | 35/6 35/12 35/13 38/16 39/3 | 11/16 12/2 |
| random [7] 19/11 19/23 | 43/24 46/14 46/17 | retailers [7] 9/25 10 |
| 20/17 20/20 20/21 21/5 | regrets [1] 6/1 | 11/5 11/7 11/10 11/14 11/22 |
| randomization [6] 27/11 | regrettably [1] 6/7 | retrieval [4] 9/23 10/13 |
| 27/12 28/4 32/22 33/7 37/18 | relate [1] 25/12 | 6/8 30 |
| randomize [1] 33/7 | related [1] 19/ | review [2] |
| randomized [1] 41/4 | relates [2] 11/5 13/4 | reviewed [2] 13/24 15/2 |
| randomizer [7] 21/22 25/25 | relating [4] 3/12 4/4 4/20 | reviewing [2] 11/19 13/9 |
| 28/7 35/19 35/21 37/20 39/13 | 18/8 | Richmond [1] |
| randomizer that [1] 35/19 | relationship [1] 5/1 | rid [3] 26/10 29 |
| randomly [2] 21/1 21/24 | relatively [2] 16/19 16/20 | right [14] 3/1 16/10 17/18 |
| RANITIDINE [2] $1 / 413 / 19$ | relevant [2] 3/20 21/18 | 25/19 27/5 27/14 28/2 30 |
| rarely [1] 39/8 | rely [2] 20/9 22/6 | 31/10 31/12 34/23 43/10 |
| rather [2] 21/14 39/21 | remain [6] 14/19 15/16 38/4 | 43/13 50/8 |
| RE [1] 1/4 | 41/12 47/1 52/23 | risk [1] 3/14 |
| reach [5] 5/8 | remaining [2] 15/4 22/12 | Road [2] 1/15 2/1 |
| 14/11 14/21 | remanded [1] 46/24 | Robert [1] 47/18 |
| reached [5] 4/8 4/25 14/3 | remarks [1] 47/22 | ROBIN [2] 1/8 2/20 |
| 18/8 48/15 | remember [2] 3/3 50/15 | robust [1] 21/10 |
| reaching [3] 15/18 | remote [1] 3/17 | role [5] 6/14 6/15 7/1 $12 / 25$ |
| 49/13 | remotely [1] 3/8 | 43/14 |
| ready [4] $37 / 3$ 37/18 $39 / 1$ | removed [2] 46/9 46/19 | roles [1] 29 |
| $52 / 8$ [4] | report [5] 15/15 18/19 48/22 | rolling [1] 11/24 |
| realize [4] 23/9 26/13 44/17 | 48/25 49/20 | Roosevelt [1] 23/1 |
| 51/4 | Reporter [3] 2/20 53/5 53/6 | ROSENBERG [3] 1/3 1/8 $2 / 20$ |
| really [18] 5/13 5/18 5/22 | reports [1] 17/21 | round [4] 4/22 7/9 11/13 |
| 6/23 13/3 14/5 16/22 28/9 | represent [5] 12/21 20/19 | 15/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 15 & 37 / 2 & 39 / 23 & 43 / 6 & 44 / 14\end{array}$ | 20/24 21/16 45/23 | rounds [1] 15/12 |
| 44/17 45/10 51/25 52/1 52/2 | representation [1] 35/11 | ruins [1] 38/20 |
| reason [9] $3 / 11$ 23/17 $28 / 3$ | representative [7] 19/19 | rule [1] 37/19 |
| 29/2 30/8 34/23 35/6 35/11 | 20/12 20/15 22/5 29/7 29/11 | rules [2] 36/18 36/20 |
| 43/24 | 35/24 | ruling [3] 18/18 33/6 41/ |
| reasonable [2] | representativeness [1] 20/4 | rulings [4] 18/13 28/22 |
| reasons [1] 29/17 | representing [2] 9/21 48/25 | 31/23 40/22 |
| reassigned [1] 5/7 | request [4] 11/9 11/24 44/8 | runner [3] 26/5 26/13 31/11 |
| reassignment [1] 5/4 | requesting [5] 11/12 13/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { running [1] } 48 / 9 \\ & \text { runs [1] } 22 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { receive [3] } & 10 / 24 & 11 / 24 & 43 / 8\end{array}$ | $14 / 12 \quad 14 / 16 \quad 14 / 19$ | S |
