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THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, everybody. We are here in the Zantac Products Liability Litigation, MDL number 2924, and we are here today pursuant to the Court's order at Docket Entry 4506 in which the Court issued an order setting conference on Bellwether selection plan.

So I see some faces on the screen, which is always nice, $I$ don't have to look into just myself.

Let's begin by having everybody state their appearance for the record. We are here, for the record, on the Zoom platform in light of the ongoing COVID pandemic.

MR. PULASKI: Adam Pulaski on behalf of the Plaintiffs, your Honor. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good afternoon here.

MR. WATTS: Mikal Watts, good afternoon, your Honor.

MR. BAYMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor, Andrew Bayman on behalf of the brand Defendants.

MS. ZOUSMER: Good afternoon, your Honor, Julia Zousmer on behalf of the brand Defendants.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you for being here.

In the Court's order at 4506, the Court indicated that it was holding a conference on the parties' Bellwether proposal, and the Bellwether proposal which had been provided to the Court through the Zantac email address. For the ease of reference and clarity on the record, the Court attached the
proposal, and I understand it is just a proposal, to the order so we are clear on what we are talking about, and it's styled Pretrial Order, Bellwether Selection, but for our purposes we will call it the Bellwether proposal.

I understand that it was jointly submitted and I appreciate that. As in many matters in this MDL, I want to continue to recognize and applaud counsel for working together when you can, recognizing from time to time that there are differences that arise, but that you really use your earnest efforts to work together so that when you sulomit proposals to the Court they are, to the best of your ability, a reflection of a joint agreement. Probably much negotiation and compromise and discussions go back and forth, and I realize that isn't always easy.

It probably would be easier for you just to submit your own proposals, but $I$ can tell you from the Court's standpoint, I do feel that I get the best of your work when you jointly propose your issues to the Court, whether it is in the Bellwether or any one of the other 60 plus pretrial orders, which I would say, for the most part, have been entered upon consensus of the parties, and I am appreciative of that.

So, I wanted to have the hearing today. Some pretrial submissions are more straightforward than others, some are more consequential than others. Clearly this appears to be in the consequential category. I think we would all agree how we go
about the Bellwether selection is one of those important decision points inflection points in an MDL. So, my first goal was to make sure that I actually understood what it was that you were proposing to the Court, because it is one thing to put it together, and I can tell it is very detailed and very particular, so $I$ have no doubt in your mind as you were walking through all of the different steps, it was very clear to you what you were doing and what you were saying and how you were conveying it, but from the outsider coming to the table not having been privy to all of those discussions and thought processes, it has taken me several readings to make sure, several charts, all of which I have.

You don't have the benefit of seeing them, but I have them all plastered on the plexiglass in front of me, visuals, timelines and trying to get from A to B to C to D.

I thought it would be helpful just to give you the latitude to explain it to me in your words so I can hear you explain what you have submitted in writing.

I know that I submitted through our special master a few questions that I had, which I was happy to do. I can't promise you they were all the questions, but I think they were the bigger ones, so don't worry. If you can't answer a question, that is fine, too.

So, let me let you give your overview. You can choose to have one point person do it or divide it up, however you
wish to do it. To the extent that you want to and can incorporate some or all of those questions that $I$ had submitted through our special master to you, that would be terrific, and then $I$ will try to hold off on asking any questions as we go along. Sometimes I can't help myself, but I will try to control myself.

Then what $I$ may want to do is then walk through particular parts of the proposal that $I$ had questions on, that I needed a little clarity, that maybe didn't make sense to me in terms of whether it was a timeline or a timeframe, or how you get from one sort of step to the next.

So, with that, let me just locate my pen again. We are working in a different courtroom, so $I$ don't have all of my things available to me. Bear with me one moment so $I$ can grab a pen.

Let me turn it over to counsel for kind of walking me through the proposal at large.

MR. PULASKI: If I may, Judge, real quick to begin with, and $I$ will have Mikal get into the details of it, $I$ do appreciate Mr. Bayman, Mr. Petrosinelli, and Ms. Zousmer working with us. We had a very good working relationship, as you can tell. As you stated, this is a very detailed proposal.

And I also appreciate the fact that you provided us with those questions that we were able to deal with in advance, which actually led us to make a few changes on some dates and
some minor changes, as well as led us to a discussion about one area where there was, I guess, an area of misinterpretation or miscommunication where there were two ways to interpret something, and we are trying to resolve that issue as of now. My understanding is that we will try and get that done within the next 48 hours and have resolution to that issue, and once we are able to resolve that issue, then we would be able to come to an agreement on this proposal at that time.

As you said, there are a number of other areas that we can discuss today regarding timelines and everything else in addition to your questions, and I do want to say that we have been working diligently with the Defense on this. After we submitted the proposal to you we continued to work diligently on it because it is a process that is going to be ongoing for the next 12 to 14 months, and we want to make sure we have all of our ducks in a row and that both sides are in agreement with every aspect of this pretrial order as it flows from stage to stage.

With that, I will turn this over to Mikal to give you kind of an overview of pretrial order A through $Z$ and how it should function and how we think it should flow.

MR. BAYMAN: Your Honor, before Mr. Watts -- I'm sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: I was just going to say thank you. Are you feeling better, Mr. Pulaski? I heard you were not feeling
well. Are you feeling better?
MR. PULASKI: Mostly recovered. Thank you for asking. THE COURT: Glad to hear it. Mr. Bayman.

MR. BAYMAN: Your Honor, just to echo what Mr. Pulaski said, this was a very cooperative process, a lot of hard work by the folks here, by Ms. Zousmer, who really has just an encyclopedic knowledge about the mechanics of this plan and she put a lot of hard work into it, as did Mr. Pulaski, Mr. Watts, myself, and Mr. Petrosinelli, and I agree with Mr. Pulaski, something arose on Friday that we see as an area of disagreement, but we are committed to spending the next 48 hours to try to work it out.

Otherwise, I think we have come up with a structure that is innovative and creative. Mr. Watts deserves a lot of credit for a lot of that, but we think it is going to produce ultimately a representative trial pool of the cases that are in this MDL.

So, I just wanted to reiterate -- agree with what Mr. Pulaski said about all the hard work and all of the collegiality that was involved in the process.

THE COURT: Excellent. I appreciate every enforcement, thank you.

MR. WATTS: Judge, Mikal Watts for the Plaintiff, and what I thought we would do is, I will give you an overview and then go through the first section and then cede the floor to

Ms. Zousmer. We really have been working together, with the assistance of your special master, kind of cleaning up the proposal so that it is more specific and addresses some of your concerns and, of course, we had to move some dates around.

From a global perspective, our goal is to have an order that takes us from 130,000 people in the Court's registry to the first four trials, and to do that in a Plaintiffs selection mechanism or process that achieves -- I mean representative Plaintiffs so that when we do get jury verdicts we have all learned from those verdicts as opposed to having wedged in excuses about why it was a Plaintiffs verdict or Defense verdict and that would be an impediment to settlement.

The order is structured in several parts. The first part, with respect to page one and two, is our discussion of what constitutes the Bellwether pool, and the first issue, of course, is whether we do that nationwide.

As the Court knows, there are cases from all over the United States here, but we pitched an idea to the Defendants that we use Florida as kind of a Bellwether state for purposes of the selection process. There are several reasons for that.

Number one, it is one of the largest states in the United States, so it is not like picking from a state with a population like Wyoming or Delaware. You have a very wide berth, if you will, of population and we believe that it stands as a representative state for purposes of using it as the

Bellwether pool.

And then the second thing, of course, is that it has been our experience in these cases that when you have out-of-state Plaintiffs being asked to participate in an MDL pool in some other state a lot of them are reticent. You have problems from the standpoint of obtaining Lexecon waivers. From my perspective, it is always a problem with the Defense, and I'm sure from the Defense's perspective, it is always a problem with the Plaintiffs.

The concept of using Florida Plaintiffs is, A, it is a big enough state that it is representative; and $B$, it solves all sorts of procedural issues from the standpoint of no Lexecon waiver, and then, of course, your Honor would have no problems from the standpoint of obtaining subpoena power over witnesses that presumably are more likely to be in the state of Florida than anywhere else, so we think that is a big advantage as well.

As you go to the second page, Ms. Zousmer has been kind enough, and I have checked her math, to give us the number of Florida Plaintiffs that were in the registry as of the end of September, which is the day before that we promised you the first draft of this. So that nobody is padding the deck, if you will, we just took a snapshot there. I think we are all pretty content about using that snapshot of the different cancers.

There is a process with respect to people being willing to bind themselves to the Bellwether selection order, and then, as you know, on December 20th the Plaintiffs will tell you if there are cancers among the top ten that in the MDL are no longer going to be pursued, or perhaps are going to be pursued elsewhere and the like, and that way we are not wasting resources further in the Bellwether discovery process working on Plaintiffs that are not being pressed in the MDL.

I will stop there and turn it over to Ms. Zousmer to add any other comments on Section I.

MS. ZOUSMER: No, Mikal, I think you got it on Section I.

MR. BAYMAN: One other thing I would add, your Honor, is that we have looked and there have been -- this is not unprecedented, there have been other MDLs that have drawn Bellwether pools from just one state. The Taxitor (phon) MDL in the Eastern District of Louisiana and I believe the Abilify Gambling MDL in Florida are two examples, but as Mr. Watts said, because of the size of the pool in a big state like Florida, in comparing it to what we see overall in the registry in terms of the -- there are some slight differences, but we don't think differences that would be meaningful.

So, we think a Florida pool would be a representative pool, and we have been able to use the registry data to make those comparisons, so another advantage to having the registry
data was being able to do that data mining and compare and see do we really think -- and both sides did it independently and both sides came to the same conclusion.

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, Adam Pulaski for the Plaintiffs. If you don't already have those reports, the global report from Florida only Plaintiffs, I am happy to send that over to Special Master Dodge to get to you if you would like to take a look at it in comparison with the global report from the entire registry.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to violate my own rule that I wasn't going to ask questions, but I kind of like what you are doing, which is -- if we break it down by section, so we are in Section I, the Bellwether pool, before we go to Section II, can I ask questions?

MR. WATTS: Do whatever you want, your Honor.
MS. ZOUSMER: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So, did you finish your discussion on Section 1?

MR. PULASKI: Yes, your Honor.
MR. WATTS: Yes.
THE COURT: Good. So, very helpful. Let me work
backwards from the last comment that was made.
Did I understand you to say that there is some type of a global report from LMI that shows certain data points that would give all of you, that is Defense and Plaintiff, comfort
and assurance in concluding that using Florida
Plaintiffs/claimants -- I think you meant to say probably Plaintiffs and claimants in $E$ on page two -- that the Florida Plaintiffs are kind of a representative group of the overall 130,000 plus persons in the registry, whether they are filed or unfiled? Is that more or less what I am understanding you to say?

MR. PULASKI: Yes, your Honor. Adam Pulaski for the Plaintiffs. As Mr. Bayman pointed out, there are some minor differences, and Mr. Watts alluded to that as well, where there may be a one year age -- average age difference, or there may be a cancer type that is off a few percentage points, or something like that.

Overall, there was nothing statistically that was a variant in any significant way that caused us any concern or problem and this was completely representative as the larger group as a whole.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. ZOUSMER: I was going to add that really for the most part the data was very representative in terms of duration of use spread and the breakdown of product type and cancer type by age. We had the aggregate CPF reports for both pools and looked at it across all the categories of data, and it really was a very representative pool on all of those key issues.

THE COURT: Okay. I will take you up on your offer,
since $I$ get regular $L M I$ reports anyway, but it sounds like this was sort of a special LMI report that you asked for, or maybe you were looking at it in a way that -- previously I had been looking at the LMI reports not for something of this nature, which would make sense since we hadn't really reached Bellwether selection issues until the submission of this proposal.

So, if I could take you up on the offer to provide the special master with what it is that you all looked at to satisfy you that the Florida group is representative of the global group, and again, global would mean persons in the registry, and persons in the registry are comprised of filed Plaintiffs and unfiled claimants.

That is very helpful to know, I wasn't aware of that. I wasn't coming at this from the standpoint of picking one state is bad, going with all states is good, although $I$ have done enough research, you would say, you know, to understand that some of the issues that might suggest a potential bad practice, a potential one, would be -- well, a definite bad practice would be not having a representative pool, and one way in which you might not have a representative pool would be pulling from one state.

It is not to say all the time that is a bad practice, so I kind of wanted to understand why you thought this was not a bad practice, but in fact was a good practice, and with that
included my questions of, you know, to the extent -- I was trying to understand whether it was driven in large part because of Lexecon and waivers and subpoenas, or whether those were kind of attendant benefits, oh, by the way, we are picking Florida Plaintiffs and now we are not going to have waiver issues, subpoena issues.

I guess what $I$ am hearing is it is everything. You do feel it is representative because of your comparison with the global, which is one of the outstanding benefits of the registry, quite frankly, among many benefits of the registry, something very novel and being well used by counsel, and in addition to that, we don't have to worry about Lexecon waivers, and the Court doesn't have to worry about its subpoena power.

MR. WATTS: Yes, Judge. Mikal Watts. There is one other issue that is brought up sometimes at these MDL conferences, and that is, you have a robust history as a Florida State Court judge and are familiar with Florida with substantive law.

We also looked at it not from the standpoint of the representative Plaintiff, but is Florida considered an outlier from other states, is it wildly different, and while every state has its differences, it is kind of in the middle from the standpoint of substantive law that would be of assistance from the standpoint of formulating settlement values and the like.

Then, of course, Erie determinations or what some

Appellate Courts call Erie guesses, so, we have a Florida judge with a great understanding of Florida substantive law making decisions with respect to the cases that are likely going to be decided under Florida substantive law, and I think the Eleventh Circuit would appreciate that as well.

THE COURT: Okay. All righty. And I think that covers sort of the biggest topic -- the only other things I was going to point out in the first section, the Bellwether pool -so, by my count, more or less -- again, when you have the chart in D, number of Florida Plaintiffs, you mean Plaintiffs and claimants?

MR. WATTS: I do. Sorry.
THE COURT: In paragraph E. So it's about 7300 or so? MR. BAYMAN: That is correct, your Honor.

MS. ZOUSMER: That's right.
THE COURT: When you take the 75 percent of that, you get about 5500?

MS. ZOUSMER: Yes, that is correct.
THE COURT: I won't go further into E, because I
understand that is one of the areas that you are working on. I am going to skip over any more discussion about paragraph E on page two.

When you talk about Bellwether pool in paragraph E, you might want to consider making that a defined term. You have Bellwether trial pool on the third to last line, and then
you refer to it as Bellwether pool on the last line of $E$. I know a lot of times you define --

MR. BAYMAN: We caught that, your Honor, when we were working through things this weekend, so we will do that.

THE COURT: Okay. Then in paragraph D, I know you define alleged cancers as those cancers that are going to be disclosed by the Plaintiffs per PTO 65 on December 20th, and we will see when we get into paragraph II, the initial discovery pool, there appeared to be a little disconnect with your dates, you doing certain things in November relating to alleged cancer, but alleged cancer is defined in paragraph $F$ as something that we won't know until December 20th, but you are probably already going to get into that.

I just violated my rule again because I didn't stick to paragraph one. That is all I have on paragraph I.

MR. WATTS: It was a fair comment, and I blame myself. Mr. Zousmer and I were going back and forth before we submitted a first draft and we were moving dates around and we obviously missed --

THE COURT: Mr. Watts, you just froze, so we are not hearing you right now. I will wait until you are unfrozen.

Ms. Zousmer, were you able to read his mind?
MS. ZOUSMER: I think so, on this at least, and that is just to say that we caught it. We moved some dates around and we were going to change the references in the earlier date
to say like the alleged cancer categories instead of the defined term, so we will make it generic.

THE COURT: Okay. You had just frozen, Mr. Watts. I don't know if you could hear us, but we couldn't hear you. Ms. Zousmer just finished your sentence.

Unless there was anything further you wanted to say, did you want to move on to paragraph II?

MR. WATTS: Yes. The changes in paragraph II and III, and there is a date change in paragraph I E as well, are all designed to account for the fact that it has been 25 days since we submitted this, or three weeks, so some of the dates have been moved back, but I am happy to say that we figured that out this weekend, about how to move some of these dates back without moving the ultimate date of when we would propose the Court conduct its first trial.

Largely, paragraph II now says that by Friday we'll agree to a form of a signed medical authorization, required authorization. Our randomizer will take place on December the 10th. We've agreed to change the number being selected by the randomizer from six to eight percent to account for the exclusion of the Apotex cases that would destroy your jurisdiction, and the numbers work out nicely.

The bottom line is that we are going to have at least 25 Plaintiffs/claimants in each cancer category, but we may have a pool as large as eight percent of what remains after we
get rid of people that are involved with Apotex such that it would destroy your discovery.

Then, of course, in paragraphs $C$ and $D$ we have a process where if for any reason it is necessary to replace Plaintiffs/claimants, initially that replacement is done through the Microsoft randomizer so we continue to get a random pool.

As we get later into the Bellwether selection process, if Plaintiffs drop out for any reason it becomes more punitive against the Plaintiff, where in effect the Defendants get to select the replacement to persuade us from gerrymandering the pool, if you will, but at least initially, in the initial discovery pool we are going back to the randomizer to select replacement Plaintiffs so that we keep the numbers up before we begin the process of doing the discovery that we need to actually make our decisions.

So, in C -- I mean in D, if somebody is going to decide not to participate after we randomly selected on December 10th, the date changes to December 17, they have to say that they are not going to be there, and then you have a replacement. The dates change from December 17 -- it goes from December 17 to the Defendant replacing them by December 22nd, and then on January the 7 th and January the 14 th -- we will have this all in the new version to you, but this is basically a version of pushing everything back two or three weeks to
account for that.
So, that gets us to the situation where we are now in the initial discovery pool which starts category III, and at that point, we will start on December 15 th, and we'll continue on a rolling basis until January 14th to provide these electronically signed medical authorizations, together with a list of what we call the big five categories, that being the primary health care physician, the gastroenterologist, the Ranitidine prescribing physician, if applicable, the physician diagnosing the alleged cancer, and the treating oncologist.

That way somebody with a medical authorization knows where to send them to get the appropriate records. That is going to be done beginning on December 15 th and ending by January 14th.

Paragraph III B says if there are any deficiencies the Defendants will let us know within five days of getting them, and this is why it is on a rolling basis, so that the Plaintiffs can correct those deficiencies within two weeks after being notified by Ms. Zousmer's group, and in no event later than January 28th.

The importance of all of that is that in the original version that you are probably looking at, as we go down to the Bellwether discovery pool, everything starts February 1. So, as long as we got there by February 1, everybody was happy, and those were the dates that we renegotiated and will submit to
you in 48 hours when we get this last issue done.

Ms. Zousmer.

MS. ZOUSMER: I don't have anything to add to that, Mikal, I think we are good.

MR. WATTS: Then with -- do you have questions on 2 and 3, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, I do. MR. WATTS: Sorry, I didn't mean to run away from you. THE COURT: Let me get my paperwork here. I pasted it up there. Okay.

So you are changing the 6 percent to 8 percent, so I had calculated that your 6 percent, based on the earlier numbers, was going to yield, I don't know, about 425 , but your 8 percent, I guess, is going to be a larger number, and --

MR. WATTS: It is not really going to be larger because the new version we're going to send you takes out the people that LMI tells us that Apotex -- pushing Apotex and the Florida situation, so the numbers basically end up where they were, with some stop, but not much.

THE COURT: You intend to use the ten cancers, or the alleged cancers? They might be one in the same, but when you talk about 6 percent in each alleged cancer or 25 Plaintiffs per category in any alleged category in which 6 percent of the certified Plaintiffs does not exceed 25 --

MR. WATTS: We are going to randomize based on the
full ten because it doesn't cost us anything. We may surprise you and make that designation slightly before December 20th. We are not there yet because we don't want to shock all of our experts and say, hey, we changed our mind on your deadline.

We understand the small disconnect in these dates, and I would anticipate that we will have a pretty good idea where we are going earlier than that. Of course, we won't sandbag you and hold it until the 20th, because we understand the dates don't line up, but we think we will be able to line them up voluntarily by disclosing those cancers slightly before December 20th.

THE COURT: So, the idea is if the ten goes to eight, hypothetically, you will have already done your randomizers to all ten, so you just eliminate those two.

MR. WATTS: Exactly.
THE COURT: I do note you do use the word "certified"
there. In discussions about $E$ you do refer to them as already being certified there.

MR. WATTS: Right.
THE COURT: Okay. So, it has to be at least 25 Plaintiffs per cancer, but it could be higher. 6 percent or 8 percent could be higher, but it has to be at least 25.

MR. WATTS: It will be higher on some cancers, but it has to be at least 25 on all cancers.