| received [5] 7/22 11/15 | $\begin{array}{lll} 11 / 13 & 11 / 23 & 12 / 8 \end{array}$ | safe [1] 52/23 |
| $\begin{array}{ccc}\text { 11/17 } & 15 / 15 & 52 / 1 \\ \text { receives [1] } & 12 / 9\end{array}$ | required [3] 18/13 $33 / 22$ | said [15] 6/18 25/19 26 |
| receives [1] 12/9 | 40/5 | 26/23 27/5 28/15 30/16 32/4 |


| S | 34/16 $34 / 18$ 47/1 47/16 53/4 | sold [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { said... [7] } & 33 / 11 & 36 / 23\end{array}$ | September 10th [1] $11 / 17$ <br> September 13th [1] $47 / 1$ | $\begin{array}{\|lrlll} \text { sole [1] } & 27 / 22 & & \\ \text { some [35] } & 8 / 25 & 9 / 18 & 11 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| 37/23 38/22 41/15 49/8 52/1 | $\begin{array}{lr}\text { September 13th [1] } & 47 / 1 \\ \text { September two [1] } & 34 / 18\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lllll} \text { some } & {[35]} & 8 / 25 & 9 / 18 & 11 / 8 \\ 12 / 7 & 23 / 20 & 24 / 8 & 24 / 24 & 26 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| same [9] l | sequence [1] 37/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 12 & 29 / 19 & 31 / 24 & 32 / 9 & 33 / 16\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 29 / 21 & 30 / 18 & 30 / 24 & 37 / 5 & 49 / 2 \\ 50 / 10 \end{array}$ | sequenced [1] 34/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 8 & 35 / 22 & 36 / 13 & 36 / 24 & 37 / 21\end{array}$ |
| mpling [3] 21/6 | sequencing [4] 24/10 24/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 13 & 38 / 17 & 38 / 24 & 38 / 25 & 39 / 9\end{array}$ |
| an [2] 1/19 2/13 | 27/9 34/3 | 39/14 40/23 43/18 43/19 |
| sandbagging [1] 34/25 | series [2] 26/2 28/12 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 43 / 21 & 45 / 7 & 49 / 7 & 49 / 14 & 49 / 15\end{array}$ |
| Sanofi [1] 45/23 | served [1] | 49/18 49/25 52 |
| Sarah [1] 46/23 | serves [1] 36/3 <br> service [2] 10/15 10/18 | somebody [5] 30/13 30/16 $32 / 6 \quad 35 / 1 \quad 36 / 25$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { save [2] } & 36 / 7 & 36 / \\ \text { saved [1] } & 35 / 25\end{array}$ | set [7] 11/2 28/7 28/12 | something [8] 6/7 7/19 8/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { saved [1] } & 35 / 25 \\ \text { saves [1] } & 29 / 14 \end{array}$ | 28/19 29/23 32/13 47/15 | 23/1 28/16 32/4 34/3 37/15 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { say [28] } & 8 / 20 & 15 / 22 & 23 / 20\end{array}$ | setting [1] 4/12 | sometime [1] |
| 23/21 23/21 23/21 31/8 32/6 | settlement [2] 10/11 20 | Sometimes [1] 44/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 8 & 33 / 7 & 33 / 10 & 36 / 13 & 37 / 16\end{array}$ | [2] 25/23 46/8 | somewhat [2] 39/24 39/24 |
| 37/20 38/3 38/13 39/8 39/19 | several [3] 15/9 15/12 | somewhere [1] |
| 40/20 $42 / 9$ 42/17 $43 / 1$ 43/12 | g [1] 7/8 | soon [3] $33 / 6 \quad 37 / 18$ 4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 43 / 13 & 43 / 17 & 43 / 22 & 44 / 18\end{array}$ | share [2] 25/3 5 <br> sharing [1] 5/18 | $\begin{array}{\|lrll} \text { sorry [3] } & 3 / 15 & 28 / 1 & 41 / 23 \\ \text { sort [8] } & 25 / 13 & 38 / 14 & 38 / 20 \end{array}$ |
| 51/25 [2] 8/6 27/16 | she [4] 17/24 22/17 $23 / 6$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 24 & 39 / 22 ~ 43 / 20 ~ 48 / 9 ~ 51 / 10 ~\end{array}$ |
| saying [2] 8/6 27/16 | 39/7 | sorts [1] 34/19 |
| says [1] 32/1 | sheet [6] 33/13 33/14 34/5 | sounds [2] 44/13 45/11 |
| scenario [1] 33/ | 36/10 37/9 44/10 | SOUTHERN [1] 1/2 |
| scenes [1] 40/11 | sheets [16] 32/20 32/21 33/4 | Spalding [2] 2/8 2/15 |
| schedule | 33/8 33/22 33/23 34/9 34/11 | speak [4] 5/8 8/5 12/1 |
| ult | 36/1 37/14 40/21 41/2 43/2 | 27/21 |
| 23/14 | 43/12 43/17 43/18 | speaking [4] 12/22 17/23 |
| schedules [1] | shine [1] 40/10 | 45/23 48/24 |
| Scholer [1] 2/5 | shockingly [1] 23/24 | special [12] 4/7 7/7 7/13 |
| Science [5] 7/18 7/21 8/7 | should [3] 14/1 19/1 19/3 | 7/20 8/21 14/23 16/6 18/7 |
| 8/10 52/19 | shouldn't [1] 34/7 | 23/5 23/8 39/7 52/18 |
| scope [1] 20 | show [1] 36/11 | specific [5] 4/10 31/5 31/20 |
| scouring [1] 21/14 | showing [1] | 32/12 36/ |
| screens [1] | side [4] 27/22 29/2 29/1 | specifically [2] 21/6 37/8 |
| second [3] 4/1 4/22 $13 / 6$ | 5 | spend [2] 28/ |
| secondary [1] 36/6 | ides [14] 10/9 17/3 20/5 | spending [2] 26/15 29/1 |
| secondary issue [1] 36/6 | 20/23 21/1 21/14 21/17 22 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { spent [1] } & 39 / 4 \\ \text { spoke [2] } & 49 / 4 & \\ \text { 52/1 }\end{array}$ |
| Secondly [1] 39/23 | $29$ | spoke [2] 49/4 52/19 |
| see [6] 6/16 6/17 18/3 40/7 | sides to | spread [1] 22 squeezed [3] |
| 51/8 51/15 $43 / 23$ | sides will [1] 20/5 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { squeezed [3] } & 23 / \\ \text { stack [1] } 35 / 10 \end{array}$ |
| seemed [1] 43/23 | sideways [1] 44/24 | stages [1] 49/19 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { seems [1] } & 16 / 15 \\ \text { seen [4] } & 35 / 12\end{array}$ | sight [1] 45/2 | stand [2] 14/25 47/ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { seen [4] } \\ 40 / 7 \end{gathered}$ | Signature [1] 53/6 | standard [1] 30/8 |
| select [6] 19/18 20/5 | significance [2] 35/17 37/24 | standpoint [6] 8/1 26/24 |
| 26/3 28/7 35/21 | significant [1] 21/25 | 28/13 28/19 34/24 37/3 |
| selected [4] 20/18 21/24 | significantly [1] 46/7 | star [1] 30/14 |
| 26/25 31/24 | Similarly [1] 47/13 | start [10] 11/3 13/8 28/2 |
| selecting [3] 19/24 20/6 | simply [3] 5/9 5/21 | $30 / 3$ 30/9 31/4 31/8 36/20 |