THE COURT: If it's less than 25, the randomizer --

MR. WATTS: Keeps going.
THE COURT: -- selects additional cases. It goes back to the group, the Bellwether pool within that cancer, and pulls more to get to 25?

MR. WATTS: Exactly.
THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So now C, by a certain
date -- it now says November 28th, but you are going to change that slightly -- any Plaintiff selected for the initial discovery pool who does not intend to proceed with his or her case or claim and be subject to discovery and deadlines.

How are you going to determine -- like, what is that? What does it mean, who does not intend to proceed? How are you going to ascertain that? I mean, in my mind I was thinking of a scenario where maybe an attorney can't reach a client, whether it is a claimant or a Plaintiff, that might be one scenario where somebody doesn't intend to proceed, because the lawyer can't reach the client.

Maybe you reach the client and they are ready to pull out, they don't want to have anything more to do with the case.

What did you envision as to who do not intend to proceed, and how were you going to learn that? What is the triggering act that sort of -- or acts that tell you that? And it dovetails into my next questions, so I want to understand that first.

MR. WATTS: We did two things. Number one, this date
is after the certification deadine, so at least 75 percent of your pool will have already certified their willingness to be involved whenever you negotiate that.

There is a 25 percent possibility that somebody hasn't certified yet, and we call them up on the $10 t h$, you just got randomly selected, they say I want no part of this.

Now, here is the challenge there, by -- and the dates are now December 10 for the randomizer, and then by December 17 any Plaintiff that wants out has to say so.

So we anticipate that on Friday the 10th, we will have a communications program where everybody who is selected will be immediately notified, all of the law firms that represent those people will be on a communication SWAT team to contact all these people, and those law firms will have the onus of getting a communication from their client that if they don't wish to proceed they have to tell us within a week.

But the challenge there, as you see, is it is not an option, you are here, you say you are going to proceed, or you voluntarily dismiss your action with prejudice.

And so, they have seven days to tell us that, and then, if that happens, then the Defendants have five days thereafter, it is now on the 22 nd, to, in effect, replace the case, and you will notice that the replacement at this point is no longer using the randomizer, okay, and that is meant to dissuade the Plaintiffs' Bar from gerrymandering the pool into
something that was representative into something that is not.
So, presumably most people who took the time to either file a lawsuit or to fill out the Census Plus form did so because they had been hired by a client to push a Zantac case.

So, at this point, it is kind of an amalgam between the certification on the one hand and this deadline on the other where people are voluntarily availing themselves of your jurisdiction for the limited purpose of participating in the Bellwether selection process. We can't have our cake and eat it, too.

So, to directly answer your question, within seven days, if you want out you have to say so. If you say so, there is a replacement process, and then they have to, in effect -the randomizer is still used at this point. I misspoke a second ago. But the bottom line is the penalty is not -- it is the randomizer substitute at this point, but the penalty is, the people that quit on us quit with prejudice.

THE COURT: Right. All right, we have two scenarios. Let's take the lawyer who can reach his or her client and the client is a filed Plaintiff, and the client says to the lawyer I don't want to proceed. I don't want to proceed, what, with my case at all? I'm done? Or I don't want to proceed with being part of the Bellwether process? Or when it says -- I am taking -- it says voluntarily dismiss his or her action with prejudice.

The Plaintiff is saying I don't want to proceed with a lawsuit, this is for the filed ones, any longer. Not only do I not want to proceed, I want to, under Rule 41 -- and I am going to ask you what section you are contemplating here -- I am going to dismiss my case with prejudice.

What if they don't want to proceed, but they don't want to voluntarily dismiss their case? What is requiring them? And if you are going to say, well, it is the Court order, explain that to me.

MR. WATTS: Well, I think the Court has power to enforce compliance with its order. Obviously, part of what each Plaintiff's lawyer would need to do when this order comes out is we need to serve -- not serve, we need to provide it to all of our Plaintiffs, explain to them that part of an MDL's job, and any Federal Court's job, is to manage Plaintiff's litigation. You have Rule 1 rights, you have Rule 16 rights, you have Rule 26 rights, and people who choose not to participate have the right to get dismissed.

So, you have the power to enter this order, you have the power to compel compliance with it, and I don't think it is unusual at all for Article III judges, when people are peeling out of the Bellwether selection process, to say there is a consequence to that. You can't just jump out because you don't want to be distracted. We are trying to do something that leads to a settlement for everyone, and not participating in
the Bellwether process is your choice, but it comes with the consequence of you are no longer going to participate in the Zantac litigation.

THE COURT: Or any Zantac litigation, it is over with prejudice.

MR. WATTS: That is right.
THE COURT: Do you envision that this would be pursuant to a court order, or is it under 41(a)(1), that it would be just a notice, or (a) (2)? Are you -- and are you envisioning notices or stipulations under (1)(a), (a)(1)(A), or haven't you --

MR. WATTS: I think that we anticipate that people who just say $I$ don't want to do it, would do a stipulation under (a)(1)(A), but there may be a followup that is needed from your Honor. I assume that the Defendant would make that motion and then we would go further down the rule.

So, in other words, $I$ think we are anticipating that under this order, it is a voluntary dismissal under Rule 41(a)(1), but I think there are involuntary dismissals under 41(b), where a Plaintiff is, in effect, failing to prosecute or complying with the Court order, and therefore the Defendant at that time can move to dismiss the action or any claim against it, and you would have the authority, under Rule 41(b), to involuntarily dismiss such a non-compliant Plaintiff's case.

THE COURT: Just again, in other words, the dismissal
is because they don't want to participate in the Bellwether selection process.

MR. WATTS: Right.
THE COURT: And so the lawyer calls the client up and says you have been selected to be part of the initial -- you are part of the initial discovery pool, that has obligations, you need to do $X, Y$, and $Z$, the client says $I$ don't want to. So the lawyer informs the client then, well, therefore, I, on your behalf, am going to voluntarily dismiss your case. The lawyer would do it.

MR. WATTS: And to the extent that the lawyer can't get authority to do that, then we would notify the Court, and then the Defendant would make their motion under Rule $41(\mathrm{~b})$, and the Court would make the decision that it makes pursuant to its inherent power to enforce its court orders.

THE COURT: Okay, let's leave C Roman numeral I for a moment and go to Roman numeral II, the unfiled claimants.

So, it is only at that point where they are in the initial discovery pool, they have indicated they don't intend to proceed, they are still a claimant, lawyer either can reach claimant or cannot reach claimant. If lawyer reaches claimant, lawyer says to claimant, $I$ am going to file a short form complaint in the MDL on your behalf, and then $I$ am going to immediately file a notice of dismissal if you don't want to proceed with the Bellwether selection process.

If the lawyer can't reach the claimant, the lawyer is going to say -- or do nothing, and the Defense is going to have to move for a motion to compel the lawyer who can't reach the client to file a short form complaint to then have the court dismiss the case? Because the Court wouldn't be able to dismiss anything if they are still an unfiled claimant.

MR. WATTS: Judge, to be blunt, for the first 15 drafts I had without prejudice here because of this jurisdictional conundrum, and here is where $I$ think it comes down:

As to the 75 percent of the Plaintiffs that are going to file whatever certification we agree on, then $I$ think that certification is, in effect, promising to comply with the Court's orders with respect to the Bellwether selection process, and I think that would give you the authority to dismiss with prejudice.

As to the unfiled claimants who never signed a certification, if they are somehow selected, then $I$ think it is a gray area. I think you have authority over their lawyer, I think you are absolutely right, you can order the lawyer to do X. I think a party could take the position that you don't have jurisdiction over me, but $I$ think that Ms. Zousmer and the Defendants felt like you have the authority, given your ability to manage the case, to do this.

So, we acceded to turning that to with prejudice, but

I think it is a gray area with respect to people that never signed the certification, but I think you have authority over the lawyers and you can order the lawyer to do X. In effect, I think it would be a situation where, you know, people shouldn't be able to sit in the registry that is a product of this Court's orders, to get the benefits of it, and then to choose to just take their ball and go home without some consequence there. I will let the Defendants talk about it. MR. PULASKI: If I may, your Honor. Those that don't sign the certification that are in the registry, I think having them leave the registry and file their case, or do whatever they are going to do after that, would be the proper way to handle those cases as opposed to having them file a short form complaint.

At that point, if they haven't filed a certification, and then dismissing their case, removal from the registry at that time I think would be appropriate for those that, if chosen, didn't want to pursue it, but my understanding is, we are going to be working on those 75 percent that actually do file their certification. So it should be a moot point at that point anyway.

MS. ZOUSMER: I don't think we are going to have that gray area actually, because the only cases that should be in the pool at that point will have been certified. So, we are only going to draw from the randomizer initially cases that are
within that 75 percent certification, so we should be covered on that gray area.

THE COURT: Is there language -- I know we are staying away from certification to some extent, but we are not because we are actually talking about it, because you are still working on certain things.

Do you have certification language? Is this language you have already drafted as to what that language looks like?

MR. PULASKI: It is an area that we haven't come to an agreement on yet, which is part of the problem, which is why we don't have an agreed proposed order really to give you at this point. That is an area of concern that we are trying to work through, and I think within the next 48 hours, hopefully, we will be able to resolve that issue.

We have different drafts that we have gone back and forth on that we hope to get to soon, but until we reach agreement on that, it is in flux.

THE COURT: So the certification, then, is larger than just that which is explained in E, which is that they will not bring claims against non-diverse Defendants, and thus will file their complaints in the MDL if selected to be in the Bellwether trial. That is sort of how you -- the best I can tell, how you generally discuss certification in E.

Are you also saying that part of the certification would also be what you have in $C$, which is, and they intend to
proceed with their claim and be subject to discovery and deadlines set forth in this order? Kind of a two part, and that is why you are saying you are not worried about $C$ being a gray area, because the certification is broad enough to cover not just claims against non-diverse Defendants, but also certifying that you are going to intend to proceed, you kind of capture that pool at that point.

MR. WATTS: It is almost like authority to enter common benefit orders. There are different ways to touch a State Court case, but it is a voluntary action, or accepting something, and so that is kind of where we are from the standpoint of trying to buff out that gray area via certification.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PULASKI: If I may, and I know we are on the certification issue. Just minutes before we had talked about changing these dates, and Mikal discussed the fact that we had changed the dates such that we were done by February 1st regardless, and that we were going to start the process, and there was a date of December 10 th that we looked at that we are going to start using the randomizer to randomly select the 8 percent of each case.

As your Honor knows, we have a motion before the Court currently that is pending with respect to an extension of time for expert reports under PTO 65. We will continue to seek
relief from the Court on that matter, and want you to know that these dates are built in such that should that date change, it will not affect what is going on here in the Bellwether process.

MR. BAYMAN: Judge, Andrew Bayman. We have a different view of that. We believe that if you grant that motion and extend, all the dates extend, flow from the extension of the 35 days. I just don't want my silence to be acquiescence here. We have a very different view that if that motion is granted these Bellwether dates have to change.

THE COURT: Well, I would just say this, you all should discuss that. Obviously that motion hasn't been ruled on because it is not ripe. The Defendants will have a chance to respond and then the Plaintiffs will have a chance to reply, so it is briefing out.

I would think you would not want to submit another proposal to me in 48 hours that would be obsolete if the Court granted the motion, or granted it in part. You will have to explain that to the Court. Is it an applicable proposal regardless of the outcome? Is it not applicable if the Court rules one way, but not the other? I would want to know that.

It already sounds like you don't necessarily see eye to eye, so let's put that in the category of flagging that issue, and I will let you all talk about it off line.

MR. PULASKI: I am sure when we discuss over the next
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48 hours that will be a topic of discussion as well.
THE COURT: All right. The first part of $C$, it sounds like you are kind of drilling down a little bit more, you know, and maybe there will be clarity on -- such that we won't find this to be a gray area.

I would say that we should try to avoid gray areas. I think it is good when we can identify gray areas on the front end. Sometimes you can't always -- and there will continue to be instances where you can't anticipate everything and so you are playing catch up on the back end to account for things. There are so many things to think about on the front end it is going to happen, probably already has happened, will continue to happen, but if we have already caught something here as a potential gray area, let's try to make it not gray.

I know, we can talk in terms of Court's authority of this, Court's authority of that. If the Court has to exercise authority and feels it can and it should, it will, but let's try to leave as little to ambiguity and grayness if we can, given we have the benefit of all of these discussions, your discussions internally and our discussions today, to try to obviate the need for gray areas to the extent possible.

So, that was really the main part of $C$, and then $I$ understand that any one of them that comes out, the Defendants, at their option, can substitute from the pool, from the same cancer. So they have the ability to do that, that is not a
randomizer, and then you have these replacements. If the replacements don't intend to proceed, then same thing -- oh, then -- so, kind of first time Defendants have option to sort of hand pick people and then the second time it is the randomizer?

MR. WATTS: I think it is the reverse actually -- no, you are right, I am sorry. Yes, the idea is to do one and then the other, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So that takes us through II.
Then you were talking about III. So, then, III really has to do with rolling basis, serving signed medical authorizations that you would have already agreed to, I think you said by this Friday, and if there are any deficiencies, the Defendants are to notify leadership, giving Plaintiffs some time to cure the deficiencies in the medical authorization.

So when you say a deficiency in a medical authorization, what is an example?

MR. WATTS: Well, obviously if it is not signed or it is not filled out, that would be a deficiency. I think the primary area is the 1 through 5 on the types of doctors. If they just didn't fill it in, then we need to go back and check on it, or tell Mr. Bayman, hey, there is no Ranitidine prescribing physician, or whatever. For example, with an over the counter there might not be a Ranitidine prescribing physician, but with a prescription there is.

There will be some give and take there, and my suspicion would be that Ms. Zousmer's team will have a deficiency team that will notify us, we'll get it out there, and it will be a second check kind of stuff if there are any gaps, but $I$ don't think it is going to be a confrontational
thing. I just think it is filling in gaps.
THE COURT: Okay. That flows into C, which kind of raises that same question we kind of talked around a little bit in II $C$, the consequences of not timely correcting the deficiency is dismissal with prejudice. But these are not necessarily filed Plaintiffs, right?

We are still working with a group that are both filed and unfiled, so there is nothing to account for the kinds of things that you were trying to account for in II $C$ where, if they are unfiled, you file the short form, only to then immediately voluntarily dismiss. So I wasn't sure about that.

MS. ZOUSMER: The reason we have that, your Honor, is because after the certification up front, then we have the opt in period that we just talked about in II C where we give the selected Plaintiffs or claimants the two-week period to decide, hey, now that $I$ have been selected, do I want to continue with my case or claim or not? If not, they just voluntarily dismiss with prejudice.

After that, we need to know that the pool is really the pool, right? As each phase -- as we go through each phase
of the process, the dismissals have to be with prejudice in order to avoid sort of gerrymandering the system, as Mr. Watts puts it, and that is why we have that in there like that.

THE COURT: Right. I'm sorry, maybe I missed something. Are they filed at that point necessarily?

MS. ZOUSMER: No. I am just explaining why we have the with prejudice --

THE COURT: I wasn't necessarily questioning with prejudice. I was questioning how you even do anything, dismissal with anything, if they are not filed at that point, like who is doing what to get a dismissal.

Is it they are being dismissed from the registry? Is it like dismissing their claim, the actual case? In which case, wouldn't they have to be filed for that to happen? How do they get filed?

MS. ZOUSMER: It would be the same process as in II C, is my understanding of it. They would file a short form complaint and then that would be dismissed with prejudice.

THE COURT: Well, if that is the case, it probably should be spelled out like you spelled it out before, but it also sounded like that was that gray area that you all were going to work on anyway. Whatever you worked on for II C, I guess the same thing would apply to III C.

MR. PULASKI: We will work on that as well, your
Honor. That is correct.
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MR. WATTS: Judge, for the timing issues, we are dealing with medical authorizations that will be negotiated by Friday. We are dealing with people who will have been selected by December 10th, and as to my clients that are selected on December 10th, we are going to be starting right then. It is not like it is a two-week period of time, we have a good stretch of time.

There may be some litigation in front of your Honor about whether something was substantially complete after the deficiency, but we think this will be a cooperative process, and the idea is on both sides, not just the Defense side, we want the tools that we need to start ordering medical records. In order to do that we have to have a completed list of providers, and we have to have filled out medical authorizations so that both sides can get going when we get into the Bellwether discovery pool in section IV.

THE COURT: That brings me to D. To the extent there are disputes over the completeness or sufficiency of the authorizations, they will be presented and decided by the Court.

First of all, again, some of them aren't necessarily filed, so what is the Court's -- you know, is the Court adjudicating disputes both of filed Plaintiffs who are insufficient or incomplete in their medical authorizations, and then through its powers of managing the registry for the
claimants?

I mean, again, and the consequences of the claimants not complying, you know, how you get them in to be a filed Plaintiff to then be voluntarily -- although here you are really not talking about voluntary dismissals, so it is slightly different than II C. Or are you talking about this as being a voluntary dismissal process, or are you talking about this as being a Court sanctioned order of dismissal because they haven't complied with something?

And then wrapped in that question, do you really want to be bringing disputes to the Court, this medical authorization isn't complete, this is insufficient?

If this is a fairly concise, straightforward authorization of which you are within a few days of finalizing, wouldn't you be able to among yourselves ascertain exactly what complete and sufficient means? You put it right in the order, this is complete and this isn't, and just leave it at that and not have a whole ancillary dispute process before the court on completeness and sufficiency of medical authorizations?

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, I am happy to make that change.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WATTS: I don't think you are going to see a lot of this, Judge. The reality is, because of the consequence of what happens, $I$ doubt you are going to see too many lawyers
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coming in and saying, hey, I want to dismiss because of liability there and things like that. I don't think there is going to be a big dispute about what is a completed, properly filled out authorization, and whether you listed the five physicians that you were required to list or not. I don't think that is going to come up very often at all.

If it does, and the consequence is dismissal, that is obviously something that, unless the Plaintiff gives the lawyer authority to do so, we are going to have to come in front of the Court. There has to be a process, but I don't consider it to be something that is going to bog you down at all, I hope.

THE COURT: Okay. Those were my questions for Roman numeral III.

MR. WATTS: Your Honor, on Roman numeral IV, this is the Bellwether discovery pool, and again, at this point in time we are down to 25 per cancer or 8 percent of what is left. So we are in the hundreds, not the thousands or the tens of thousands. So, by December 3rd, we will agree on the form of a CPF Bellwether supplement and what happens is, between February 1st and April 30th, to the extent possible, the Plaintiffs and the claimants in the initial discovery pool will start serving, via LMI, the CPF Bellwether supplement and this time it is executed under oath.

When you think about it from a timing perspective, if we have the randomizer make its initial selection back on

December 10th, and we are in the hundreds, and of course there are over 200 law firms with cases in the registry, there will be some that have a number of clients that are in there, but we will get started on December 10th. We won't wait until February 1st, we will start seven weeks before getting this kind of information because we have already agreed on the form of the CPF Bellwether supplement.

For example, if a Watts Guerra Plaintiff gets selected by the randomizer on the 10th, job one is to immediately get them notice so they can make the decision whether they are going to participate or throw away their lawsuit. If they participate, then we are going to immediately start step two and fill out the information that is needed to order the records.

Then at the same time, and it will be simultaneously, we will start working on whatever the information that is necessary to do the CPF Bellwether supplement under oath.

The concept is, our deadine starts on February 1st, and the reason it continues for, in effect, the next three months is, we are trying to true up the information of what the Plaintiff thinks versus what the information is that their records show. This is the Plaintiff's opportunity to, in effect, true up what is -- to true up whatever the questions are. This would be like interrogatory answers that have to be sworn to under oath, and we will do that on a rolling basis
between February 1st and April 30th.
We will go through that same deficiency process. If there are answers that are not filled in, the Defendants will notify the Plaintiffs, and at the time they notify us we will have 14 days, but in no event later than May 14, 2022, to clean up whatever was deficient.

Paragraph 3 of subsection A is, obviously, if we have problems there is the consequence, and replacement Plaintiffs so that we can get the replacement Plaintiffs' sworn to CPF Bellwether supplements by June 3rd.

The concept is, before any of the discovery really starts the Plaintiffs and the Defendants have sworn to information from each of the Plaintiffs from which they are selecting potential trial Bellwethers.

So, as long as we get that done by June 3rd, with respect to the original selected Plaintiffs and claimants, and the replacement selected Plaintiffs and claimants by June 3rd, then we are in good shape to hit all the deadlines that are coming with respect to what is going to be Subsection $B$, the vetting for eligibility criteria, which I will get to in a second, and then later on, when the Court gets around to ruling on Daubert, we will be starting to select trial Plaintiffs and the like.

If you'd like, I am happy to go into the vetting for eligibility criteria, or stop here at subsection $A$ and answer
any questions you have.
THE COURT: Maybe stop there. I take it you haven't drafted the CPF Bellwether supplement yet.