| 25/10 | since [7] 3/12 11/11 11/20 | 37/18 41/5 |
| selection [28] 3/24 17/20 | situation [2] 35/1 3 | started [1] 9/ starting [1] |
| 18/3 18/14 18/17 19/11 19/17 | $\text { six [4] } \quad 25 / 23 \quad 26 / 22 \quad 28 / 23$ | state [31] 4/16 5/12 5/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 23 & 20 / 1 & 20 / 4 & 20 / 13 & 20 / 17\end{array}$ | six [4] 25/23 26/22 28/23 <br> 41/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 9 / 22 & 10 / 6 & 17 / 23 & 35 / 14 & 45 / 19 \end{array}$ |
| 20/18 20/21 20/21 20/22 22/3 | size [2] 13/21 51/10 | 45/20 $46 / 3 \quad 46 / 13 \quad 46 / 15 \quad 46 / 18$ |
| 22/8 26/7 27/2 28/14 29/1 | slide [1] 46/2 | 47/3 47/5 47/6 47/17 47/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 4 & 29 / 5 & 30 / 5 & 34 / 25 & 36 / 5\end{array}$ $37 / 6$ | slight [1] 12/6 | 48/1 48/21 48/24 49/6 49/12 |
| selection/desel | slow [1] 39/20 | 49/21 49/25 50/18 50/20 |
| 22/3 | small [3] 6/19 26/1 45/1 | 50/21 50/21 51/7 51/15 |
| selling [1] | aller [2] 21/15 28/11 | State/Federal [1] 4/16 |
| sense [2] 13/20 35/20 | smarter [1] 40/8 | statement [1] 6/19 |
| sent [5] 15/11 15/17 22/21 | smoking [1] 32/24 | statements [1] 11/18 |
| 22/21 26/8 | smoothly [2] 15/23 49/1 | states [3] 1/1 1/9 13/1 |
| separated [2] 11/21 25/20 | snapshot [1] 34/14 | statistical [2] 35/16 37/24 |
| September [7] 1/5 11/17 | software [1] 21/24 | $37 / 24$ |


| S | et [1] | 42/10 52 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| statistically [4] 20/14 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { team [2] } & 18 / 22 & 41 \\ \text { tell }\end{array}$ | things [15] 8/25 14/25 24/11 |
| 21/24 22/4 35/23 | $39 / 9 \quad 39 / 22 \quad 44 / 1 \quad 44 / 11$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 24 / 17 & 27 / 13 & 30 / 1 & 31 / 9 \\ 39 / 11 & 39 / 20 & 40 / 7 & 41 / 13 \end{array}$ |
| status [2] 22/11 46/2 <br> Statute [2] 34/19 35/3 | telling [1] 40/11 | 50/19 50/20 |
| stay [1] 46/21 | Tennessee [9] 5/1 5/2 $46 / 4$ | think [60] |
| step [3] 14/2 17/6 $29 / 8$ | 46/8 46/11 47/11 47/18 48/23 | think certainly [1] 27/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { steps [3] } & 21 / 12 & 22 / 4 & 42 / 21\end{array}$ | term [5] 14/22 15/4 22/25 |  |
| sticking [1] 23/19 | $23 / 21 \quad 34 / 1$ | thirds [1] 14/6 |
| $\begin{array}{\|ccccc} \text { still } & {[9]} & 11 / 19 & 11 / 21 & 24 / 8 \\ 27 / 14 & 32 / 19 & 33 / 9 & 34 / 3 & 35 / 22 \end{array}$ | terms [4] 16/10 $16 / 11$ 42/9 | this [99] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 27 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | 43/7 | those [30] $7 / 178 / 98 / 2$ |
| Stipes [3] 2/20 17/23 53/5 | Terrific [1] | 8/25 11/20 12/5 12/7 12/18 |
| Stokes [2] 5/2 49/4 | Texas [5] 46/4 47/17 48/24 | 13/25 14/2 $14 / 6$ 14/15 $14 / 18$ |
| stopped [1] 13/16 | 49/9 49/15 |  |
| stormed [1] 27/3 | than [13] 8/20 11/12 $12 / 8$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}26 / 16 & 32 / 9 & 33 / 6 & 36 / 15 & 38 / 19\end{array}$ |
| streamlined [1] 10/9 | 19/3 21/14 $33 / 133 / 18$ 34/2 | 39/10 $46 / 6$ 46/21 48/24 $48 / 25$ |
| Street [4] 2/2 2/6 2/9 2/16 | th | $3 / 176 / 1640 / 20$ |
| strike [4] 29/8 29/9 29/12 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 12/15 } & 12 / 18 & 16 / 2 & 16 / 4 \\ 17\end{array}$ | $44 / 25$ |
| 30/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 14 & 17 / 15 & 17 / 16 & 17 / 17\end{array}$ | thought [1] 31/15 |
| tructural [5] 25/21 26/16 | 19/12 22/13 24/2 38/11 39/25 | thoughts [1] 22/21 |
| 27/8 32/19 33/3 | 40/14 41/20 44/13 45/13 | thousands [1] 19/19 |
| tructurally [1] 27/13 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 45 / 16 & 45 / 17 & 45 / 18 & 48 / 6 & 48 / 18\end{array}$ | three [3] 23/4 31/5 46/20 |
| structure [3] 16/14 25/10 $28 / 18$ | 50/3 50/7 50/8 52/6 52/14 | three-month [1] 31/5 |
| structured [1] 28/2 | that [367] | threshold [4] 19/16 21/21 |
| stuff [1] 39/ | that's [1] | 24/8 |
| ubcommittee, [1] | the expense [1] | through [15] 1/8 7/6 10/22 |
| committee, and [1] | the others [1] 18 | 12/9 15/21 18/24 22/2 23 |
| subject [3] 8/5 26/17 37/15 | the randomization [1] 33/7 | 29/1 29/20 31/14 36/16 37/9 |
| submission [2] $42 / 25$ 43/8 | the work [1] 26/ | $39 / 1$ |
| submit [2] 15/5 21/23 | their [17] 9/3 10/2 10/3 |  |
| submitted [5] 11/9 11/10 | 30/23 35/2 36/13 46/15 | thus [2] 21/12 |
| 11/11 14/14 34/13 | 46/25 49/3 49/7 50/19 | time [37] $6 / 21$ 7 |
| submitting [1] 11/13 | them [20] 6/16 6/17 11/25 | $\begin{array}{lllllllll}15 / 10 & 16 / 2 & 16 / 18 & 16 / 21 & 16 / 25\end{array}$ |
| subpoena [1] 19/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 12 & 19 / 24 & 20 / 5 & 20 / 23 & 25 / 23\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 1 & 21 / 3 & 24 / 23 & 25 / 5 & 26 / 25\end{array}$ |
| subset [1] 26/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 19 & 27 / 19 & 28 / 19 & 35 / 3 & 35 / 17\end{array}$ | 26/25 27/1 27/2 28/9 29/10 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { substance [2] } & 38 / 25 \\ \text { successful }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}40 / 10 & 43 / 10 & 43 / 21 & 49 / 16\end{array}$ | 29/14 30/24 31/9 31/9 31/20 |
| such [10] $3 / 22 \quad 14 / 9 \quad 18 / 25$ | 49/18 51/13 51/25 | 31/22 32/3 36/7 37/5 37/8 |
| $24 / 18 \quad 32 / 22 \quad 38 / 11 \quad 39 / 2 \quad 44$ | themselves [1] 9/3 | 37/12 39/4 43/21 $46 / 3$ 47/1 |
| $44 / 25 \quad 52 / 15$ | then [30] 4/14 7/18 8/23 | 48/7 48/14 50/12 52/14 |