MR. WATTS: Not yet.
THE COURT: Is it what would be comparable to like a Plaintiff's fact sheet? Is that what you are envisioning, this it would be in lieu of -- but it would be at the same time that one would have otherwise in other cases had a Plaintiff fact sheet?

MR. WATTS: Right. We will have the typical scrum where I want the Plaintiff fact sheet to be three sentences long and they want it to be 25 pages long. We will negotiate that and we will get it to your Honor by December the 3rd, and if we are having any problems, I am sure the special master will let you know.

It is important that we get that adjudicated about the time of the randomization, by December 10 th, so that we have a CPF Bellwether supplement in form that is approved by the Court so we can start getting it filled out.

THE COURT: You say it is certified, so certified meaning it has the same -- you are envisioning it would have the same legal effect as, say, a sworn interrogatory?

MR. WATTS: It will be sworn to, yeah, it will be sworn testimony. We will probably do it via whatever the Federal statute says you can do it, digitally. It will have
the same effect, it will be under penalty of perjury.
THE COURT: Uh-hum. Okay. And then again, just the same types of questions for paragraphs 3 and 4 of subsection A, you know, the dismiss with prejudice, again $I$ am just sort of trying to make that link between those who are still unfiled at this point, and then sort of the completeness or sufficiency and, you know, wondering -- well, two things.

Number one, are you in a position to give greater thought to what that is at this juncture for this type of an order or not? So again, $I$ am flagging issues, $I$ am not going to put you on the spot right now, but these are the things that came to mind to avoid disputes down the road. And then again, to the extent that there are disputes, that they are adjudicated by the Court, that is its own issue.

Then secondly, as to those unfiled claimants, you know, the mechanism by which the Court is adjudicating and ultimately contemplated to dismiss with prejudice.

I mean, I keep coming back to -- and again, you don't have to answer it, but is there a reason why, when we have gotten to this point, or all these different stages, why you wouldn't want all of these persons in these pools to be filed Plaintiffs at that point?

Again, I don't want to put anyone on the spot if it is a contentious issue. Maybe I haven't thought through everything, but $I$ keep coming back to that.

MR. PULASKI: If I may, your Honor. At some point down the line they will become filed when we narrow this pool a little further. I think that, pursuant to PTO 15 where it discusses this issue that we thought about early on in March of 2020, you know, it discusses a mechanism by which they are dismissed without prejudice, and there is no procedure unless they have to file a claim, so that you then have to dismiss the claim.

I think that Ms. Zousmer and Mr. Bayman and I and Mr. Watts will talk about that over the next 48 hours to come up with a solution that alleviates the burden of you having to deal with things that you shouldn't be dealing with, and us being able to resolve things in a more efficient manner so that we can move on through this process a little more easily.

THE COURT: I don't have PTO 15 in front of me so I don't know exactly what you are looking at. But also to make sure process and authority and, you know, everything that goes along with that is really buttoned up.

MR. WATTS: Sure.
THE COURT: It's really buttoned up.
MR. WATTS: This is why we need the extra 48 hours. We think we have solutions to a lot of this, but it is not there yet obviously.

THE COURT: Okay. All righty. Did you want to move on to B?

MR. WATTS: Sure. Frankly, I want to give Mr. Bayman credit for this one. The concept is that at a certain point in time we are going to get the CPF Bellwether supplements, we are going to be getting in medical records, and through no fault of anybody's -- I mean, this is a product that had been on the market for 36 years and memories do fade, so time of usage may be different.

Somebody may think that they have been on Zantac since 1968, and of course we know that can't possibly be true because it wasn't sold in the United States until 1983. Records may come in and show something where somebody thought they were on Zantac and it turns out they were on Prilosec, these kinds of examples.

Mr. Bayman's thoughts to me, and I bought into it, was, why would we want to continue to spend resources doing discovery on somebody who so obviously not lied, just got it wrong, either through faded memory or product ID or the like.

The concept is that by March 1, 2022, we will be far enough into the CPF Bellwether process where we have a bunch of answers, we are ordering records, that we are going to start seeing some red flags, it happens in every case, and we will learn some things that we can't even fathom right now.

The idea would be we are just trying to get rid of the theater of the absurd, if there are certain Plaintiffs that said $X$ and the records say $Y$, or it is not possible that the

Defendants that are in the case were in fact the providers of the product. It may be that somebody thought that they were on a GSK supplied Zantac the whole time and they were on a generic, these kinds of things.

What $I$ think we are both anticipating is a very simplistic elimination factor to get rid of cases that wouldn't make any sense to waste the Court's time to try.

I don't want to take a Defense verdict on somebody that said they were taking Boehringer Ingelheim stuff when they weren't, and frankly, Mr. Bayman doesn't want a Plaintiff's verdict on something that went wrong. So, we are throwing this in as almost like a place holder.

When we get smarter, looking at all this stuff, we are going to come up with a list of reasons why somebody shouldn't be a Bellwether, and we will agree on it, otherwise it won't be there. But if we have an eligibility criteria, it will be agreed to by March 1st, and then as we continue to get into records and the $C P F$ Bellwether supplements we'll entertain -or we'll enter into a discourse with each other about, hey, Paul Plaintiff over here, or Sally over there, she probably wouldn't be a good Plaintiff because she got her dates wrong or she was on the generic, this or that.

So, that is what this is really all about, and the bottom line is that we are anticipating that by August 15 -well, by August lst, if we can do a joint list of which ones to
take out we will do that. If there is a disagreement, we will come to your Honor by August 15th, and the concept is that we can eliminate the outliers that probably aren't going to be representative.

THE COURT: So, if you can't agree -- you are going to have to agree, first of all, what the eligibility criteria is by March 1, and if you can't agree -- well, you don't provide for if you can't agree on eligibility criteria, you just say you are going to agree. I don't know, I am just -- should there be something that happens if you can't agree? That's number one. Maybe not, maybe.

Number two, let's assume you agree; if you then cannot agree on who satisfies the agreed upon eligibility criteria, you each submit your list of those whom you think do not satisfy the eligibility criteria. Plaintiff could have, let's say, ten, Defense could have five, maybe the five overlap, but the Plaintiff have five more, or vice versa. The Court looks at those that the parties don't agree on and makes a decision, yes, satisfies criteria, no, doesn't. If they satisfy, they stay in; if they don't, they are out.

MR. WATTS: Exactly. In other words, at a certain point we are going to rely upon the good judgment of the court. Of course, you have the authority anyway to decide whether you want to expend the Court's resources to try this case or that case, but we are asking you to do that before we start the
formal discovery process so we don't waste a bunch of time. MR. BAYMAN: Your Honor, if I might, Andrew Bayman. There are other cases that we were contemplating that wouldn't be representative Plaintiffs, someone who got a previous diagnosis of cancer right before taking Zantac, for example.

The records will help to inform us of what we are looking at. I don't think all mistakes can be vetted out, but I think this is a way that if we say -- for example, we find out a claim that is clearly barred by the statute of Limitations or statute of Repose, this is a way to get rid of those at this point in the process rather than going through expensive discovery on cases that really don't belong.

It is not perfect, and as I say, I don't know that you can vet out all mistakes, but $I$ think we can come up with a list of things where we both agree this doesn't make any sense to be in a pool that we are doing discovery.

THE COURT: Is it possible that the CPF supplement might be different than the original $C P F$, and that in and of itself might be they didn't meet the eligibility criteria because they are saying two different things at two different times?

MR. BAYMAN: Or they have corrected for what was incorrect in the past when they are under oath, and they have to make that verification.

MR. WATTS: I don't think that makes them ineligible,
but at the same time, we are trying to clean up the facts, in effect, before we started the process of spending big dollars doing discovery and deciding which claims we want to try.

MR. BAYMAN: It might make them ineligible if they took a different product or if they took it at a different time, something like that.

MR. WATTS: Agreed.

THE COURT: Okay. I think you meant in paragraph four on page seven where it says, Plaintiff will provide LMI the disclosed cancers on December 20, and terminate the records collection process in cases involving Plaintiff's -- is it not alleging?

MR. BAYMAN: Yes, your Honor, we caught that this weekend. It is not alleging.

MR. PULASKI: Again, your Honor, that date may change depending upon our motion that is before you.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. WATTS: Judge, we had some typos in here because my colleagues in Atlanta got a little tipsy after watching the Falcons win, so there were things that were missed.

MR. BAYMAN: More like the Braves, your Honor.
MR. WATTS: The Braves could have done it, too, that's right.

THE COURT: Well, you are getting another shot at it, no worries, this is draft.

Okay. So, then you get to paragraph V, Roman numeral V.

MR. WATTS: Yes, ma'am. This is the part that starts with your rulings on general causation, Daubert, whenever that may be, and of course we will leaves that to the Court's discretion as to when. That is why we put the summer or fall. I put the summer, they put the fall, and there we are, whenever it happens.

THE COURT: Right now, under your current PTO 65, under the only governing order, I want to say it is July 18th that they are ripe. Right?

MR. WATTS: Yes.
THE COURT: The Court can't do anything before that date, that is for sure, but $I$ guess the Plaintiffs are asking for a later date it sounds like. PTO 65 has the replies due on general causation on July 18th.

MR. WATTS: Right. I guess our point is, we didn't want to be so presumptive to tell the Court how fast you have to rule. So the rest of the order hinges -- it is almost like day zero when you do rule and then we go.

So, beginning on page seven, paragraph $V$, we say we anticipate that sometime in the summer or the fall -- of course I'd like the summer, they'd like the fall, but it is what it is -- and then we go and we start setting the order of the permitted cancers.

We use the Microsoft randomizer with respect to the cancers that remain to, in effect, sequence the cancers in a certain order. The first two permitted cancers selected by the Microsoft randomizer will be phase one cancers, and the second two will be the phase two cancers.

The rest of this order is largely focused on the phase one cancers to get us to trial number 1. We would anticipate that shortly after Daubert there would be some motion practice as to how do we get ready on cases, you know, whatever you want to try.

But with respect to phase one, the concept is that the randomizer selects eight Bellwether cases per cancer, and then we have an immediate deselection. Remember I told you at the last hearing we have selection, deselection, selection, deselection, with the randomizer thrown in. The idea here, to use my Vioxx example, is to get rid of the marathon runner and the 295-pound person blaming his heart attack on a pill.

So, each side for whatever reason can strike one to get us from eight to six per cancer in phase one, and at that point specific written discovery begins on that date, and then other case specific discovery, i.e. depositions, start the following Monday, we start noticing and the like, we work on schedules.

Again, at this point, if a Bellwether trial plan or somebody in the Bellwether trial pool dismisses their case, the

Defendants get to pick replacements, so in effect it costs me a strike later on because they will pick the worst one left and I'll try to get rid of that. If I lose a Plaintiff because I let them out or for gamesmanship, or whatever, it is punitive towards the Plaintiff to prevent that from happening.

At this point, there is going to be a total of 12 Plaintiffs in the Bellwether trial pool so that will be -- by the way, I mean the phase one Bellwether trial pool, six per. At this point, we are going to file an individual complaint using the short form complaint process at this point, and you are supposed to tie your pleading to what is in your CPF Bellwether supplement so that the facts are all lined up, so we have coherence between the facts pled and the facts that we know to be true as sworn to by the Plaintiff.

Of course, if they plead something that is inconsistent, they are not allowed to, and so if they do plead something that is inconsistent at this point, the Defendants get to substitute another Plaintiff in this final discovery pool to keep that from happening.

That puts the onus on us in the springtime and through the supplemental process to get the facts right so that we are all of one mind before we're selecting as to what the facts are.

At that point, when the complaints are done, the Defendants have three weeks to respond to those complaints, and
then we have a process where in the middle of the discovery process, 70 days in, each side gets to strike another one. This was also Mr. Bayman's idea and I give him credit for it. If you take some depositions and you find out somebody is a four-time felon, that is not going to be my idea of a good Plaintiffs' pick. If Mr. Bayman takes a deposition and it's the world's best Plaintiff, he may want to strike that person. So, again, we are selecting, deselecting, trying to get to the top of the bell curve.

After that deselection of one case per cancer 70 days in, then the remaining cases will constitute the final Bellwether trial pool, and so, the case specific discovery closes 95 days after it starts, and only for good cause shown, and probably on the word of this Court, can you take a deposition after that 90 days.

Now, the idea is we get all the phase one discovery done first and then we hit you with a proposed order about how to do phase two, so that we are not waiting on the trial in phase one to get the phase two cases ready. At the same time we have all of the teachings, having gone through the discovery process, and if we need to modify this order with respect to phase two, we will do that, and we will provide you proposals for how to select those phase two cases within 14 days of the close of the phase one cases.

THE COURT: How many trials are -- phase one cancers
are two cancers.

MR. WATTS: Yes.

THE COURT: And you had six in each, so 12, and then it goes down to --

MR. WATTS: Four.

THE COURT: Four in each, eight, and then what does it go down to?

MR. WATTS: So, here is the thing we decided to kick, and that is, you are going to notice later on with respect to which cases are being tried that there is a parenthetical with an $S$ around the Plaintiffs. I will just set out --

THE COURT: What page is that?
MR. WATTS: Eleven, paragraph two. The Court will decide which Plaintiff, open paren, $S$, close paren. That is very purposeful, and just to predict for you -- this is something we don't need to brief for some time -- the Plaintiffs will take the position that you should try multi Plaintiff trials for efficiency's sake, and the Defendants have already said they want to do it one at a time. We are not here to litigate that with you or anything like that.

We'll cite to what Judge Rogers is doing with the $3 M$ ear plugs, and of course they will say that's not fair, you will have to decide.

The point is, where $I$ have seen this messed up is when people say, hey, Judge, right now we want four Plaintiffs per
and we don't know anything about the Plaintiffs, we haven't gone through discovery yet. So, before we decide what is fair, we need to know how the different cases line up, similarities, deficiencies, dissimilarities, and the like, but we are projecting to you our intention to go through a motions practice at some point where $I$ will ask you to try multiple Plaintiffs at once, and they will ask you to do it one at a time, and you will make the call. You shouldn't make that until we have all the discovery done so we know what the similarities of the case are at that time.

THE COURT: How many eligible --
MR. WATTS: Four --
THE COURT: -- Plaintiffs? At that point there will be four in phase one.

MR. WATTS: Yes.
THE COURT: You are saying there might be a dispute about Plaintiffs saying try all four -- bring all four, consolidate all four into one trial, and Defendants might say have four separate trials, but we are talking about four Plaintiffs.

MR. WATTS: That is right.
THE COURT: And then four in phase two.
MR. WATTS: No. Remember phase one has two different cancers, so phase one is actually two different trials, and then phase two is trials three and four.

MR. PULASKI: Cancers three and four.

MS. ZOUSMER: Phase one cancers would be trial one and two.

THE COURT: So, phase one cancers are two cancers, four Plaintiffs in each.

MR. WATTS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. ZOUSMER: Correct.

THE COURT: The idea would be, however that is done, that all eight get tried?

MR. WATTS: Well, it could be. If you don't buy my argument that you should try them together, you may decide to try one and then go on to a separate cancer. It is up to you.

MS. ZOUSMER: From our perspective, we were envisioning a process where you tried one case for cancer one, and then one case for cancer two, and then we go to the next phase.

THE COURT: Right. So when you want -- would you want phase two cancers to be ready at the same -- on or about the same time as phase one cancers? How far apart are they in terms of their readiness for trial?

MR. WATTS: Let me answer that question for you. You will notice that on page nine, at the end of the discovery on phase one we will provide with you a plan with respect to how to schedule the selection and discovery in phase two.

So, the concept would be that phase two discovery is
taking place, we say simultaneous with the pretrial schedule for phase one. Somebody may take the position that is spreading law firms with 2,000 lawyers too thin, but we will see where we go when we get there.

The bottom line is, you will have to set that schedule. We will see if we can negotiate that where we have one team doing the phase two discovery while the trial team in phase one is getting ready to try the first trial, and the second trial.

We had previous versions of this where I wanted to schedule all four trials right now, and ultimately they talked me into a more orderly process where let's go through it first, let's get smart and then we'll propose to you a schedule that allows you to sequence things as you want. Of course, nobody loves the delicious anarchy that is taking place in $3 M$ earplugs right now. The Court is trying to force everybody to some degree of sanity and the court is trying cases all over the place and the like.

After the first trial that may become appropriate, but I am not sure it is appropriate for me to ask you for that right now because we don't know how this is going to shake out.

MR. BAYMAN: Your Honor, if $I$ may, at this point, we don't know which Defendants will be in which case. You may not want to try two cases in a row against the same company, for example. There are just a lot of things we don't know right
now.

MR. WATTS: I agree with Mr. Bayman.

MR. BAYMAN: Your Honor, one other point, if I may intervene again, we also don't know as we sit here today -this is pre Daubert, so we don't know what the landscape looks like until after your Daubert rulings. Some of these cancers may not be here.

MR. WATTS: Then again, they all may be.
THE COURT: Would it make sense, and again this is just a question, to keep Roman numeral VI and VII as sort of separate orders? It seems like everything up until then is all about the Bellwether selection process that brings us to -well, except for -- I guess you talk about case specific discovery in $V$, and you have a 95 -day period for case specific discovery to take place.

So it is kind of a selection process plus an amount of time for discovery, and then everything after that is sort of, I guess, what happens after that.

Does it, in your view, make sense to project that far out in one order, or to keep those orders separate and maybe the pretrial schedule gets set at a different point a little bit later on when maybe we are armed with more information?

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, we were trying to keep the train on schedule on the track, and these dates for us got us to a point where we could have our trial in a short enough time
that -- and a long enough time that allowed for everything to occur, but got us to trial at a date -- at the earliest possible date we could, making sure that everything was done properly.

MR. WATTS: Judge, Mikal Watts. I will tell you that section VI was carefully analyzed by the parties and the dates all fit perfectly to get the first trial within nine to 12 months of Daubert, which is what you told us to do, and we have it starting in July. Of course, if you are going to be on vacation that week, then we need to know that, but I think it is important from the standpoint of the MDL's role in this litigation that we have a firm trial setting now.

There are State Court trials that are popping up in May, August, October of next year before this trial happens. They will continue to get set, but if there is going to be any honor among thieves in terms of not setting all sorts of State Court trials on the same day that your Honor is trying the case, we need a date.

So, we believe that the July 2023 gives us that hard date so that we can caution our State Court colleagues, don't set these people for trial on the same date. We think that is appropriate.

THE COURT: In your motion, which I don't want to get into the merits, and we haven't gotten a response yet, but you asked for the Court to push your ripe date back to August for

Daubert. So, whether you are talking about July or August for the ripe date, based on your experience with cases of this nature, size, and complexity, what have you seen other Courts do? From the date of Daubert motions being ripe through hearing, through rulings, what amount of time are you seeing for rulings to come out on all Daubert motions?

MR. WATTS: I see it in two different ways. You know, the Court could certainly get the Bellwether selection process going by ruling from the bench, if you choose to do so. That happens a lot where somebody says, I am going to let him testify, I am going to let her testify, or $I$ am not going to let this person testify about that.

Or if you want to write them all out, my experience has been we haven't seen a lot of delay in this Court in terms of getting rulings, so I am not particularly worried about it, but the ripe date of July to August, for me, has no bearing whatsoever on the ability to get this date.

I know my friend, Mr. Bayman, disagrees, but it is really a function of how long you think you will take after all the pleadings are in, the motions, the responses, the replies, for you to make a ruling. But there are all sorts of summary adjudications followed by in-depth rulings later on, and knowing that all this is dependent upon how you rule, but $I$ wouldn't presume -- I do know the case law is clear that how you conduct Daubert, how you choose to rule is completely
within your discretion.

The problem is that we think whether it is ripe in July or August, as long as you hit these days within a typical amount of time that you have been ruling, it is going to be fine.

THE COURT: I don't know that there is any typical yet because I haven't had any Daubert rulings, but if you use Motions to Dismiss, you know, they have been different with every round, but again, $I$ don't know that they are analogous.

Did you want to say something, Mr. Bayman?
MR. BAYMAN: Yes, your Honor, thank you. I'd actually like to phone a friend if $I$ can on this one. Could I ask Mr. Petrosinelli, who was going to appear, but we were more in the mechanics of this, but we have been talking about this very issue. I was going to let him address it if $I$ could.

THE COURT: Everybody can phone one friend.
MR. PETROSINELLI: I am glad I am the friend Mr. Bayman is phoning. This Joe Petrosinelli, good afternoon, your Honor.

The size of this litigation, you have to assume that -- and given the number of cancers that are being pursued, whether it is carved back from ten or not, that there will be substantial Daubert briefs. I think in most Federal MDLs of this size the Court would have evidentiary hearings where the experts would come in and testify and be cross-examined, and
then your Honor would need time, so there would be time that would be needed to set that hearing, and then there would need to be time for the Court to reach its decision.

To me, just being realistic here, from the time of the ripeness of the motion, which right now is July 19th, to the time that the Court would actually issue decisions, particularly if it is going to be eight cancers or something like that -- your Honor is a prolific writer, but that is going to take some time, I would think. That is why, to us, the PTO 65 dates were so critical and were paired with this Bellwether order.

So, I think it's going to be a couple of months for sure after the ripeness date of the motion, and that is why, as Mr. Watts said, we didn't know exactly what to put about when to assume it would be done, but $I$ think the fall is much more realistic under the current schedule.

If the schedule gets pushed back five weeks, that is another five weeks added, and now you are into the late fall, early winter, which we oppose, and you will get our opposition on that. That is my view, is that this is going to be a major evidentiary proceeding that is going to require a lot of resources and then effort by the Court to rule on what are really going to be separate motions dealing with separate cancers.

THE COURT: So, I was just looking into, for example,
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Roundup, I remember one cancer and it was many, many months. I am checking as to when that order came out.

MR. PETROSINELLI: The last one, your Honor, I did, which was a cancer in a Federal MDL, the Daubert hearing was in October and the ruling came out in January. We had a two-week evidentiary hearing, and then the order came out within two and a half to three months of that. There were the holidays in between there, so that is -- obviously that took out some of the time, but $I$ think that seems realistic to me.

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, I don't know -- if and when the time comes there may be ten cancers, there may be eight cancers, there may be nine cancers, but in my experience so far with this Court, and not that you don't need time to make a very well thought out and concerned decision as it relates to this because it is an important decision as it relates to the litigation, $I$ just don't see this pushing off into winter ever.

But even with our request for an extension, I still think that we would have time to get through this with our experts and our presentations and your rulings by fall at the latest, but I --

THE COURT: What is the latest date that the Court would need to issue all of its rulings by which you could adhere to a July 2023 Bellwether trial? By what date would you need the ruling?

Because right now you have -- for example, on page ten
in VI B you have: If, however, the Court has not ruled on the parties' case specific dispositive and Daubert motions by May 19th -- well, of course $I$ won't have ruled on them by May 19th, because they are not even ripe by May 19th.

So, I mean, how did you arrive at the July date if it was tethered to if I haven't ruled on them by May?

MR. PETROSINELLI: Your Honor, those are the case specific Daubert motions. In other words, we are talking about the general causation Daubert motions which is going to be fully briefed by July of 2022, and then -- to answer your question, the assumption would be they really would have to be decided around Septemberish to stick with a July 2023 trial date.

Then layered on top of that you would have case specific Daubert motions, and those are the ones that would be briefed and decided by May 19, 2023.

MR. PULASKI: I think when we were going through those dates we were of the opinion that we could get -- that we may get a decision from your Honor in August or September.

THE COURT: Now you are asking for ripe dates in August, so that wouldn't be possible, unless you are truly imagining a ruling from the bench. Again, I don't want to get into the merits.

MR. PULASKI: That is why we have this laid out here in the way we did, which is, as Mikal said, kind of ground
zero, or day zero, and we are going from the time of your ruling, and if it is such that we don't have a July trial date, and it turns into a August trial date, well then it turns into an August trial date, and there is nothing that we can do about that.

We are hopeful that we can keep the train on track on our side and hopefully we can make presentations to you that are, obviously, with our experts and the Defense experts -- I mean with the Defense work that they are going to do, you will have your information there and you will take the time that you need and, you know, we were all hopeful that we could get it done by August or September. If we can't, we can't, and we will move on.

We certainly don't want that to affect your decision process on our motion for extension because every aspect of this trial and this litigation is important, and if certain things get pushed back a little, I still think we can keep the train on track, but if for some reason things get moved, again, we are working from day zero as opposed to a date certain.

MR. WATTS: Judge, Mikal Watts, if I could say one other thing. The honest answer is, if you tell us the date you want to try the case, we can make the order work. This was an effort to try to hit nine to 12 months after Daubert. Ms. Zousmer may correct me, but $I$ think we settled at about ten and a half months, $I$ am not exactly sure.

The point is that the July 17 th date, which is agreed to, that makes the MDL trial the sixth trial. You have the one in Texas in May, the one in Illinois in August, the first Bellwether in California on October $10 t h$, the second Bellwether on February 6th, the third bellwether on May 1st, and the fourth on August 7th.

So, my point is, the ability to have a hard date is incredibly important to our ability to not have multiple trials going at the same time, unless you want that to happen, which happens all the time by the way.

Our thought is that the July 17th slot is open right now, it fits. If we get to the end of Daubert and we need to have an amended Bellwether order to make that date work, then we will get with you and do that. This is kind of projective, but I do think it would be a mistake for the MDL judge to not have a date out there, in fact I'd rather have four, just so we can get them on the books, but that is your call how you want to do it.

This is an order that was designed -- as you said, the Court is anticipating nine to 12 months after Daubert, so we designed it that way. If you want it faster, in my view, we can try this case in April, but that is not going to happen, not here anyway, but whenever you want to try the case, tell us and then we will work backwards and make the dates work.

MR. PULASKI: I think just as recently as the Paraquat
litigation where a trial date was set early on in the litigation and everyone was working the schedule to fit so that they could get to that trial date on time, like Mikal said, I think that at some point after Daubert, if we need to adjust this Bellwether order so that we can stay on the track and get the case tried in July, and if we have further dates already laid out by this Court, that may also be helpful, but we would be able to stay on track.

I think we could work with Mr. Bayman and Mr. Petrosinelli and Ms. Zousmer to get there. We have been able to do that so far and I don't see is not being able to do that if we need to move on the fly.

THE COURT: I just was -- you know, it's a different case, but Roundup, four months from the motion ripening to the hearing and four months from the hearing to the ruling for one cancer.

MR. PETROSINELLI: It sounds like they should cut their list down to one cancer.

MR. WATTS: If you will pay what was paid in Roundup, we will work with you.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think -- let me see if there is anything more -- did you cover everything that you wanted to -- I know that I have the one question that goes to your randomization for phase one and phase two cancers.

Had you considered whether certain cancers impact
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greater numbers of Plaintiffs, as indicated on your page two of your proposal, whether the order of the cancers to be tried should be random as opposed to where certain cancers may impact greater numbers of Plaintiffs?

MR. WATTS: Judge, the first draft I sent over said exactly that. If this Court were the only jurisdiction trying the cases, that would be a material concern, in other words, if somehow the randomizer picked a cancer that had the smallest number of Plaintiffs.

But as long as we know when that randomization occurs that we have a hole in the State/Federal trial schedule, and we need to slot in a pancreatic cancer, for example, we can fill those slots by virtue of which State Court jurisdiction we press the next cross setting for, so we kind of get those in. We would do that, I would anticipate, in coordination with your Honor consulting with her State Court colleagues to utilize the State Courts as an avenue to help in that regard.

MS. ZOUSMER: Your Honor, the reason that we set them as random was because we anticipate that the parties will have differing views on which cancers to be tried first. So, because of the way the schedule is set up we wanted to eliminate the dispute time, like the back and forth that we probably would have over deciding the order of the cancers, just make it random, and then start case specific discovery right away.

So, it is a practical efficient way to keep us on schedule, and there are cases, as Mr. Watts said, outside of the Florida pool so that the prevalence issue -- even if there is a smaller pool in Florida, those cases will still provide learning for the whole MDL, so the cancer types across the board.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else that you wanted to cover?

MR. PULASKI: I think that is it, your Honor.

MR. BAYMAN: Nothing from the Defense, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. WATTS: I would tell the Court that --

THE COURT: I am sorry, Mr. Watts, could you repeat
that? Ms. Stipes didn't hear what you just said.
MR. WATTS: On page 11, paragraph seven, all case settings, it says: The Court intends to issue subsequent orders setting a date for the second through fourth Bellwether trials.

I can tell the court it is up to you when you want to do that, but if you say, hey, I want to try the first one July 17th, I'd like the next one two months later, and the third one two months after that, the fourth one two months after that, we can work on those orders now.

If you want to wait until we go through the process and do that later on in the process, we can do that then as
well. It is up to you. To the extent that you think having slots -- not that you couldn't, under the supremacy clause, trample over anybody else's schedule you want to, but if you want to pick those and say, okay, this is good for my schedule and I want to try four cases, tell us what those dates are and we will work on subsequent Bellwether selection orders for those. It doesn't have to be right now, but I'm saying we don't have to wait until the end.

THE COURT: How long do you think each trial will last?

MR. WATTS: The first one always lasts longer. We were joking about this a few meetings back. I don't know that there is a way to give you an honest answer unless $I$ can tell you which Plaintiff is picked and how many of the Defendants are in the case.

In other words, if I have somebody that took Mr. Sachse's pill and then took Mr. Petrosinelli's pill and then took Mr. Bayman's pill and then ended up taking Mr. Agneshwar's pill, that is a longer trial than if we have somebody whose usage facts just have one or two of them.

My experience has been arguing over the admissibility takes a long time, so lots of pretrial, but after that they tend to go really fast. What happened up in Pensacola is a good example. The first trial went four, five weeksish, and now she is knocking them out two at a time.

THE COURT: You are talking about Judge Rogers in 3M? MR. WATTS: I am.

THE COURT: She is working off of time trials, so they are limited to two weeks.

MR. WATTS: I am in favor of that after the first Bellwether. I think you can turn these into eight-week monstrosities and get through and get jurors' attitudes. It is going to be dependent on how many Defendants there are, is the honest answer.

THE COURT: Are the same lawyers trying all of the Bellwether trials or will there be different sets of lawyers for each Bellwether trial?

MR. WATTS: Are you talking in $3 M$ or here?

THE COURT: Here.

MR. WATTS: So, there is flexibility for that to happen. There is also, depending upon -- I work at the will of the Court. If you want separate trial teams, we can make that happen. If you want me in all of them I am happy to do that. We will have lots of lawyers ready to participate in lots of trials if you want that to happen.

THE COURT: I am just thinking out loud without any sense of how they will play out, but if, hypothetically, the Court set them back to back, presumably whether the same lawyers were trying those cases would have some impact, it might be hard for the same lawyer to come out of one trial on

Friday, go back into a new trial on Monday, but maybe the Court can do that more readily.

How viable an option is that as it relates to Plaintiff or Defense trial counsel?

MR. WATTS: I have one that plans on me being in trial the entirety of 2023, trying Zantac cases over and over again.

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, I think you will see different lawyers on different trial teams, and while one case is being tried, the other one will be worked up and ready to go and prepared and ready to start immediately thereafter if you are ready to shotgun these and go one after the other.

MS. ZOUSMER: We don't have that information yet, we don't know which Defendants are going to be in the case or what these trials are going to look like. Until we have a better sense of that, $I$ think it would be very difficult to set a schedule of trial after trial after trial and any sort of date that makes sense at this point, honestly.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, your plan is to go back to the drawing board with some of the points we discussed and other ones that you have been working on, and you think you are in a position -- you mentioned the 48 hours. Is that realistic for you? Today is --

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, with the additional items that we brought up where there still may be some discrepancies or some confusion -- not confusion, but some things we really
need to work out to make things perfectly clear where there is no gray area and everything is black and white, I think a little bit longer than 48 hours would be good so that we don't disappoint the Court and ourselves in not being able to finish this.

I would think hope that we could get it done by Friday, which would give us four days to get everything worked out and finished. If we can get it done sooner, we will submit it to you earlier.

MR. BAYMAN: Your Honor, for the Defense, I would agree with Mr. Pulaski that this is a longer list than we were anticipating when we gave 48 hours. I think a week is probably more realistic.

THE COURT: Well, I want you to take the time that you need, so we can leave it open. I am just trying to think whether you can still be doing some of the things that you were otherwise going to be doing before the order gets entered. For example, I would think you could be working on the agreement on the signed medical authorization, the medical authorization -medical or other authorizations, which was supposed to be October 13, and --

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, we already have an authorization agreement in place for the class aspect of the case, so that should be an easy process for us to --

MS. ZOUSMER: We are just working on getting
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agreement.
THE COURT: Ideally, while you are working on it -- I wouldn't think that working on it and then having the Court enter the order, whether it is the end of this week or next week, should impact any of the dates any further. You have already said the dates you have in this version are slightly changing, but there shouldn't be any reason why they should change any more based on your revising and the Court entering the order, right?

MR. WATTS: That is right. Monday is not going to move anything.

THE COURT: The next date you have is November 15th, where at least the 75 percent certify, and then your dates --

MR. WATTS: That has been changing.
THE COURT: That is the next date, and then you have the randomizer, the next date. Presumably the order will be entered before all of that, so really the only date that has come and gone is the medical authorization date, right?

MR. WATTS: Right. Can we submit it to you on Monday and order by Tuesday?

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, go forth. That's all --

MR. BAYMAN: We will do it as quickly as we can, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate it. Thank you,
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everyone, thanks for your time and all of the work put into it and the effort to explain your thinking to the court. I appreciate it.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Thank you, Judge.

MR. WATTS: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Have a nice day, everybody, be well. (Thereupon, the hearing was concluded.)
* * *
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| 64/2 65/6 68/16 76/3 | 2 | 70 [2] 54/2 54/10 |
| MR. PULASKI: [24] 3/10 6/17 | 2,000 [1] 58/3 | $\text { 713-664-4555 [1] } 1 / 14$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}8 / 1 & 12 / 3 & 12 / 18 & 13 / 7 & 30 / 8 \\ 31 / 8 & 32 / 14 & 33 / 24 & 37 / 23 & 39 / 19\end{array}$ | 20 [1] 50/10 | 725 [1] 2/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 8 & 32 / 14 & 33 / 24 & 37 / 23 & 39 / 19 \\ 44 / 25 & 50 / 14 & 56 / 25 & 59 / 22 & 64 / 9\end{array}$ | 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG [1] | 7300 [1] 16/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 44 / 25 & 50 / 14 & 56 / 25 & 59 / 22 & 64 / 9 \\ 65 / 16 & 65 / 23 & 67 / 24 & 70 / 8 & 73 / 6 \end{array}$ | $1 / 3$ | 75 percent [6] 16/16 24/1 |
| $73 / 22 \quad 74 / 21$ | 200 [1] 41/2 | 29/11 30/19 31/1 75/13 |
| MR. WATTS: [74] 3/13 8/22 | 20005 [1] 2/2 | 77098 [1] 1/14 |
|  | 202-434-5567 [1] 2/3 | 78257 [1] 1/17 |
| 17/15 18/7 21/4 21/7 21/14 | 2020 [1] 45/5 | 7th [2] 19/23 67/6 |
| 21/24 22/14 22/18 22/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}2021 & {[2]} & 1 / 5 & 76 / 12 \\ 2022 & 3] & 42 / 5 & 46 / 18\end{array}$ | 8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}22 / 25 & 23 / 4 & 23 / 24 & 26 / 9 & 27 / 5\end{array}$ | 2023 [5] 60/19 64/23 65/12 | 8 percent [3] 21/11 21/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}27 / 11 & 28 / 2 & 28 / 10 & 29 / 6 & 32 / 7\end{array}$ | 65/16 73/6 | 22/22 [3] 21/11 21/1 |
| 35/5 35/17 37/25 39/22 40/13 | 20th [6] 11/3 17/7 17/12 |  |
| 43/3 $43 / 9 \quad 43 / 22 \quad 45 / 18 \quad 45 / 20$ |  | 9 |
| 45/25 48/20 49/24 50/6 50/17 | 210-447-0500 [1] 1/18 | 90 [1] 54/15 |
| 50/21 51/2 51/11 51/16 55/1 | 22nd [2] 19/22 24/22 | 95 [1] 54/13 |
| 55/4 55/7 $55 / 12$ 56/11 $56 / 14$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 25 [12] } & 1 / 5 & 18 / 10 & 18 / 24\end{array}$ | 95-day [1] 59/14 |
| 56/20 56/22 57/5 57/9 57/20 | $\begin{array}{ccccc}25 & {[12]} \\ 21 / 22 & 21 / 24 & 22 / 20 & 22 / 22\end{array}$ |  |
| 59/1 59/7 60/4 61/6 66/19 | 22/24 $22 / 25$ 23/4 40/16 43/1 | A |
| 68/18 69/4 70/11 70/14 71/10 | 25 percent [1] $24 / 4$ | Abilify [1] 11/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}72 / 1 & 72 / 4 & 72 / 12 & 72 / 14 & 73 / 4\end{array}$ | 26 [2] 26/17 76/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { ability [6] } & 4 / 11 & 29 / 23 & 34 / 25\end{array}$ |
| $75 / 9$ $75 / 13$ <br> MS $75 / 18$ | 28th [2] 20/20 23/7 | 61/17 67/7 67/8 |
|  | 2924 [1] 3/3 | able [16] 6/24 7/7 7/7 11/24 |
| 11/10 12/15 $13 / 18$ 16/14 | 2925 [1] 1/13 | 12/1 17/22 22/9 29/5 30/5 |
| 16/17 17/22 21/2 30/21 36/16 | 295-pound [1] 52/17 | 31/14 39/15 45/13 68/8 68/10 |
| 69/17 73/11 74/24 | 3 | 68/11 74/ |
| THE COURT: [97] | 30309 [1] 1/21 | 8/19 9/11 10/24 15/12 15/13 |
| / | 30th [2] 40/20 42/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 13 & 16 / 17 & 16 / 21 & 16 / 23\end{array}$ |
| /s [1] 76/13 | 312-995-6333 [1] 1/25 | 18/13 21/13 21/22 22/17 30/8 |
| 0 | 35 [1] 33/8 | 35/10 36/16 36/19 38/9 39/5 |
| 0500 [1] 1/18 | 353 [1] 1/24 | 39/6 39/7 40/3 40/24 43/16 |
|  | 36 [1] 46/6 | 45/4 45/10 $47 / 19$ 47/23 $54 / 17$ |
| 1 | 3M [4] 55/21 58/15 72/1 | 56/1 56/17 56/19 57/18 59/12 |
| 10 [1] 24/8 | 3nd [5] 40/18 42/10 42/15 | 59/13 61/1 $61 / 12$ 61/15 62/14 |
| 100 [1] 1/17 | $\text { 3rd [5] } 40 / 18 \text { 42/10 } 42 / 15$ | 63/14 65/8 66/4 66/24 71/12 |
| 10th [12] 18/19 19/19 24/5 | 42/17 43/13 | 72/1 |
| 24/10 32/20 38/4 38/5 41/1 | 4 | absolutely [1] 29/20 |
| 41/4 41/9 43/17 67/4 | 404-572-4600 [1] 1/22 | absurd [1] 46/24 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 11 & {[1]} \\ 1180 & 70 / 15 \\ {[1]} & 1 / 21 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}41 & {[6]} & 26 / 3 & 27 / 8 & 27 / 19 & 27 / 20\end{array}$ | acceded [1] 29/25 |
| 1180 [1] 1/21 | 27/23 28/13 | accepting [1] 32/10 |
| 12 [6] 7/15 53/6 55/3 60/7 66/23 67/20 | 425 [1] 21/13 | account [6] 18/10 18/20 20/1 |
| 12th [2] 1/24 2/2 | 4506 [2] 3/4 3/21 | 34/10 36/13 36/14 |
| 13 [1] 74/21 | 4555 [1] 1/14 | achieves [1] 9/8 |
| 130,000 [2] 9/6 13/5 | 4600 [1] 1/22 | acquiescence [1] 33/9 |
| 14 [4] 7/15 $42 / 5$ 42/5 54/23 | 48 [11] 7/6 8/11 21/1 31/13 | across [2] 13/23 70/5 |
| 14th [3] 19/23 20/5 20/14 | 33/17 34/1 45/10 45/21 73/21 74/3 74/12 | act [1] 23/22 <br> action [4] 24/19 25/24 27/22 |
| 15 [4] $29 / 7$ 45/3 45/15 47/24 |  | $32 / 10$ |
| 15th [4] 20/4 20/13 48/2 | 5 | acts [1] 23/2 |
| 75/12 | 5500 [1] 16/17 | actual [1] 37/13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16[1] \quad 26 / 16 \\ & 1600[1] \quad 1 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | 5567 [1] 2/3 | actually [10] 5/3 6/25 19/16 |
|  | 561-803-3434 [1] 2/5 | 30/19 30/23 31/5 35/6 56/24 |
| 24/8 | 6 | $\begin{array}{rrrrr}62 / 11 & 63 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 1725 $[1]$ $1 / 13$   <br> 17 th $[3]$ $67 / 1$ $67 / 11$ $70 / 21$ | 6 percent [5] 21/11 21/12 | add [4] $11 / 10$ 11/13 $13 / 19$ |