|  | 20/22 25/6 26/1 27/12 28/6 | time-wise [1] 17/1 |
| Suite [6] 1/11 1/15 | 28/9 28/12 29/12 30/10 30/18 | times [1] 6/20 |
| 1/22 2/9 2/12 | $31 / 3$ 31/21 32/8 33/6 33/7 | timing [3] 26/19 34/2 39/17 |
| summary [5] $4 / 5$ 18/9 42 | 33/20 36/4 36/5 36/19 37/17 | to provide [1] 40/18 |
| 47/20 48/9 | 37/21 37/21 38/20 41/3 43/3 | to the [1] 32/22 |
| upplement | 43/7 44/20 | today [20] 3/5 6/2 6/7 6/1 |
| supporting | there [65] | 7/2 10/12 10/13 11/14 12/22 |
| supporting [1] $\text { sure [6] } 9 / 1520$ | therefore [1] 13/20 | 12/23 13/2 16/2 16/12 17/10 |
| $31 / 25 \quad 43 / 9 \quad 52 / 1$ | Thereupon [1] 52/24 | 18/4 18/19 40/6 45/24 46/24 |
| survive [3] 32/1 | these [21] 4/8 4/10 9/23 | 52/17 |
| suspect [1] 30/22 | 15/24 16/9 18/20 19/7 19/10 | today's [1] 3/18 |
| Syngenta [1] 26/10 | 19/20 19/25 27/18 $35 / 6$ 38/3 | together [9] 3/13 15/24 $23 / 9$ |
| system [1] 35/18 | 39/20 40/7 46/14 47/15 49/6 | 38/12 $39 / 4 \begin{array}{llllll} & 42 / 13 & 43 / 1 & 44 / 14\end{array}$ |
| T | they [45] 5/10 5/11 5/21 | told [1] 49/ |
| take [7] 3/13 11/1 23/15 | 6/15 9/15 11/2 11/14 13/10 | tolling [1] 10/ |
| 28/6 30/16 34/14 35/4 | $\begin{array}{llll}13 / 12 & 13 / 14 & 14 / 4 & 20 / 23\end{array} 22 / 21$ | TOMMY [2] 2/5 45/22 |
| takeaways [1] 41/21 | 22/24 $23 / 11$ 23/21 $23 / 21 \quad 24 / 8$ | ton [2] 28/16 31/3 |
| takes [3] 34/11 36/18 | 27/15 $29 / 2 \begin{array}{lllll} \\ 31 / 12 & 30 / 16 & 30 / 18 & 31 / 10\end{array}$ | tool [1] 20/2 |
| taking [3] 24/19 36/21 38/11 | 31/12 $35 / 2 \begin{array}{llllll} & 35 / 14 & 35 / 14 & 38 / 2\end{array}$ | top [1] 29/6 |
| Talcum [1] 20/25 | 40/1 40/8 40/12 41/1 44/3 | topic [5] 4/14 7/19 9/4 |
| talk [1] 19/10 | 44/24 $47 / 1 \begin{array}{lllll} & 49 / 3 & 49 / 7 & 49 / 18\end{array}$ | 17/19 18/2 |
| talked [2] 26/9 35/19 | 49/25 50/1 50/6 50/19 50/20 | topics [5] 3/20 4/3 9/16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { talking [5] 23/12 25/2 29/14 } \\ & 36 / 1349 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}52 / 1 & 52 / 2 \\ \text { thing [9] } & 23 / 23 ~ 27 / 7 ~ 34 / 19 ~\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|ccc} 22 / 12 & 23 / 24 \\ \text { total [2] } & 11 / 10 & 21 / 16 \end{array}$ |


| T | 42 | voluntarily [2] 13/10 14/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| towards [1] 19/7 | up [19] 3/14 4/1 7/8 8/21 $\text { 11/2 20/6 22/19 24/1 } 24 / 1$ | W |
| $\begin{array}{lrrl}\text { track [3] } & 12 / 16 & 47 / 19 & 50 / 19\end{array}$ | 26/11 28/12 28/17 30/5 32/13 | wait [3] 7/15 7/23 42/1 |
| traditional [1] | 36/11 $36 / 14 \begin{array}{lllll} & 39 / 11 & 45 / 3 & 49 / 22\end{array}$ | waiting [1] 31/19 |
| transcript [3] 12/17 48/13 | upcoming [2] 49/24 50/2 | waivers [1] 19/5 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 53 / 1 \end{array}$ | update [17] 3/22 3/23 4/13 | want [27] 3/13 4/18 22/16 |
| transfer [1] 46/21 | 4/24 9/15 $13 / 115$ | 25/23 26/20 |
| transition [1] 22/10 | $17 / 4$ $17 / 15$ $19 / 15$ $22 / 8$ | 28/15 30/19 30/24 31/10 |
| tremendous [1] 40/5 | updated [2] 15/15 48 | $\begin{array}{llll} 31 / 12 & 32 / 2 & 32 / 11 & 32 / 11 \\ 39 / 25 & 41 / 24 & 42 / 6 & 44 / 12 \end{array}$ |
| trial [25] 4/9 4/12 $4 / 14$ 5/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { updates [3] } & 4 / 18 & 4 / 23 & 51 / 24\end{array}$ | $44 / 22 \quad 45 / 6 \quad 46 / 8 \quad 48 / 8 \quad 51 / 9$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}19 / 6 & 20 / 6 & 20 / 18 & 22 / 24 & 25 / 13\end{array}$ | updating <br> [1] <br> 5/23 | 52/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}25 / 15 & 25 / 15 & 26 / 21 & 27 / 1 \\ 28 / 17\end{array}$ | upon [1] 22/7 | wanted [8] $7 / 5$ 22/23 $22 / 24$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 17 & 29 / 12 & 37 / 3 & 39 / 1 & 39 / 10 \\ 41 / 16 & 41 / 16 & 41 / 17 & 44 / 6 & 47 / 21\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { us [20] } & 8 / 25 & 13 / 21 & 23 / 5 & 23 / 6\end{array}$ | 35/7 41/6 48/22 49/20 49/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}41 / 16 & 41 / 16 & 41 / 17 & 44 / 6 & 47 / 21\end{array}$ | 23/10 $25 / 6 \quad 26 / 20 \quad 27 / 5 \quad 27 / 11$ | wanting [1] 25/17 |
| trial you [1] 44/6 | 30/9 38/12 $39 / 9$ 39/19 39/22 | wants [1] 45/7 |
| trials [6] 4/4 18/9 18/12 | 40/9 40/11 41/11 49/2 51/4 | was [23] 3/3 $3 / 5$ 4/1 $4 / 2$ 4/3 |
| 19/20 22/7 22/22 | 51/15 | 5/3 6/2 12/16 14/5 16/4 |
| tried [3] 20/7 21/2 41/8 | us |  |
| true [4] 20/3 24/15 $37 / 25$ | use [12] 5/15 9/24 10/20 | $48 / 14 \quad 50 / 16 \quad 52 / 24$ |
|  | 13/12 21/13 24/16 24/17 26/4 | Washington [1] 2/3 |
| rue-up [1] | 28/6 31/25 33/11 46/10 | wasn't [3] 16/24 29/11 50/15 |
| $\text { try [3] } 6 / 5 \quad 29 / 6$ | used [3] 10/8 13/19 34/2 | waste [7] 29/9 31/14 32/12 |
| trying [11] 16/18 25/22 | useful [2] 5/25 10/10 | 34/9 37/5 37/8 37/12 |
| 28/18 29/3 30/7 30/16 31 | users [1] 38/1 | wasted [2] 32/7 32/10 |
| $32 / 3 \quad 32 / 13$ 35/10 37/22 | using [4] 13/14 24/16 25/25 | wasting [3] 28/23 31/3 36/25 |
| Tuesday [1] 23/14 | 26/4 | WATTS [19] 1/17 $1 / 18$ 2/11 |
| urn [3] 9/3 19/10 20/13 | usurping | 22/11 22/15 24/6 24/23 25/2 |
| turned [1] 43/6 | utilize [1] 21/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}25 / 18 & 27 / 14 & 27 / 25 & 29 / 17 & 30 / 6\end{array}$ |
| turning [1] 47/2 | utilized [1] 21/5 | 32/19 37/23 39/10 40/2 41/8 |
| turns [1] 30/14 | utilizing [1] 19/24 | 41/21 |
| two [17] 4/3 12/11 13/3 $14 / 6$ | utmost [1] | way [10] 15/11 15/25 27/25 |