## A

added [1] 63/18
addition [2] 7/11 15/12
additional [2] 23/2 73/23
address [2] 3/24 62/15
addresses [1] 9/3
adhere [1] 64/23
adjudicated [2] 43/16 44/14
adjudicating [2] 38/23 44/16
adjudications [1] 61/22
adjust [1] 68/4
admissibility [1] 71/21
advance [1] 6/24
advantage [2] 10/16 11/25
affect [2] 33/3 66/14
after [30] 7/12 18/25 19/18 20/19 24/1 30/12 $36 / 18$ 36/24 38/9 50/19 52/8 54/10 54/13 54/15 58/19 59/6 59/17 59/18 61/19 63/13 66/23 67/20 68/4 $70 / 22 \quad 70 / 23$ 71/22 72/5 73/11 73/16 73/16
afternoon [7] 3/1 $3 / 13$ 3/14
3/15 3/17 3/19 62/18
again [24] 6/12 14/11 16/9 17/14 27/25 38/21 39/2 40/15 $44 / 2$ 44/4 44/10 44/12 44/18 44/23 50/15 52/24 54/8 59/4 59/8 59/9 62/9 65/22 66/18 73/6
against [5] 19/10 27/22 31/20 32/5 58/24
age [3] 13/11 13/11 $13 / 22$
aggregate [1] 13/22
Agneshwar's [1] 71/18
ago [1] 25/15
agree [19] 4/25 8/9 8/18 $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 17 & 29 / 12 & 40 / 18 & 47 / 15\end{array} 48 / 5$ 48/6 48/7 48/8 48/9 48/10
48/12 48/13 48/18 49/15 59/2 74/11
agreed [8] 18/19 31/11 35/12 41/6 47/17 48/13 50/7 67/1 agreement [8] 4/12 $7 / 8 \quad 7 / 16$ 31/10 31/17 74/18 74/23 75/1 all [86]
alleged [8] 17/6 17/10 17/11 18/1 20/10 21/21 21/22 21/23
alleging [2] 50/12 50/14
alleviates [1] 45/11
allowed [2] 53/16 60/1
allows [1] 58/14
alluded [1] 13/10
almost [3] 32/8 47/12 51/19
along [2] 6/5 45/18
already [15] 12/5 17/13
22/13 22/17 24/2 31/8 33/22 34/12 34/13 35/12 41/6 55/19 68/6 74/22 75/6
also [11] 6/23 15/19 31/24 31/25 32/5 37/21 45/16 54/3 59/4 68/7 72/16
although [2] 14/16 39/4
always [6] 3/6 4/14 10/7 10/8 34/8 71/11
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { am [38] } & 4 / 21 & 12 / 6 & 12 / 10 & 13 / 6\end{array}$ 15/7 16/21 18/12 25/23 26/3

26/4 28/9 28/22 28/23 33/25 $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 7 & 37 / 6 & 39 / 20 & 42 / 24 & 43 / 14\end{array}$ 44/4 44/10 44/10 48/9 58/20 61/10 61/11 61/11 61/15
62/17 62/17 64/2 66/25 70/13 72/2 72/5 72/18 72/21 74/15 amalgam [1] 25/5 ambiguity [1] 34/18 amended [1] 67/13
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { among [4] } & 11 / 4 & 15 / 10 & 39 / 15\end{array}$ 60/16
amount [3] 59/16 61/5 62/4
analogous [1] 62/9
analyzed [1] 60/6
anarchy [1] 58/15
ancillary [1] 39/18
ANDREW [4] $1 / 20 \quad 3 / 15 \quad 33 / 5$ 49/2
another [6] 11/25 33/16 50/24 53/18 54/2 63/18
answer [9] 5/22 25/11 42/25 44/19 57/21 65/10 66/21 71/13 72/9
answers [3] 41/24 42/3 46/20
anticipate [8] 22/6 24/10 27/12 34/9 51/22 52/7 69/15 69/19
anticipating [5] 27/17 47/5 47/24 67/20 74/12
Antonio [1] 1/17
any [33] 4/19 6/4 11/10 $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 15 & 13 / 15 & 16 / 21 & 19 / 4 & 19 / 9\end{array}$ 20/15 21/23 23/8 24/9 26/2 26/15 27/4 27/22 34/23 35/13 36/4 42/11 43/1 43/14 47/7 49/15 60/15 62/6 62/7 72/21 73/16 75/5 75/5 75/7 75/8 anybody [1] 71/3 anybody's [1] 46/5 anyone [1] 44/23
anything [13] $18 / 6$ 21/3 $22 / 1$ 23/19 29/6 37/9 37/10 51/13 55/20 56/1 68/22 70/7 75/11
anyway [5] 14/1 30/21 37/22 48/23 67/23
anywhere [1] 10/16
apart [1] 57/19
Apotex [4] 18/21 19/1 $21 / 17$ 21/17
appear [1] 62/13
appearance [1] 3/8
appeared [1] 17/9
appears [1] 4/24
Appellate [1] 16/1
applaud [1] 4/7
applicable [3] 20/9 33/19 33/20
apply [1] 37/23
appreciate [7] 4/6 6/20 6/23 8/21 16/5 75/25 76/3
appreciative [1] 4/21
appropriate [5] 20/12 30/17 58/19 58/20 60/22
approved [1] 43/18
April [3] 40/20 42/1 67/22
April 30th [2] 40/20 42/1
are [238]
area [16] 7/2 7/2 8/10 29/19
$30 / 1 \quad 30 / 23 \quad 31 / 2 \quad 31 / 9 \quad 31 / 12$
$\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 4 & 32 / 12 & 34 / 5 & 34 / 14 & 35 / 20\end{array}$ 37/21 74/2
area via [1] 32/12
areas [5] 7/9 16/20 34/6 34/7 34/21
aren't [2] 38/21 48/3
arguing [1] 71/21
argument [1] 57/11
arise [1] 4/9
armed [1] 59/22
arose [1] 8/10
around [7] 9/4 17/18 17/24
36/8 42/21 55/11 65/12
arrive [1] 65/5
Article [1] 26/21
as [94]
ascertain [2] 23/13 $39 / 15$
ask [7] 12/11 12/14 26/4 56/6 56/7 58/20 62/12
asked [3] 10/4 14/2 60/25
asking [5] 6/4 8/2 48/25 51/14 65/20
aspect [3] 7/17 66/15 74/23
assistance [2] 9/2 15/23
assume [4] 27/15 48/12 62/20 63/15
assumption [1] 65/11
assurance [1] 13/1
Atlanta [2] 1/21 50/19
attached [1] 3/25
attack [1] 52/17
attendant [1] 15/4
attitudes [1] 72/7
attorney [1] 23/14
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { August [15] } & 47 / 24 & 47 / 25 & 48 / 2\end{array}$ 60/14 60/25 61/1 61/16 62/3 65/19 65/21 66/3 66/4 66/12 67/3 67/6
August 15 [1] 47/24
August 15th [1] 48/2
August 7th [1] 67/6
authority [13] 27/23 28/12
29/15 29/19 29/23 30/2 32/8 34/15 34/16 $34 / 17$ 40/9 45/17 48/23
authorization [12] 18/17 18/18 20/11 35/15 35/17 $\begin{array}{lllll}39 / 12 & 39 / 14 & 40 / 4 & 74 / 19 & 74 / 19\end{array}$ 74/23 75/18
authorizations [8] 20/6 35/12 38/2 38/15 38/19 38/24 39/19 74/20
available [1] 6/14
availing [1] 25/7
avenue [2] 1/13 69/17
average [1] 13/11
avoid [3] $34 / 6$ 37/2 $44 / 12$
aware [1] 14/14
away [4] $21 / 8$ 31/4 $41 / 11$ 69/25

## B

back [23] 4/13 17/17 18/12 18/13 19/13 19/25 23/2 31/15 $34 / 10 \quad 35 / 21 \quad 40 / 25 \quad 44 / 18$ 44/25 60/25 62/22 63/17 66/17 69/22 71/12 72/23

| B | 25/23 26/22 $27 / 1$ 28/1 $28 / 25$ | calculated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| back... [3] 72/23 73/1 73/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 14 & 31 / 21 & 33 / 3 & 33 / 10 & 38 / 16\end{array}$ | California [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { backwards [2] } & 12 / 22 & 67 / 24\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 40 / 15 & 40 / 19 & 40 / 22 & 41 / 7 & 41 / 17 \\ 42 / 10 & 43 / 3 & 43 / 18 & 46 / 3 & 46 / 19 \end{array}$ |  |
| bad [5] 14/16 14/18 $14 / 19$ | $\begin{array}{llll}47 / 15 & 47 / 18 & 52 / 12 & 52 / 24\end{array}$ | calls [1] 28/4 |
| $\begin{array}{cc} 14 / 23 & 14 / 25 \\ \text { ball } & {[1]} \end{array}$ | 52/25 53/7 $53 / 8 \quad 53 / 12 \quad 54 / 12$ | came [5] 12/3 44/12 |
| Bar [1] 24/25 | 59/12 61/8 63/10 64/23 67/4 | 64/5 64/6 |
| barred [1] 49/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll}67 / 4 & 67 / 5 & 67 / 13 & 68 / 5 & 70 / 17\end{array}$ | can [60] 4/8 4/16 5/5 5/17 |
| based [4] 21/12 21/25 61/2 | 71/6 72/6 72/11 72/12 | 5/24 6/1 $6 / 14$ 6/22 7/10 |
| 75/8 [4] 21/12 21/25 61/2 | Bellwether supplement [1] | $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 14 & 20 / 18 & 25 / 19 & 27 / 22\end{array}$ |
| basically [2] 19/24 21/18 | 41/7 7 [1] | 28/20 29/20 30/3 31/22 34/7 |
| basis [4] 20/5 20/17 35/11 | Bellwethers [1] 42/14 | $\begin{array}{llll}34 / 15 & 34 / 17 & 34 / 18 & 34 / 24\end{array}$ |
| 41/25 | belong [1] 49/12 | 38/15 $41 / 10$ 42/9 $43 / 19$ 43/25 |
| BAYMAN [17] 1/20 3/15 6/20 | bench [2] 61/9 65/22 | 45/14 $47 / 25$ 48/3 49/7 49 |
| 8/3 13/9 33/5 35/22 45/9 | benefit [3] 5/13 32/9 34/19 | 49/14 52/18 54/14 58/6 60/20 |
| 46/1 47/10 49/2 54/6 59/2 | benefits [4] 15/4 15/9 15/10 | 62/12 62/16 66/4 66/6 66/7 |
| 61/18 62/10 62/18 68/9 | $0 / 6$ | 66/17 66/22 67/17 67/22 68/5 |
| Bayman's [3] 46/14 54/3 | berth [1] 9/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}69 / 12 & 70 / 19 & 70 / 23 & 70 / 25\end{array}$ |
| 71/18 | st [4] 4/11 4/17 31/22 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}71 / 13 & 72 / 6 & 72 / 17 & 73 / 2 & 74 / 8\end{array}$ |
| be [183] |  |  |
| BEACH [3] 1/2 1/5 2/5 | between [6] 25/5 40/19 42/1 | $23 / 14 \quad 23 / 17 \quad 25 / 9 \quad 26 / 23 \quad 28 / 11$ |
| Beach/Ft [1] 2/5 | 44/5 53/13 64/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 29 / 1 & 29 / 3 & 34 / 8 & 34 / 9 & 46 / 9\end{array}$ |
| Bear [1] 6/14 <br> bearing [1] | big [6] 10/11 10/16 11/19 | 46/22 48/5 48/7 48/8 48/10 |
| bearing [1] <br> because [41] | 20/7 40/3 50/2 | 51/13 66/12 66/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 15/3 } & 15 / 8 & 16 / 19 & 17 / 14 & 21 / 16\end{array}$ | bigger [1] 5/22 | can't always [1] 34/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 22 / 1 & 22 / 3 & 22 / 8 & 23 / 16 & 25 / 4\end{array}$ | biggest [1] 16/7 | can't anticipate [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 23 & 28 / 1 & 29 / 5 & 29 / 8 & 30 / 23\end{array}$ | bind [1] 11/2 | cancer [26] 13/12 13/21 |
| 31/4 31/5 32/4 33/13 36/18 | bit [4] 34/3 36/8 59/22 74/3 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}17 / 11 & 17 / 11 & 18 / 1 & 18 / 24 & 20 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 39/8 39/24 40/1 41/6 46/9 | black [1] 74/2 | 21/22 22/21 23/3 34/25 40/16 |
| 47/21 49/20 50/18 53/2 53/3 | blame [1] 17/16 | 49/5 52/12 52/19 54/10 57/12 |
| 58/21 62/7 64/15 64/25 65/4 | blaming [1] 52/17 | 57/14 57/15 64/1 64/4 68/16 |
| 66/15 69/19 69/21 | Bldg [1] 1/17 | 68/18 69/8 69/12 70/5 |
| become [2] 45/2 58/19 | blunt [1] 29/7 | cancer or [1] 40/16 |
| becomes [1] 19/9 | board [2] 70/6 73/19 | cancers [39] 10/25 11/4 17/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { been [29] } & 3 / 23 & 4 / 20 & 5 / 10\end{array}$ | Boehringer [1] 47/9 | 17/6 21/20 21/21 22/10 22/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}7 / 12 & 9 / 1 & 10 / 3 & 10 / 18 & 11 / 14\end{array}$ | bog [1] 40/11 | 22/24 50/10 51/25 52/2 52/2 |
| 11/15 11/24 14/3 18/10 18/12 | books [1] 67/17 | 52/3 52/4 52/5 52/7 54/25 |
| 25/4 28/5 30/24 33/12 36/21 | both [10] 7/16 12/2 $12 / 3$ | 55/1 56/24 57/1 57/2 57/4 |
| 38/3 46/5 46/8 61/14 62/4 | 13/22 36/12 38/11 38/15 | 57/4 57/18 $57 / 19$ 59/6 62/21 |
| 62/8 62/14 68/10 71/21 73/20 | $38 / 23$ 47/5 49/15 | 63/7 63/24 64/11 64/12 64/12 |
| 75/14 | bottom [4] 18/23 25/15 47/24 | 68/24 68/25 69/2 69/3 69/20 |
| before [24] 1/9 7/22 10/21 | 58/5 | 69/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 13 & 17 / 17 & 19 / 14 & 22 / 2 & 22 / 10\end{array}$ | bought [1] 46/14 | cannot [2] 28/21 48/12 |
| 32/16 32/23 37/20 39/18 41/5 | brand [2] 3/16 3/18 | capture [1] 32 |
| 42/11 $48 / 25$ 49/5 50/2 50/16 | Braves [2] 50/21 50/22 | care [1] 20/8 |
| 51/13 53/22 56/2 60/14 74/17 | break [1] 12/12 | carefully [1] 60 |
| 75/17 | breakdown [1] 13/21 | carved [1] 62/22 |
| begin [3] 3/8 6/18 19/15 | brief [1] 55/16 | case [50] 1/3 23 |
| beginning [2] 20/13 51/21 | briefed [2] 65/10 65/16 | 24/23 25/4 25/22 26/5 26/7 |
| begins [1] 52/20 | briefing [1] 33/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll}27 / 24 & 28 / 9 & 29 / 5 & 29 / 24 & 30 / 11\end{array}$ |
| behalf [5] 3/11 3/16 3/18 | briefs [1] 62/23 | $30 / 16$ 32/10 32/22 36/22 |
| 28/9 28/23 | bring [2] 31/20 56/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 13 & 37 / 14 & 37 / 19 & 46 / 21 & 47 / 1\end{array}$ |
| being [24] 3/20 10/4 11/1 | bringing [1] 39/11 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 48 / 24 & 48 / 25 & 52 / 21 & 52 / 25\end{array}$ |
| 11/8 12/1 15/11 18/19 20/7 | brings [2] 38/17 59/12 | 54/10 54/12 56/10 57/14 |
| 20/19 22/18 25/23 32/3 37/12 | broad [1] 32/4 | 57/15 58/23 59/13 59/14 |
| 39/7 39/8 45/13 55/10 61/4 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { brought [2] } & 15 / 15 & 73 / 24\end{array}$ | 60/18 61/24 65/2 65/7 65/14 |
| 62/21 63/4 68/11 73/5 73/9 | buff [1] 32/12 | 66/22 67/22 67/23 68/6 68/14 |
| $74 / 4$ ( 7 / | built [1] 33/2 | 69/24 70/15 71/15 73/8 73/13 |
| believe [4] | bunch [2] 46/19 49/1 | 74/24 |
| believe | burden [1] 45/11 | cases [32] 8/16 9/17 10/3 |
| bell [1] 54/9 | but I [1] 64/20 | 16/3 18/21 $23 / 2$ 30/13 30/23 |
| bellwether [67] $1 / 9$ 3/5 3/22 | but we [1] 56/4 | $30 / 25$ 41/2 43/8 47/6 49/3 |
| $3 / 23$ $4 / 3$ $4 / 4$ $4 / 19$ $5 / 1$ <br> $1 / 15$     | buttoned [2] 45/18 45/20 | 49/12 $50 / 11$ 52/9 52/12 $54 / 11$ |
| 9/19 10/1 11/2 11/7 11/16 | buy [1] 57/10 | 54/19 54/23 54/24 55/10 56/3 |
| 12/13 14/6 16/8 16/23 16/25 | C |  |
| 17/1 19/8 20/23 23/3 25/9 | cake [1] 25/9 | catch [1] 34/10 |