| 15/6 19/22 $22 / 4$ 23/4 27/4 | V | $2 \text { 28/22 34/6 35/18 40/1 }$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 29 / 8 & 34 / 18 & 35 / 6 & 45 / 10 & 46 / 14 \\ 46 / 16 & 46 / 24 & 46 / 25 \end{array}$ | valid [1] 20 | way to [1] 35/18 |
| two-step [1] 29/8 | Vargas [1] 47/18 | ways [5] 16/21 19/22 27/4 |
| two-thirds [1] 14/6 | variables [2] 20/ | 7/5 39/13 |
| TX [3] 1/12 1/19 2/13 | variant [2] 3/6 3/13 | we [220] |
| type [1] 47/7 | various [4] 11/7 41/8 | we'll [1] 39/10 |
| typical [1] 29/13 | 9/19 | we're [1] |
| U | verdict and [1] 20/ | week [4] 12/10 12/11 |
|  | verdicts [1] 22/7 | 35/5 |
| ltimately [5] 21/2 24/2 | version [1] 43/4 | weeks [2] 49/24 50/ |
| ultimately [5] 21/2 24/22 31/13 40/25 51/20 | versus [1] 24/24 | welcome [3] 3/2 12/19 16/ |
| under [3] $33 / 13$ 40/24 41/9 | very [38] 4/25 5/10 5/19 | well [16] 4/14 7/4 8/6 8/14 |
| understand [10] 5/6 16/5 | 5/19 5/22 5/24 5/24 6/25 7/3 | 14/15 15/24 17/21 28/21 |
| 16/13 19/2 25/17 43/2 43/16 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 15 & 12 / 16 & 14 / 17 & 14 / 22 & 15 / 2\end{array}$ | 31/19 32/8 41/19 41/21 42/6 |
| 44/6 44/12 47/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 4 & 15 / 11 & 15 / 24 & 16 / 4 & 16 / 5\end{array}$ | 52/13 52/14 52/23 |
| understanding [1] 4 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}17 / 7 & 17 / 10 & 17 / 15 & 17 / 22 & 21 / 9\end{array}$ | went [3] 15/14 27/5 52/10 |
|  | 23/25 24/21 26/1 28/6 35/2 | were [19] 3/12 7/9 11/17 |
| $42 / 4$ | $\begin{array}{llll}36 / 22 & 36 / 22 & 41 / 10 & 42 / 13\end{array}$ | 11/20 $14 / 7$ 14/11 $15 / 17120 / 25$ |
|  | 43/11 43/11 44/13 49/15 | 21/2 22/22 25/20 26/20 41/23 |
| cres [1] | 51/12 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}42 / 23 & 46 / 3 & 46 / 8 & 46 / 13 & 46 / 16\end{array}$ |
| unheard [1] 38/18 | vet [1] 33 | 52/2 |
| uniformity [2] 51/8 51/10 unintended [1] 38/14 | vetted [1] 24/18 | WEST [4] 1/2 1/5 2/6 2/21 |
| unique [1] 21/23 | vetting [6] 30/21 32/22 33/5 | what [54] |
| UNITED [2] 1/1 1/9 | 33/23 37/17 41/2 | whatever [6] 23/22 25/23 |
| universe [1] 31/23 | viable [2] 13/12 29/24 | 28/3 29/2 29/19 35/14 |
| unless [2] 7/10 19/9 | view [3] 32/21 34/5 49/ | when [24] 3/10 6/9 8/9 12/4 |
| Unlike [1] 47/18 | viewers [1] 16/12 | 14/23 20/7 22/22 24/11 25/19 |
| ute [1] | Vioxx [3] 26/4 26/6 31/12 | 27/15 27/15 27/16 28/22 |
| [1] | virtually [1] 18/4 | 31/20 32/20 33/10 34/18 39/9 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \mathrm{d} & {[1]} & 52 \\ \mathrm{~d} & {[1]} & \end{array}$ | vision [3] 18/11 31/21 41/16 | 44/1 44/6 44/24 48/14 50/13 |
| til [4] 3/14 6/8 18/17 | volume [1] 11/20 | 50/14 |
| [4] 3/14 6/8 | voluminous [1] 43/21 | where [20] 14/25 18/25 23/15 |