| C | December [24] 11/3 | e [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Court's... [5] 34/16 38/22 | $218 / 18$ 19/19 19 | diagnosing |
| 47/7 48/24 51/5 | $22 / 2 \quad 22 / 11 \quad 24 / 8 \quad 24 / 8 \quad 32 / 20$ | $\text { did [14] } \quad 8 / 8 \quad 12 / 2 \quad 12 / 17$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { courtroom [1] 6/13 } \\ \text { Courts [3] } & \\ \text { co/l } & 61 / 3 & 69\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll} \\ 38 / 4 & 38 / 5 & 40 / 18 & 41 / 1 & 41 / 4\end{array}$ | 12/23 18/7 23/20 23/25 25 |
| Courts [3] 16/1 61/3 69/17 cover [3] 32/4 68/22 70/8 | 43/13 43/17 50/10 | 45/24 62/10 64/3 65/5 65/2 |
| covered [1] 31/1 | December 10 [1] $24 /$ | 68/22 |
| covers [1] 16/7 | December 10th [7] | didn't [9] |
| COVID [1] 3/10 | 32/20 38/4 38/5 41/1 41/4 | 30/18 35/21 49/19 51/1 |
| CPF [14] 13/22 40/19 40/22 | December 15th [2] 20/4 20/13 | difference [1] 13/11 |
| 41/7 41/17 $42 / 9$ 43/3 43/18 | December 17 [4] 19/19 19/21 | differences [5] 4/9 11/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}46 / 3 & 46 / 19 & 47 / 18 & 49 / 17 & 49 / 18 \\ 53 / 11\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { December } 17 \\ 19 / 22 \quad 24 / 8 \end{array}$ | 11/22 13/10 15/22 |
| $53 / 11$ | December 20th [5] 11/3 17/7 | different [26] 5/7 6/13 |
| credit [3] | 17/12 22/2 22/1 | 10/24 15/21 31/15 32/9 33 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { criteria [9] } & 42 / 20 & 42 / 25\end{array}$ | December 22nd [1] 19/22 | $33 / 9$ 39/6 44/20 46/7 49/18 |
|  | December 3rd [1] 40/18 | 49/20 49/20 50/5 50/5 56/3 |
| 48/19 49/19 | decide [7] 19/18 $36 / 20$ 48/23 | 56/23 56/24 59/21 61/7 62/8 |
| critical [1] 63/10 | 55/14 55/23 56/2 57/11 | 68/13 72/11 73/8 73/8 |
| cross [2] 62/25 69/14 | decided [5] 16/4 38/19 55/8 | differing [1] 69/20 |
| cross-examined [1] 62 | 65/12 65/16 | difficult [1] |
| cure [1] 35/15 | deciding [2] 50/3 69/23 | digitally [1] 43/25 |
| current [2] 51 | decision [9] 5/2 28/14 41/10 | diligently [2] 7/12 7/13 |
| currently [1] 32/24 | 48/18 63/3 64/14 64/15 65/19 | directly [1] 2 |
| curve [1] 54/9 | 66/14 | disagreement [2] 8/11 48 |
| cut [1] 68/17 | sions [3] 16/3 19 | sagrees [1] 61 |
| D | deck | disclosed [2] |
|  | Defendant [4] 19/22 27/15 | disclosing [1] 22/10 |
| data [6] 11/24 | 27/21 28/13 | disconnect [2] 17/9 22/ |
| 12/24 13/20 13/23 | DEFENDANTS [27] 1/19 3/1 | discourse [1] 47/ |
| date [46] 17/25 18/9 18/14 | 3/18 9/18 19/10 $20 / 16$ 24/21 | discovery [38] 11 |
| 19/19 23/7 23/25 32/20 33/2 | 29/23 30/8 $31 / 20$ 32/5 $33 / 13$ | 19/2 19/13 19/15 20/3 20/23 |
| 50/15 51/14 51/15 52/20 60/2 | $34 / 23$ 35/3 35/14 42/3 42/12 | 23/9 23/10 $28 / 6 \quad 28 / 19$ 32/1 |
| 60/3 60/18 60/20 60/21 60/25 | 47/1 53/1 53/17 53/25 55/18 | 38/16 $40 / 15$ 40/21 42/11 |
| 61/2 61/4 61/16 61/17 63/13 | /18 58/23 71/14 72/8 73/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll}46 / 16 & 49 / 1 & 49 / 12 & 49 / 16 & 50 / 3\end{array}$ |
| 64/21 64/23 65/5 65/13 66/2 | Defense [13] 7/12 9/12 | 52/20 52/21 53/18 54/1 54/12 |
| 66/3 66/4 $66 / 19$ 66/21 67/1 | $66 / 8 \quad 66 / 9 \quad 70 / 10 \quad 73 / 4 \quad 74 / 10$ | 57/24 57/25 58/7 59/14 59/15 |
| 67/7 67/13 67/16 68/1 68/3 | Defense's [1] 10/8 | 59/17 69/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}70 / 17 & 73 / 16 & 75 / 12 & 75 / 15\end{array}$ | deficiencies [5] 20/15 20/18 | discrepancies $\text { [1] } 73$ |
| 75/16 $75 / 17$ 75/18 $76 / 12$ | deficiencies [5] $30 / 15$ 20/18 35/13 35/15 56/4 | discretion [2] 51/6 62/1 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { dates [29] } & 6 / 25 & 9 / 4 & 17 / 9 \\ 17 / 18 & 17 / 24 & 18 / 11 & 18 / 13\end{array}$ | deficiency [6] 35/16 35/19 | discuss [4] 7/10 $31 / 23$ 33/12 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 18 & 17 / 24 & 18 / 11 & 18 / 13 \\ 19 / 21 & 20 / 25 & 22 / 5 & 22 / 8 & 24 / 7\end{array}$ | 36/3 36/10 38/10 42/2 | 33/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 21 & 20 / 25 & 22 / 5 & 22 / 8 & 24 / 7 \\ 32 / 17 & 32 / 18 & 33 / 2 & 33 / 7 & 33 / 10\end{array}$ | deficient [1] 42/6 | discussed [2] 32/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 17 & 32 / 18 & 33 / 2 & 33 / 7 & 33 / 10\end{array}$ | define [2] 17/2 17/6 | discusses [2] 45/4 45/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}47 / 21 & 59 / 24 & 60 / 6 & 63 / 10 & 65 / 18 \\ 65 / 20 & 67 / 24 & 68 / 6 & 71 / 5 & 75 / 5\end{array}$ | defined [3] 16/24 17/11 18/2 | discussion [5] 7/1 9/14 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccl}75 / 6 & 75 / 13 \\ \text { Daubert [21] } & 42 / 22 & 51 / 4 & 52 / 8\end{array}$ | degree [1] 58/17 | discussions [6] 4/13 5/10 |
| Daubert [21] $42 / 22$ 51/4 52/8 $59 / 5$ 59/6 60/8 61/1 61/4 | Delaware [1] 9/23 | 22/17 $34 / 19$ 34/20 $34 / 20$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}59 / 5 & 59 / 6 & 60 / 8 & 61 / 1 & 61 / 4 \\ 61 / 6 & 61 / 25 & 62 / 7 & 62 / 23 & 64 / 4\end{array}$ | delay [1] 61/14 | dismiss [17] 24/19 25/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}61 / 6 & 61 / 25 & 62 / 7 & 62 / 23 \\ 65 / 4 / 4 \\ 65 / 2 & 65 / 8 & 65 / 9 & 65 / 15 \\ 66 / 23\end{array}$ | delicious [1] 58/15 | $26 / 5 \quad 26 / 7 \quad 27 / 22 \quad 27 / 24 \quad 28 / 9$ |
| $65 / 265 / 8 \quad 65 / 9 \quad 65 / 1566 / 23$ $67 / 1267 / 20 ~ 68 / 4$ | dependent [2] 61/23 72/8 | 29/5 29/6 29/16 36/16 36/22 |
| $67 / 12$ day [7] | depending [2] 50/16 72/16 | 40/1 44/4 44/17 45/7 62/8 |
| day [7] $10 / 21$ 51/20 59/14 <br> 60/17 $66 / 1 \quad 66 / 19$ <br> $6 / 6$ | deposition [2] 54/6 54/15 | dismissal [9] 27/18 27/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}60 / 17 & 66 / 1 & 66 / 19 & 76 / 6 \\ \text { days [15] } & 18 / 10 & 20 / 16 & 24 / 20\end{array}$ | depositions [2] 52/21 54/4 | 28/24 36/10 37/10 37/11 39/7 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { days } & {[15]} & 18 / 10 & 20 / 16 & 24 / 20 \\ 24 / 21 & 25 / 12 & 33 / 8 & 39 / 14 & 42 / 5\end{array}$ | depth [1] 61/22 | $39 / 8 \quad 40 / 7$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 21 & 25 / 12 & 33 / 8 & 39 / 14 & 42 / 5 \\ 54 / 2 & 54 / 10 & 54 / 13 & 54 / 15 & 54 / 23\end{array}$ | deselecting [1] 54/8 | dismissals [3] 27/19 37 |
| $62 / 3 \quad 74 / 7$ days of [1] $54 / 23$ | 52/15 54/10 | dismissed [4] 26/18 37/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { days of [1] } & 54 / 23 & & \\ \text { deadline [4] } & 22 / 4 & 24 / 1 & 25 / 6\end{array}$ | deserves [1] 8/1 | 37/18 45/6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { deadline [4] 22/4 24/1 25/6 } \\ & 41 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | designation [1] 22/2 | dismisses [1] 52/25 |
| deadlines [3] 23/10 32/2 | designed [3] 18/10 67/19 | dismissing [2] 30/16 37/13 |
| ```42/18 deal [2] 6/24 45/12 dealing [4] 38/2 38/3 45/12 63/23``` | ```destroy [2] 18/21 19/2 detailed [2] 5/5 6/22 details [1] 6/19``` | ```dispositive [1] 65/2 dispute [4] 39/18 40/3 56/16 69/22 disputes [5] 38/18 38/23 39/11 44/12 44/13``` |


| D | echo [1] 8/4 | evidentiary [3] 62/24 63/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| dissimilarities [1] 56/4 | effect [13] 19/10 24/22 | 4 |
| dissuade [1] 24/25 |  | 5/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { distracted [1] } & \text { 26/24 } \\ \text { DISTRICT [4] } & \\ 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 & 1 / 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 / 23 \text { 43/22 } 44 / 1 \text { 50/2 52/2 } \\ & 53 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | 45/16 48/21 $63 / 14$ $66 / 25$ $69 / 6$ <br> examined [1] $62 / 25$   |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{DISTRICT~[4]~} \\ & 11 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | efficiency's [1] 55/18 | example [12] 35/17 35/23 |
| diverse [2] 31/20 32/5 | efficient [2] 45/13 70/ | 41/8 49/5 49/8 52/16 58/25 |
| divide [1] 5/25 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 63 / 25 \\ & 74 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| DIVISION [1] 1/2 <br> do [86] | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { eight [10] } & 18 / 20 & 18 / 25 & 22 / 12\end{array}$ | examples [2] 11/18 46/13 |
| Docket [1] 3/4 | 52/12 52/19 55/6 57/9 63/7 | exceed [1] |
| doctors [1] 35/20 | 64/11 72/6 | Excellent [1] 8/2 |
| Dodge [1] 12/7 | $\begin{array}{\|lllll} \text { eight-week } & {[1]} & 72 / 6 \\ \text { either [3] } & 25 / 2 & 28 / 20 & 46 / 17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { except [1] 59/13 } \\ \text { exclusion [1] } & 18 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| $23 / 1240 / 755 / 659 / 19$ | electronically [1] 20/6 | excuses [1] 9/11 |
| doesn't [7] 15/13 22/1 23/16 | Eleven [1] 55/13 | executed [1] 40/23 |
| 47/10 48/19 49/15 71/7 | Eleventh [1] 16/4 | exercise [1] 34/16 |
| doing [12] 5/8 12/12 17/10 | eligibility [8] 42/20 42/25 | expend [1] 48/24 |
| 19/15 37/11 46/15 49/16 50/3 | 47/16 48/6 48/8 48/13 48/15 | expensive [1] 49/12 |
| 55/21 58/7 74/16 74/17 | 49/19 [1] | experience [5] 10/3 61/2 |
| dollars [1] 50/2 | eligibility criteria [1] 47/16 | 61/13 64/12 71/21 |
| Domain [1] 1/16 | eligible [1] 56/11 | experts [5] 22/4 62/25 64/19 |
| don't [77] | eliminate [3] 22/14 48/3 | 66/8 66/8 |
| done [19] 7/5 14/17 19/5 | 69/22 | explain [6] 5/17 5/18 $26 / 9$ |
| 20/13 $21 / 1 \quad 22 / 13$ 25/22 $32 / 18$ | elimination [1] 47/6 | 26/14 33/19 76/2 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}42 / 15 & 50 / 22 & 53 / 24 & 54 / 17 \\ 57 / 8 & 60 / 3 & 63 / 15 & 66 / 12\end{array}$ | else [3] 7/10 10/16 70/7 | explain to [1] 26/14 |
| 57/8 60/3 63/15 66/12 74/6 | else's [1] 71/3 | explained [1] 31/19 |
|  | elsewhere [1] 11/6 | explaining [1] 37/6 |
| dovetails [1] 23/23 | email [1] 3/24 | extend [2] 33/7 33/7 |
| down [12] 12/12 20/22 27/16 | encyclopedic [1] 8/7 | extension [4] 32/24 33 |
| 29/10 $34 / 3 \quad 40 / 11 \quad 40 / 16 \quad 44 / 12$ | end [9] 10/20 21/18 34/8 | 64/17 66/15 |
| 45/2 55/4 55/7 68/18 | 34/10 34/11 57/22 67/12 71/8 | extent [9] 6/1 15/1 28/11 |
| draft [4] 10/22 17/18 50/25 |  | 31/4 34/21 38/17 40/20 44/13 |
| 69/5 | ended [1] 71 | 71/1 |
| drafted [2] $31 / 8 \quad 43 / 3$ | ending [1] 20/13 | extra [1] |
| drafts [2] 29/8 31/15 | enforce [2] | eye [2] 33 |
| draw [1] 30/25 | enough [7] 10/11 10/19 | F |
| drawing [1] 73/19 | 32/4 46/19 59/25 60/1 | faces [1] 3/6 |
| drawn [1] 11/15 | enter [4] 26/19 32/8 47/19 | fact [9] 6/23 14/25 18/1] |
| drilling [1] 34/3 | 75/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 32 / 17 & 43 / 6 & 43 / 8 & 43 / 11 & 47 / 1\end{array}$ |
| Drive [1] 1/16 | entered [3] 4/20 74/17 75/17 | 67/16 |
| driven [1] 15/ | entering [1] 75/8 | factor [1] 47/6 |
| drop [1] 19/9 | entertain [1] 47/18 | facts [7] 50/1 53/12 53/1 |
| ducks [1] 7/16 | entire [1] 12/9 | 53/13 53/21 53/22 71/20 |
| due [1] $51 / 15$ duration [1] 13/20 | entirety [1] 73/6 | fade [1] 46/6 |
| duration [1] 13/20 | Entry [1] 3/4 | faded [1] 46/1 |
| E | envision [2] 23/20 27/7 | failing [1] 27/20 |
| each [16] 18/24 21/22 26/12 | envisioning [4] 27/10 43/6 | fair [3] 17/16 55/22 56/2 fairly [1] 39/13 |
| 32/22 36/25 36/25 42/13 | Erie [2] 15/25 16/1 | Falcons [1] 50/20 |
| 47/19 48/14 52/18 $54 / 2 \quad 55 / 3$ |  | fall [7] 51/6 51/7 51/22 |
| 55/6 57/5 71/9 72/12 | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{ESQ} \\ 2 / 1 \end{gathered}$ | $51 / 2363 / 15 \text { 63/18 64/19 }$ |
| each phase [1] | even [5] 37/9 46/22 64/17 | familiar [1] 15/17 |
| ear [1] 55/22 | 65/4 70/3 | far [5] 46/18 57/19 59/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { earlier [4] } & 17 / 25 & 21 / 12 & 22 / 7\end{array}$ $74 / 9$ | event [2] 20/19 42/5 | 64/12 68/11 |
| earliest [1] | ever [1] 64/16 | fast [2] 51/18 71/23 |
| early [3] 45/4 63, | every [6] 7/17 8/21 15/21 | faster [1] 67/21 |
| earnest [1] 4/9 | 46/21 62/9 66/15 | fathom [1] 46/22 |
| earplugs <br> [1] <br> 58/15 | everybody [7] 3/1 $3 / 8$ 20/24 | fault [1] 46/4 |
| ease [1] 3/24 | 24/11 58/16 62/16 76/6 | favor [1] 72/5 |
| easier [1] 4/ | everyone [4] 3/19 26/25 68/2 | February [8] 20/23 20/24 |
| easily [1] 45/14 | $6 /$ | 32/18 40/19 41/5 41/18 42/1 |
| Eastern [1] 11/17 | everything [14] | $67 / 5$ [6] $26 / 15$ 43/25 |
| easy [2] 4/14 74/24 | 9/25 20/23 34/9 44/25 45/17 | Federal [6] 26/15 43/25 |
| eat [1] 25/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}59 / 11 & 59 / 17 & 60 / 1 & 60 / 3 & 68 / 22\end{array}$ <br> $74 / 274 / 7$ | feel [2] 4/17 15/8 |


| F | $\text { forth [6] } 4 / 13 \quad 17 / 17 \quad 31 / 16$ | 75/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| feeling [3] 7/25 7/25 8/1 | four [24] 9/7 50/8 54/5 55/5 | $\begin{array}{\|ccccc} \mid \operatorname{good}[24] & 3 / 1 & 3 / 12 & 3 / 13 & 3 / 14 \\ 3 / 15 & 3 / 17 & 3 / 19 & 6 / 21 & 12 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| feels [1] 34/17 | 55/6 55/25 56/12 56/14 56/17 | $14 / 16 \quad 14 / 25 \quad 21 / 4 \quad 22 / 6 \quad 34 / 7$ |
| $\begin{array}{lr}\text { felon [1] } & 54 / 5 \\ \text { felt [1] } & 29 / 23\end{array}$ | 56/17 $56 / 18$ 56/19 $56 / 19$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}38 / 6 & 42 / 18 & 47 / 21 & 48 / 22 & 54 / 5\end{array}$ |
| felt [1] 29/23 <br> few [5] 5/20 6/25 13 | 56/22 56/25 57/1 57/5 58/11 | 54/13 62/18 71/4 71/24 74/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lrl} \text { few [5] } 5 / 206 / 25 \\ 39 / 14 ~ 71 / 12 ~ \end{array}$ | 67/16 68/14 68/15 71/5 71/24 | got [9] 11/11 20/24 24/5 |
| figured [1] 18/12 | $4 /$ | 46/16 $47 / 2149 / 4$ 50/19 59/24 |
| file [13] 25/3 28/22 28/24 | fourth [3] 67/6 70 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 4 & 29 / 12 & 30 / 11 & 30 / 13 & 30 / 20\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { fourth [3] } & 67 / 6 & 70 / 17 & 70 / 22 \\ \text { frankly [3] } & 15 / 10 & 46 / 1 & 47 / 10 \end{array}$ | gotten [2] 44/20 60/2 <br> governing [1] 51/10 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 20 & 36 / 15 & 37 / 17 & 45 / 7 & 53 / 9 \\ \text { iled } & 16] & 13 / 5 & 14 / 12 & 25 / 20\end{array}$ | $\text { Friday [7] } 8 / 10 \quad 18 / 16 \quad 24 / 10$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { Led } & {[16]} & 13 / 5 & 14 / 12 & 25 / 2 \\ 5 / 2 & 30 / 15 & 36 / 11 & 36 / 12 & 37 \end{array}$ | 35/13 38/3 73/1 74/7 | grant [1] 33/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}37 / 10 & 37 / 14 & 37 / 15 & 38 / 22\end{array}$ | friend [4] 61/18 62/12 62/16 | granted [3] 33/10 33/18 |
| 38/23 39/3 44/21 45/2 | 62/17 | 33/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { fill [4] } \quad 25 / 3 \quad 35 / 21 \quad 41 / 13 \\ & 69 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|cccccc} \text { front }[7] & 5 / 14 & 34 / 7 & 3 \\ 36 / 18 & 38 / 8 & 40 / 9 & 45 / 15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|cccc} \text { gray [14] } & 29 / 19 & 30 / 1 & 30 / 23 \\ 31 / 2 & 32 / 4 & 32 / 12 & 34 / 5 \\ 34 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| filled [5] 35/19 38/14 40/4 | froze [1] 17/20 | $34 / 7$ 34/14 $34 / 14$ 34/21 37/21 |
| 42/3 43/19 | frozen [1] 18/3 | 74/2 |
| filling [1] 36/6 | 2/5 | grayness [1] 34/18 |
| final [2] 53/18 54/11 | full [1] ${ }^{\text {fully [1] }} 6$ | great [1] 16/ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { finalizing [1] } & 39 / 14 \\ \text { find }\end{array}$ | function [2] 7/21 61/19 | ground [1] 65/25 |
| find [3] 34/4 49/8 $54 / 4$ | further [7] $11 / 7$ 16/19 $18 / 6$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { group [7] } & 13 / 4 & 13 / 17 & 14 / 10\end{array}$ |
| inish [2] 12/17 | 27/16 45/3 68/6 75/5 | 14/11 20/19 23/3 36/12 |
| finished [2] 18/5 74/8 | G | 1] $47 / 3$ |
| firm [1] 60/12 | GA [1] | $\text { guess [8] } 7 / 2 \quad 15 / 7 \quad 21 / 14$ |
| $\underset{\text { firms [4] }}{58 / 3} \mathbf{2 4 / 1 2} 24 / 14$ 41/2 | Gambling [1] 11/18 | $37 / 2351 / 1451 / 1759 / 13$ |
| first [28] 5/2 8/25 9/7 9/13 | gamesmanship [1] 53 |  |
| 9/15 10/22 16/8 17/18 18/15 | gaps [2] $36 / 5$ 36/6 | guesses [1] 16/ |
| 23/24 $29 / 7$ 34/2 $35 / 3$ 38/21 |  | H |
| 48/6 52/3 54/17 58/8 $58 / 12$ | 20/8 | had [23] 3/23 5/20 6/2 6/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 58 / 19 & 60 / 7 & 67 / 3 & 69 / 5 & 69 / 20 \\ 70 / 20 & 71 / 11 & 71 / 24 & 72 / 5 \end{array}$ | gave [1] 74/12 | 6/21 9/4 13/22 14/3 18/3 |
| fit [2] 60/7 68/2 | general [3] 51/4 51/16 65/9 | 21/12 25/4 29/8 32/16 32/17 |
| fits [1] 67/12 | generally [1] 31/23 | 43/8 $46 / 5$ 50/18 55/3 $58 / 10$ |
| five [10] 20/7 20/16 24/21 | generic [3] 18/2 47/4 47/2 | 62/7 64/5 68/25 69/8 |
| 40/4 48/16 48/16 48/17 63/17 | gerrymandering [3] 19/11 | hadn't [1] 14/5 |
| 63/18 71/24 | 24/25 37/2 | half [2] 64/7 66/25 |
| FL [2] 1/5 $2 / 5$ | get [82] | hand [2] 25/6 35/4 |
| flagging [2] 33/23 44/10 | gets [7] 20/2 41/8 42/21 | handle [1] 30/1 |
| flags [1] 46/21 | 54/2 59/21 63/17 74/17 | happen [8] $34 / 12$ 34/13 $37 / 14$ |
| flexibility [1] 72/15 | getting [9] 20/16 24/15 41/5 | 67/9 67/22 $72 / 16$ 72/18 $72 / 20$ |
| floor [2] 1/24 8/25 | 43/19 46/4 50/24 58/8 61/15 | happened [2] 34/12 71/23 |
| FLORIDA [23] $1 / 1$ 9/19 $10 / 10$ | 74/25 | happening [2] 53/5 53/19 |
| 10/16 10/20 11/18 11/20 | give [15] 5/16 5/24 7/19 | happens [10] 24/21 39/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 23 & 12 / 6 & 13 / 1 & 13 / 3 & 14 / 10\end{array}$ | 8/24 10/19 12/25 29/15 31/11 | 40/19 46/21 48/10 51/8 59/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}15 / 5 & 15 / 17 & 15 / 17 & 15 / 20 & 16 / 1\end{array}$ | 36/19 44/8 46/1 54/3 | 60/14 61/10 67/10 |
| 16/2 16/4 16/10 21/18 70/3 |  | happy [7] 5/20 12/6 $18 / 12$ |
| 70/4 | $\text { gives [2] } 40 / 8 \text { 60/19 }$ | hard [6] 8/5 8/8 8/19 60/ |
| flow [2] 7/21 33/7 | giving [1] 35/14 | 67/7 72/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lrrr}\text { flows [2] } & 7 / 17 & 36 / 7 \\ \text { flux [1] } & 31 / 17\end{array}$ | glad [2] 8/3 62/17 | has [25] 5/11 8/6 10/2 $10 / 18$ |
| $\begin{array}{lr}\text { flux [1] } & 31 / 17 \\ \text { fly [1] } & 68 / 12\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { global [7] } & \text { /5 } & 12 / 6 & 12 / 8\end{array}$ | 15/22 18/10 22/20 22/22 |
| fly [1] 68/12 | 12/24 14/11 14/11 15/9 | 22/24 24/9 26/10 28/6 34/1 |
| focused [1] folks [1] $8 / 6$ | go [30] 4/13 4/25 6/4 8/25 | 34/16 35/11 40/10 43/21 |
| folks [1] 8/6 followed [1] 61/ | 10/18 12/13 16/19 20/22 | 51/15 56/23 61/14 61/16 65/1 |
| llowed [1] 51/ | 27/16 28/17 30/7 35/21 36/25 | 71/21 75/14 75/17 |
| llowing [1] 27/14 | 42/2 42/24 51/20 51/24 55/7 | hasn't [2] 24/4 33/12 |
| orce [1] 58/16 | 56/5 57/12 57/15 58/4 58/12 | have [205] |
| foregoing [1] 76/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll}70 / 24 & 71 / 23 & 73 / 1 & 73 / 9 & 73 / 11\end{array}$ | haven't [11] 27/11 30/15 |
| form [11] 18/17 25/3 28/22 | 73/18 75/21 | 31/9 39/9 43/2 44/24 56/1 |
| $\begin{array}{rlllll}\text { 29/4 } & 30 / 13 & 36 / 15 & 37 / 17 & 40 / 18\end{array}$ | goal [2] $5 / 2$ $9 / 5$  <br> goes [6] $19 / 21$ $22 / 12$ $23 / 2$ | $\begin{array}{rlll} 60 / 24 & 61 / 14 & 62 / 7 & 65 / 6 \\ \text { having [12] } & 3 / 8 & 5 / 10 & 9 / 10 \end{array}$ |
| 41/6 43/18 53/10 | $45 / 1755 / 4 \quad 68 / 23$ | $11 / 25 \text { 14/20 30/10 30/13 }$ |
| formal [1] 49/1 formulating [1] 15/24 | going [107] | 43/14 45/11 54/20 71/2 75/3 |
| formulating [1] 15/24 | gone [4] 31/15 54/20 56/2 | having slots [1] 71/2 |


| H | 56/3 56/11 57/19 57/23 58/21 | instead [1] 18/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he [1] 54/7 | 61/19 61/23 61/24 61/25 65/5 | insufficient [2] $38 / 24 \quad 39 / 12$ |
| health [1] 20/8 | 73/3 | ntend [9] 21/20 23/9 23/12 23/16 23/20 28/19 31/25 32/6 |
| $\underset{70 / 14}{\operatorname{hear}}[5] \quad 5 / 178 / 3 \quad 18 / 4 \quad 18 / 4$ | however [3] 5/25 57/8 65/1 | $35 / 2$ |
| heard [1] 7/25 | hum [1] 44/2 | intends [1] 70/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { hearing [12] } & 1 / 9 & 4 / 22 & 15 / 7\end{array}$ | hundreds [2] 40/17 41/1 | intention [1] 56/5 |
| 17/21 52/14 61/5 63/2 $64 / 4$ | hypothetically [2] 22/13 | internally [1] 34/20 |
| 64/6 68/15 68/15 76/7 |  | interpret [1] 7/3 |
| hearings [1] 62/24 | I | $22$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \text { heart [1] } & 52 / 17 & \\ \text { help [3] } & 6 / 5 & 49 / 6 & 69 / 17 \end{array}$ | I'd [4] 51/23 62/11 67/16 | intervene [1] 59 |
| helpful [4] 5/16 12/21 | 70/21 | involuntarily [1] 27/24 |
| 68/7 | I'll [1] 53/3 | involuntary [1] 27/19 |
| her [7] 10/19 23/9 25/19 | I'm [5] 7/22 10/8 25/22 37/4 | involved [3] 8/20 19/1 2 |
| 25/24 47/21 61/11 69/16 |  | involving [1] 50/11 |
| here [30] 3/2 $3 / 3$ 3/9 3/13 | ID [1] 46/ | is [367] <br> isn't [3] 4/13 39/12 |
| 3/20 8/6 9/18 21/9 24/7 | $\text { idea [11] } 9 / 18 \quad 22 / 6 \quad 22 / 12$ | isn't [3] $4 / 13$ $39 / 12$ <br> issue [17] $7 / 4$ $7 / 6$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 18 & 26 / 4 & 29 / 8 & 29 / 9 & 33 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 35 / 7 & 38 / 11 & 46 / 23 ~ 52 / 15 ~ & 54 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rllll}\text { 15/15 } & 21 / 1 & 31 / 14 & 32 / 16 & 33 / 24\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 9 & 34 / 13 & 39 / 4 & 42 / 25 & 47 / 20\end{array}$ | 54/5 54/16 57/8 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} \\ 44 / 14 & 44 / 24 & 45 / 4 & 62 / 15 & 63 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 50/18 52/15 55/8 55/19 59/4 | Ideally [1] 75/2 | 64/22 70/3 70/16 |
| 59/7 63/4 65/24 67/23 72/13 | identify [1] 34/7 | issued [1] 3/4 |
| h | II [13] 12/14 17/8 18/7 18/8 | issues [9] 4/18 $10 / 12$ 13/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}40 / 1 & 47 / 19 & 55 / 25 & 70 / 20\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 16 & 28 / 17 & 35 / 9 & 36 / 9 & 36 / 14\end{array}$ | 14/6 14/18 15/6 15/6 38/1 |
| higher [3] 22/21 22/22 22/23 | 6/19 37/16 37/22 39/6 | 44/10 |
| him [3] 54/3 61/10 62/15 | III [8] 18/8 20/3 20/15 | it [274] |
| hinges [1] 51/19 | 26/21 35/10 35/10 37/23 | it's [7] 4/2 16/13 22/25 |
| hired [1] 25/4 | 40/13 | 45/20 54/6 63/12 68/13 |
| his [5] 17/22 23/9 25/19 | IL [1] 1/24 | items [1] 73/23 |
| 25/24 52/17 | Illinois [1] 67/ | its [11] 15/13 15/22 |
| history [1] 15/16 | imagining [1] 65/22 | 26/11 28/15 28/15 38/25 |
| hit [4] 42/18 54/17 62/3 | immediate [1] 52/13 | 40/25 44/14 63/3 64/22 |
| 66/23 | immediately [6] 24/12 28/24 | itself [1] 49/19 |
| hold [2] 6/4 22/8 | $36 / 16$ 41/9 41/12 73/10 | IV [2] 38/16 40/14 |
| holder [1] 47/12 | ct [4] 68/25 69/3 72/ | J |
| holding [1] 3/22 | impediment [1] | January [6] $19 / 23$ $19 / 23$ $20 / 5$ |
| hole [1] 69/11 | importance [1] 20/21 | 20/14 20/20 64/5 |
| holidays [1] 64/7 | important [6] 5/1 43/16 | January 14th [2] 20/5 20/1 |
| home [1] 30/7 | 60/11 64/15 66/16 67/8 | January 28th [1] 20/20 |
| HON [1] 2/4 | in-depth [1] 61/22 | January the [1] 19/23 |
| honest [3] 66/21 71/13 72 honestly [1] 73/17 | included [1] 15/1 | job [3] 26/15 26/15 41/9 |
| honor [53] 3/12 3/14 3/15 | incomplete [1] 38/24 | Joe [1] 62/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}3 / 17 & 7 / 22 & 7 / 23 & 8 / 4 \\ 10 / 13\end{array}$ | inconsistent [2] 53/16 53/17 | joint [2] 4/12 47/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 11 / 13 & 12 / 4 & 12 / 15 & 12 / 16 & 12 / 19\end{array}$ | incorporate [1] 6/2 | jointly [2] 4/5 4/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 8 & 16 / 14 & 17 / 3 & 27 / 15 & 30 / 9\end{array}$ | incorrect [1] 49/23 | joking [1] 71/12 |
| 32/23 $36 / 17$ 37/25 38/8 39/20 | incredibly [1] 67/8 | JOSEPH [1] 2/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 40 / 14 & 43 / 13 & 45 / 1 & 48 / 2 & 49 / 2\end{array}$ | independently [1] 12/2 | judge [21] 1/10 6/18 8/23 |
| 50/13 50/15 50/21 58/22 59/3 | indicated [3] 3/21 28/19 | 15/14 15/17 16/1 21/6 29/7 |
| 59/23 60/16 60/17 62/11 | 69/1 | 33/5 38/1 39/24 50/18 55/21 |
| 62/19 63/1 63/8 64/3 64/10 | individual [1] 53/9 | 55/25 60/5 66/20 67/15 69/5 |
| 65/7 65/19 69/16 69/18 70/9 | ineligible [2] 49/25 50/4 | 72/1 76/4 76/5 |
| 70/10 73/7 73/23 74/10 74/22 | inflection [1] 5/2 | judges [1] 26/21 |
| 75/24 | inform [1] 49/6 | judgment [1] 48/2 |
| HONORABLE [1] 1/9 | information [9] 41/6 41/13 | JULIA [2] 1/23 3/17 |
| hope [3] 31/16 40/11 74/6 | 41/16 41/20 41/21 42/13 | July [17] 51/10 51/16 60/9 |
| hopeful [2] 66/6 66/11 | 59/22 66/10 73/12 | 60/19 61/1 61/16 62/3 63/5 |
| hopefully [2] 31/13 66/7 | informs [1] 28/8 | 64/23 65/5 65/10 65/12 66/2 |
| hours [11] 7/6 8/12 21/1 | Ingelheim [1] 47/9 | 67/1 67/11 68/6 70/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 31 / 13 & 33 / 17 & 34 / 1 & 45 / 10 & 45 / 21\end{array}$ | inherent [1] 28/15 | July 17th [3] 67/1 67/11 |
| 73/21 $74 / 3$ 74/12 | initial [9] 17/8 19/12 20/3 | 70/21 |
| Houston [1] 1/14 | 23/8 28/5 28/6 28/19 40/21 | July 18th [2] 51/10 51/16 |
| how [35] 4/25 5/8 6/10 7/20 | 40/25 | July 19th [1] 63/5 |
| 7/21 18/13 23/11 23/12 23/21 | initially [3] 19/5 19/12 | July 2023 [2] 64/23 65/12 |
| $31 / 22$ 31/22 37/9 37/14 39/3 | 30/25 [1] 8/14 | jump [1] 26/23 |
| 51/18 52/9 54/17 54/23 54/25 | $\begin{array}{lr}\text { innovative [1] } & 8 / 1 \\ \text { instances [1] } & 34 / 9\end{array}$ | juncture $[1]$ $44 / 9$  <br> June [3] $42 / 10$ $42 / 15$ $42 / 17$ |


| J | later [11] 19/8 20/20 42/5 | 26/16 27/3 27/4 38/8 60/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| June 3rd [1] 42/17 | 42/21 51/15 53/2 55/9 59/2 | 62/20 64/16 66/16 68/1 68/2 |
| jurisdiction [5] 18/22 25/8 | latest [2] 64/20 64/21 | 34/18 $36 / 8 \quad 45 / 3 \quad 45 / 14 \quad 50 / 19$ |
| 29/22 69/6 69/13 | latitude [1] 5/17 | 59/21 66/17 74/3 |
| jurisdictional [1] 29/9 <br> jurors' [1] 72/7 | law [9] 15/18 15/23 16/2 | LLP [3] 1/16 $1 / 201 / 23$ |
| jury [1] 9/9 | 16/4 24/12 24/14 41/2 58/3 | LMI [7] 12/24 14/1 14/2 $14 / 4$ |
| just [57] $3 / 7$ 4/1 $4 / 15$ 5/16 | 61/24 | 21/17 40/22 50/9 |
| 6/12 7/24 8/4 8/6 8/18 10/23 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { lawsuit [3] } & 25 / 3 & 26 / 2 & 41 / 11 \\ \text { lawyer [19] } & 23 / 17 & 25 / 19\end{array}$ | locate [1] 6/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}11 / 17 / 14 & 17 / 20 & 17 / 24 & 18 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rlll} \text { lawyer }[19] & 23 / 17 & 25 / 19 \\ 25 / 20 & 26 / 12 & 28 / 4 & 28 / 8 \\ 28 / 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { long [10] } & 20 / 24 & 42 / 15 & 43 / 12 \\ 43 / 12 & 60 / 1 & 61 / 19 & 62 / 3 & 69 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 18/5 22/14 24/5 26/23 27/9 | 28/11 28/20 28/21 28/22 29/1 | $71 / 9 \quad 71 / 22$ |
| $32 / 16$ 33/8 33/11 35/21 36/6 | 29/1 29/3 29/19 29/20 30/3 | longer [8] 11/5 24/24 26/2 |
| 36/19 36/22 37/6 38/11 39/17 | 40/8 72/25 | 27/2 $71 / 11$ 71/19 $74 / 3 \quad 74 / 11$ |
| 44/2 44/4 46/16 46/23 48/8 | lawyers [8] 30/3 39/25 58/3 | look [3] 3/7 12/8 73/14 |
| 48/9 55/11 55/15 58/25 59/10 | 11 72/19 $72 / 24 \quad 73$ | looked [5] 11/14 13/23 14/9 |
| 63/4 63/25 64/16 67/16 67/25 | [1] 65/14 | 15/19 32/20 |
| 68/13 $69 / 24 \quad 70 / 14 \quad 71 / 20$ | leadership [1] <br> leads [1] 26/25 | looking $[7]$ $14 / 3$ $14 / 4$ $20 / 22$ <br> $45 / 16$ $47 / 13$ $49 / 7$ $63 / 25$ |
| 72/21 74/15 74/25 | learn [2] 23/21 | looks [3] 31/8 48/17 59/5 |
| K | learned [1] 9/10 | lose [1] 53/3 |
| keep [10] 19/14 44/18 44/25 | learning [1] 70/5 | lot [12] 8/5 8/8 8/14 8 |
| 53/19 59/10 59/20 59/23 66/6 | $\begin{array}{\|llllll} \text { least [8] } & 17 / 23 & 18 / 23 & 19 / 12 \\ 22 / 20 & 22 / 22 & 22 / 24 & 24 / 1 & 75 / 13 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 / 5 \text { 17/2 39/23 45/22 58/2 } \\ & 61 / 1061 / 1463 / 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 66/17 70/1 | leave [5] $28 / 16 \quad 30 / 11 \quad 34 / 18$ | lots [3] 71/22 $72 / 19 \quad 72 / 19$ |
| Keeps [1] 23/1 | 39/17 74/15 | loud [1] 72 |
| key [1] 13/24 | leaves [1] 51/5 | Louisiana [1] 11/17 |
| Kherkher [1] 1/13 | led [2] 6/25 7/1 | loves [1] 58/15 |
| kind [24] 6/16 7/20 9/2 9/19 | left [2] 40/16 53/ | M |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 19 & 12 / 11 & 13 / 4 & 14 / 24 & 15 / 4\end{array}$ | $\text { less [3] } 13 / 6 \quad 16 / 9 \quad 22 / 25$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 22 & 25 / 5 & 32 / 2 & 32 / 6 & 32 / 11\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { less [3] } & 13 / 6 & 16 / 9 & 22 / 25 \\ \text { let [17] } & 5 / 24 & 5 / 24 & 6 / 12 \end{array} \text { 6/16 }$ | made [1] 12/22 |
| 34/3 $35 / 3 \quad 36 / 4 \quad 36 / 7 \quad 36 / 8$ | $12 / 21 \text { 20/16 } 21 / 9 \text { 30/8 } 33 / 24$ | main [1] 34/22 |
| 41/6 59/16 65/25 67/14 69/14 | 43/15 53/4 57/21 61/10 61/11 | major [1] 63/20 |
| kinds [3] $36 / 13$ $46 / 12$ <br> $1 / 4$   | 61/12 62/15 68/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { make [36] } & 5 / 3 & 5 / 11 & 6 / 9 & 6 / 25\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { King [2] } & 1 / 20 & 1 / 23 \\ \text { knocking } & {[1]} & 71 / 25\end{array}$ | let's [10] 3/8 25/19 28/16 | 7/15 11/24 14/5 18/2 19/16 |
| knocking [1] 71/25 | 33/23 34/14 34/17 48/12 | 22/2 27/15 28/13 28/14 34/14 |
| know [56] 5/19 11/3 14/14 | 48/15 58/12 58/13 | 39/20 40/25 41/10 44/5 45/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 17 & 15 / 1 & 17 / 2 & 17 / 5 & 17 / 12 \\ 18 / 4 & 20 / 16 & 21 / 13 & 30 / 4 & 31 / 3\end{array}$ | Lexecon [4] 10/6 10/13 $15 / 3$ | 47/7 49/15 49/24 50/4 56/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 4 & 20 / 16 & 21 / 13 & 30 / 4 & 31 / 3 \\ 32 / 15 & 33 / 1 & 33 / 21 & 34 / 3 & 34 / 15\end{array}$ | 15/12 [4] 10/6 10/13 | 56/8 59/9 59/19 61/21 64/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 15 & 33 / 1 & 33 / 21 & 34 / 3 & 34 / 15 \\ 36 / 24 & 38 / 22 & 39 / 3 & 43 / 15 & 44 / 4\end{array}$ | liability [3] $1 / 5$ 3/2 $40 / 2$ | 66/7 66/22 67/13 67/24 69/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 24 & 38 / 22 & 39 / 3 & 43 / 15 & 44 / 4 \\ 44 / 7 & 44 / 16 & 45 / 5 & 45 / 16 & 45 / 17\end{array}$ | lied [1] 46/16 | 72/17 74/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}44 / 7 & 44 / 16 & 45 / 5 & 45 / 16 & 45 / 17 \\ 46 / 9 & 48 / 9 & 49 / 13 & 52 / 9 & 53 / 14\end{array}$ | lieu [1] 43/7 | makes [5] 28/14 48/18 49/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 56 / 1 & 56 / 3 & 56 / 9 & 58 / 21 & 58 / 23\end{array}$ | light [1] 3/10 | 67/2 73/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}56 / 1 & 56 / 3 & 56 / 9 & 58 / 21 & 58 / 23 \\ 58 / 25 & 59 / 4 & 59 / 5 & 60 / 10 & 61 / 7\end{array}$ | like [48] 9/22 9/23 11/6 | making [3] 16/2 16/24 60/3 |
| $61 / 18$ 61/24 62/6 62/8 62/9 | 11/19 $12 / 8$ 12/11 $13 / 1314 / 1$ | manage [2] 26/15 29/24 |
| 63/14 64/10 66/11 68/13 | 15/24 18/1 $23 / 11$ 29/23 $31 / 8$ | managing [1] 38/25 |
| 68/23 69/10 71/12 73/13 | $32 / 8$ 33/22 $34 / 3 \quad 37 / 3 \quad 37 / 11$ | manner [1] 45/13 |
| know as [1] 59/4 | 37/13 37/20 37/21 38/6 40/2 | many [10] 4/6 15/10 34/11 |
| knowing [1] 61/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}41 / 24 & 42 / 23 & 42 / 24 & 43 / 5 & 46 / 17\end{array}$ | 39/25 54/25 56/11 64/1 64 |
| knowledge [1] 8/7 | 47/12 50/6 50/21 51/15 51/19 | 71/14 72/8 |
| knows [3] 9/17 20/11 32/23 | 51/23 51/23 52/22 55/20 56/4 | marathon [1] |
| L | 68/3 68/17 69/22 70/21 73/14 | 48/7 |
|  | likely [2] 10/15 16/3 | market [1] |
| landscape [1] 59/5 | Limitations [1] 49/10 | master [6] 5/19 6/3 9/2 12/7 |
| language [4] $31 / 3 \quad 31 / 7 \quad 31 / 7$ | limited [2] 25/8 72/4 | 14/9 43/14 |
| 31/8 | line [11] 16/25 17/1 18/23 | material [1] 69/7 |
| large [3] 6/17 15/2 18/25 | 22/9 $22 / 9$ 25/15 $33 / 24$ 45/2 | math [1] 10/19 |
| largely [2] 18/16 52/6 | 47/24 56/3 58/5 | matter [2] 33/1 76/10 |
| $\underset{31 / 18}{\substack{\text { larger } \\ 3}}$ | $\text { link [1] } 44 / 5$ | $\text { may [43] } 6 / 7 \quad 6 / 18 \quad 13 / 11$ |
| largest [1] 9/21 | list [9] 20/7 38/13 40/5 | 13/11 18/24 22/1 27/14 30/0 |
| last [7] 12/22 16/25 17/1 | 47/14 $47 / 2548 / 1449 / 15$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 15 & 38 / 8 & 42 / 5 & 45 / 1 & 46 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 21/1 52/14 64/3 71/10 | 68/18 74/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}46 / 8 & 46 / 10 & 47 / 2 & 50 / 15 & 51 / 5\end{array}$ |
| lasts [1] 71/11 | listed [1] 40/4 | 4/7 57/11 58/2 58/19 58/22 <br> 8/23 59/3 59/7 59/8 60/14 |
| late [1] 63/18 | litigation [12] 1/5 3/2 | 64/11 64/11 64/12 65/2 65/3 |


| M | 63/12 64/1 64/7 66/23 66/25 | 12 69/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| may... [10] 65/4 65/6 65/16 | 67/20 68/14 68/15 70/21 | needed [4] 6/9 27/14 4 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}65 / 18 & 66 / 24 & 67 / 3 & 67 / 5 & 68 / 7\end{array}$ | moot [1] 30/20 | negotiate [3] 24/3 43/12 |
| maybe [14] 6/9 14/2 23 | more [23] 4/23 4/23 9/3 | 58/6 |
| $\begin{array}{rrrrl}\text { maybe } \\ 23 / 18 & 34 / 4 & 37 / 4 & 43 / 2 & 44 / 24\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 15 & 13 / 6 & 16 / 9 & 16 / 21 & 19 / 9\end{array}$ | negotiated [1] |
| 48/11 48/11 48/16 59/20 | 23/19 34/3 45/13 45/14 | negotiation |
| 59/22 73/1 | $\begin{array}{llll} 48 / 17 & 50 / 21 & 58 / 12 & 59 / 2 \\ 62 / 13 & 63 / 15 & 68 / 22 & 73 / 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { never [2] } & 29 / 17 \\ \text { new [3] } & 19 / 24 \quad 21 \end{array}$ |
| md [1] 1/3 | 6/8/8 $75 / 8$ | next [17] 6/11 7/6 7/15 8/11 |
| MDL [16] $3 / 2$ 4/6 5/2 $8 / 17$ | morning [1] 3/12 | 23/23 31/13 33/25 41/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 4 & 11 / 4 & 11 / 8 & 11 / 16 & 11 / 18\end{array}$ | most [4] 4/20 13/20 25/2 | 45/10 $57 / 15$ 60/14 $69 / 14$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 15 & 28 / 23 & 31 / 21 & 64 / 4 & 67 / 2 \\ 67 / 15 & 70 / 5 & & \end{array}$ | 62/23 | 70/21 $75 / 4 \quad 75 / 12 \quad 75 / 15 \quad 75 / 16$ |
| $67 / 15 ~ 70 / 5$ MDL's [2] $26 / 14$ | Mostly [1] 8/2 | nice [2] 3/7 76/6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MDL's [2] } \\ & \text { MDLs [2] } \end{aligned}$ | motion [15] 27/15 28/13 29/3 | nicely [1] 18/ |
| me [29] 5/11 5/14 5/17 5/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 23 & 33 / 7 & 33 / 10 & 33 / 12 & 33 / 18\end{array}$ | nine [5] 57/22 60/7 64/12 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}6 / 9 & 6 / 12 \\ 6 / 14 & 6 / 14 \\ 6 / 16 & 6 / 16\end{array}$ | 50/16 52/8 60/23 63/5 63/13 $66 / 15$ 68/14 | $66 / 23 \quad 67 / 20$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 21 & 21 / 9 & 26 / 9 & 29 / 22 & 33 / 17\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { motions [10] } & 56 / 5 & 61 / 4 & 61 / 6\end{array}$ | no [21] 1/3 5/6 10/12 <br> 11/5 11/11 20/19 24/6 |
| 38/17 $45 / 15$ 46/14 $53 / 1$ 57/21 | 61/20 62/8 63/23 65/2 65/8 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}11 / 2 & 35 / 6 & 35 / 22 & 37 / 6 & 42 / 5\end{array}$ |
| 58/12 $58 / 2061 / 16$ 63/4 $64 / 9$ | 65/9 65/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}45 / 6 & 46 / 4 & 48 / 19 & 50 / 25 & 56 / 23\end{array}$ |
| $66 / 24$ $68 / 21$ $72 / 18$ $73 / 5$ <br> mean $13]$ $9 / 8$ $14 / 11$ <br> $16 / 10$    | move [10] 9/4 | 61/16 74/2 |
|  | 27/22 29/3 45/14 45/24 66/13 | nobody [2] 10/22 58/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 17 & 21 / 8 & 23 / 12 & 23 / 13 & 39 / 2 \\ 44 / 18 & 46 / 5 & 53 / 8 & 65 / 5 & 66 / 9\end{array}$ | 68/12 75/11 | non [3] 27/24 31/20 32/5 |
| $44 / 18$ meaning [1] | moved [3] 17/24 18/12 66/18 | non-compliant [1] 27/24 |
| meaning [1] meaningful | moving [2] 17/18 18/14 | non-diverse [2] 31/20 32/5 |
| means [1] 39/16 | Mr [42] 6/20 6/20 7/22 7/25 | not [94] |
| meant [3] 13/2 $24 / 24$ 50/8 | 8/3 8/4 8/8 8/8 8/9 8/9 8/14 | not wasting [1] 11/6 |
| mechanics [2] 8/7 62/14 | 8/18 $11 / 18$ 13/9 $13 / 1017 / 17$ | note [1] 22/ |
| mechanism [3] 9/8 $44 / 16$ 45/5 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 20 & 18 / 3 & 35 / 22 & 37 / 2 & 45 / 9\end{array}$ | nothing [5] 13/14 29/2 36/13 |
| medical [17] 18/17 20/6 | 45/9 46/1 $46 / 14$ 47/10 $54 / 3$ | 66/4 70 |
| 20/11 $35 / 11 \quad 35 / 15 \quad 35 / 16$ | 54/6 59/2 61/18 62/10 62/12 | notice [6] 24/23 27/9 28/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}38 / 12 & 38 / 14 & 38 / 24 & 39 / 11\end{array}$ | 62/17 63/14 68/9 68/9 70/2 | 41/10 55/9 57/22 |
| 39/19 46/4 74/19 74/19 74/20 | 13 71/16 71/17 71/18 | notices [1] 27/10 |
| 75/18 | 71/18 74/11 | noticing [1] 52/22 |
| meet [1] 49/19 | Ms [4] 6/20 20/19 36/2 66/23 | notified [2] 20/19 |
| meetings [1] 71/12 | Ms. [11] $8 / 6$ 9/1 $10 / 18$ 11/9 | notify [5] 28/12 35/14 36/3 |
| memories [1] 46/6 | 7/22 18/5 21/2 29/22 45/9 | 42/4 42/4 |
| memory [1] 46/17 | Ms. Stipes [1] 70/14 | November [3] 17/10 |
| mentioned [1] 73/21 | Ms. Zousmer [10] 8/6 9/1 | November 75 |
| merits [2] 60/24 65/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 10/18 } & 11 / 9 & 17 / 22 & 18 / 5 & 21 / 2\end{array}$ | November 15th [1] 75/12 |
| messed [1] 55/24 | 29/22 45/9 68/10 | November 28th [1] 23/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Microsoft [3] } & 19 / 6 & 52 / 1 & 52 / 4 \\ \text { middle [2] } & 15 / 22 & 54 / 1\end{array}$ | much [3] 4/12 21/19 63/15 | now [29] 7/4 15/5 17/21 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { middle [2] } & 15 / 22 & 54 / 1 \\ \text { might [13] } & 14 / 18 & 14 / 21 & 16 / 24\end{array}$ | multi [1] 55/17 | $18 / 16$ $20 / 2$ $23 / 6$ $23 / 7$ <br> 14    |
| might [13] $14 / 18$ 14/21 $16 / 24$ | multiple [2] 56/6 67/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 24/8 } & 24 / 22 & 36 / 21 & 44 / 11 & 46 / 22\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 21 & 23 / 15 & 35 / 24 & 49 / 2 & 49 / 18 \\ 49 / 19 & 50 / 4 & 56 / 16 & 56 / 18 & 72 / 25\end{array}$ | my [33] 5/2 6/12 6/13 $7 / 5$ | 51/9 54/16 55/25 58/11 58/16 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { 49/19 } & 50 / 4 & 56 / 16 & 56 / 18 & 72 / 25\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 7 & 12 / 10 & 15 / 1 & 16 / 9 & 17 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}58 / 21 & 59 / 1 & 60 / 12 & 63 / 5 & 63 / 18\end{array}$ |
| MIKAL [13] $1 / 15$ 3/14 $6 / 19$ | 21/9 23/13 $23 / 23 \quad 25 / 22 \quad 26 / 5$ | 64/25 65/20 67/12 70/23 71/7 |
| 7/19 8/23 11/11 15/14 21/4 | $30 / 18 \quad 33 / 8 \quad 36 / 1 \quad 36 / 22 \quad 37 / 17$ | $71 / 25$ (1) |
| 32/17 60/5 65/25 66/20 68/3 | $38 / 4 \quad 40 / 12 \quad 50 / 19 \quad 52 / 16 \quad 54 / 5$ | number [15] 3/3 7/9 9/2 |
| mind [6] 5/6 17/22 22/4 | $57 / 10 \quad 61 / 13 \quad 61 / 18 \quad 63 / 20$ | 10/19 16/10 18/19 21/14 |
| 23/13 44/12 53/22 | 64/12 67/7 67/21 71/4 71/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 23 / 25 & 41 / 3 & 44 / 8 & 48 / 11 & 48 / 12\end{array}$ |
| mining [1] 12/1 | myself [5] 3/7 6/5 6/6 8/9 | 52/7 62/21 69/9 |
| minor [2] | 17/16 | numbers [6] |
| miscommunication [1] 7/3 | N | 21/18 69/1 69/4 |
| misinterpretation [1] 7/2 missed [3] 17/19 37/4 50/20 | narrow [1] 45/2 | 40/13 40/14 51/1 59/10 |
| missed [3] 17/19 37/4 50/20 <br> misspoke [1] 25/14 | nationwide [1] 9/16 | NW [1] 2/2 |
| stake [1] 67/15 | nature [2] 14/4 61/3 |  |
| mistakes [2] 49/7 49/14 | necessarily [5] 33/22 36/11 | 0 |
| modify [1] 54/21 | 37/5 37/8 38/21 | oath [4] 40/23 41/17 41/25 |
| moment [2] 6/14 28/17 | necessary [2] 19/4 41/17 | 23 |
| Monday [4] 52/22 $73 / 1$ 75/10 | need [27] 19/15 26/12 26/13 | obligations [1] 28/ |
| 75/19 | 26/13 28/7 34/21 35/21 36/24 | obsolete [1] 33/ |
| monstrosities [1] 72/7 | 38/12 $45 / 21$ 54/21 55/16 56/3 | obtaining [2] 10/6 10/1 |
| months [14] 7/15 41/20 60/8 | 60/10 $60 / 18$ 63/1 $63 / 2$ 64/13 | obviate [1] 34/21 |
|  | 64/22 64/24 66/11 67/12 68/4 | obviously [10] 17/18 26/11 |


| 0 | 49/3 52/21 59/3 61/3 65/8 | $28 / 5$ 28/6 31/10 31/24 32/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| obviously... [8] 33/12 35/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}66 / 21 & 69 / 7 & 71 / 16 & 73 / 9 & 73 / 11 \\ 73 / 20 & 74 / 20 & \end{array}$ | $33 / 18 \text { 34/2 } 34 / 22 \quad 51 / 3$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}40 / 8 & 42 / 7 & 45 / 23 & 46 / 16 & 64 / 8\end{array}$ | others [2] 4/23 4/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 26 / 18 & 27 / 2 & 28 / 1 & 41 / 11 & 41 / 12 \end{array}$ |
| occur [1] 60/2 | otherwise [4] 8/13 43/8 | 72/19 |
| occurs [1] 69/10 | 47/15 74/17 | participating [2] 25/8 26/25 |
| October [6] 1/5 60/14 64/5 | our [30] 4/3 5/19 6/3 7/1 | particular [2] 5/6 6/8 |
| 67/4 74/21 76/12 | 9/5 9/14 10/3 18/18 19/16 | particularly [2] 61/15 63/7 |
| October 10th [1] 67/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 3 & 22 / 4 & 25 / 9 & 26 / 14 & 34 / 20\end{array}$ | parties [4] 4/21 48/18 60/6 |
| October 13 [1] 74/21 | 41/18 $50 / 16$ 51/17 $56 / 5$ 57/13 |  |
| of formulating [1] 15/24 | 25 60/20 63/19 64/17 | parties' [2] 3/22 65/ |
| of Repose [1] 49/10 | 64/18 64/19 66/7 66/8 66/15 | parts [2] 6/8 |
| off [5] 6/4 13/12 33/24 | 67/8 67/11 | party [1] 29/21 |
| 64/16 72/3 | our decisions [1] 19/1 | past [1] 49 |
| offer [2] 13/25 14/8 | ourselves [1] 74/4 | pasted [1] |
| Official [2] 2/4 76/13 | out [53] 8/12 10/4 13/9 16/1 | Paul [1] 47 |
| often [1] $40 / 6$ | 18/12 18/22 19/9 21/16 23/19 | Pauline [2] 2/4 76/13 |
| oh [2] 15/4 35/2 | 24/9 25/3 25/12 26/13 26/2 | pay [1] 68/ |
| okay [31] $12 / 10$ 12/17 $13 / 18$ | 6/23 $32 / 12$ 33/15 $34 / 23$ | Peachtree [1] |
| 13/25 16/6 17/5 18/3 21/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 19 & 36 / 3 & 37 / 20 & 37 / 20 & 38 / 14\end{array}$ | peeling [1] 26 |
| 22/20 23/6 23/6 24/24 28/16 | 40/4 41/13 $43 / 19$ 46/12 $48 / 1$ | pen [2] 6/12 6/15 |
| 32/14 35/9 35/9 36/7 39/22 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}48 / 20 & 49 / 7 & 49 / 9 & 49 / 14 & 53 / 4\end{array}$ | penalty [3] 25/15 25/16 4 |
| 40/12 $44 / 2 \quad 45 / 24 \quad 50 / 8 \quad 50 / 17$ | 54/4 55/11 58/21 59/20 61/6 | pending [1] 32/24 |
| 51/1 68/21 70/7 70/11 71/4 | (13 $64 / 264 / 564 / 6 \quad 64 / 8$ | Pensacola [1] |
| 73/18 75/21 75/25 | 64/14 65/24 67/16 68/7 71/25 | people [18] 9/6 11/1 |
| once [2] 7/6 56/7 | $\begin{array}{lllll}72 / 21 & 72 / 22 & 72 / 25 & 74 / 1 & 74 / 8\end{array}$ | $724 / 132$ |
| oncologist [1] 20 | out-of-state | $30 / 4 \quad 35 / 4 \quad 38 / 3 \quad 55 / 25 \quad 60 / 21$ |
| - | outcome [1] 33/20 | per [9] 17/7 21/23 22/ |
| one cancers [1] | outlier [1] 15/20 | 40/16 52/12 52/19 53/8 54/10 |
| es [5] 5/ | outliers [1] 48 | 55/25 |
| $65 / 15$ ongoing [2] 3/10 | outside [1] 70/2 | percent [19] 16/16 18/20 |
| ongoing [2] $3 / 10$ 7/14 only [11] $12 / 6 \quad 16 / 7 \quad 26 / 2$ | outsider [1] 5/9 | 18/25 21/11 21/11 21/12 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { only [11] } & 12 / 6 & 16 / 7 & 26 / 2 \\ 28 / 18 & 30 / 23 & 30 / 25 & 36 / 15\end{array}$ | outstanding [1] 15/9 | 21/14 21/22 21/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 18 & 30 / 23 & 30 / 25 & 36 / 15 \\ 51 / 10 & 54 / 13 & 69 / 6 & 75 / 17\end{array}$ | $\text { over [25] 6/16 } 7 / 19 \quad 9 / 17$ | 22/22 24/1 $24 / 4$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}51 / 10 & 54 / 13 & 69 / 6 \quad 75 / 17\end{array}$ | 10/14 11/9 12/7 16/21 27/4 | 31/1 32/22 $40 / 16$ 75/1 |
| onus [2] 24/14 53/20 | 29/19 29/22 30/2 33/25 35/23 | percentage [1] 13/12 |
| open [3] 55/14 67/11 $74 / 1$ | 38/18 $41 / 2 \quad 45 / 10 \quad 47 / 20 \quad 47 / 20$ | perfect [1] 49/13 |
| opinion [1] 65/18 | $58 / 17 \text { 69/5 69/23 71/3 71/21 }$ |  |
| opportunity [1] 41/22 | $73 / 6 \quad 73 / 6$ | perhaps [1] |
| oppose [1] 63/19 | overall [3] 11/20 13/4 13/14 |  |
| opposed [4] 9/10 30/13 66/19 | overall [3] 11/20 $13 / 413 / 14$ | period [4] 36/19 36/20 38 |
| 69/3 | overlap [1] 48/16 |  |
| opposition [1] 63/19 | overview [3] 5/24 7/20 8/ | perjury [1] |
| opt [1] 36/18 | own [3] $4 / 16$ 12/10 $44 / 14$ | permitted [2] 51/25 52/3 |
| option [4] 24/18 34/24 35 | P | n [4] 5/25 52/17 54/ |
| 73/3 |  |  |
| order [49] 3/4 3/4 3/21 4/1 | padding | ons [4] 13/5 14/11 14 |
| 4/3 7/17 7/20 9/6 9/13 11/2 | age [11] 9/14 10/18 13/3 | 1 |
| 26/9 26/11 26/12 26/19 27/8 | 16/22 50/9 51/21 55/12 57/22 | perspective |
| 27/18 27/21 29/20 30/3 31/11 | 1 70/15 | 10/8 40/24 57/13 |
| 32/2 37/2 38/13 39/8 39/16 | pages [1] | persuade [1] 19/1 |
| 41/13 44/10 51/10 51/19 | paid [1] 68/ | PETROSINELLI [6] 2/1 6/20 |
| 51/24 52/3 52/6 54/17 54/21 | paired [1] 63/10 | 8/9 62/13 62/18 68/10 |
| 59/20 63/11 64/2 64/6 66/22 | PALM [3] 1/2 1/5 | Petrosinelli's [1] 71 |
| 67/13 67/19 68/5 69/2 69/23 | pancreatic [1] 69 | phase [34] 36/25 36/25 52/4 |
| 74/17 75/4 75/9 75/16 75/20 | pandemic [1] 3/10 | 52/5 52/6 52/11 52/19 53/8 |
| ordering [2] 38/12 46/20 | paperwork [1] 21/9 | 54/16 $54 / 18$ 54/19 54/19 |
| orderly [1] 58/12 | paragraph [19] 16/13 16/21 | 54/22 $54 / 23$ 54/24 54/25 |
| orders [10] 4/19 28/15 29/14 | 16/23 17/5 17/8 17/11 17/15 | 56/14 56/22 56/23 56/24 |
| 30/6 32/9 59/11 59/20 70/17 | 17/15 18/7 18/8 18/9 18/16 | 56/25 57/2 57/4 57/16 57/18 |
| 70/23 71/6 | 20/15 42/7 50/8 51/1 51/21 | 57/19 57/23 57/24 57/25 58/2 |
| original [3] 20/21 42/16 | 55/13 70/15 | 58/7 58/8 68/24 68/24 |
| original $49 / 18$ | paragraphs [2] 19/3 44/3 | phon [1] 11/16 |
| other [29] 4/19 7/9 10/5 | Paraquat [1] 67/25 | phone [2] 62/12 62/16 |
| 11/10 11/13 11/15 15/15 | paren [2] 55/14 55/14 | phoning [1] 62/18 |
| 15/21 16/7 25/7 27/17 27/25 | parenthetical [1] 55/10 | physician [5] 20/8 20/9 20/9 |
| 33/21 $35 / 8$ 43/8 $47 / 19$ 48/21 | $15 / 2 \quad 24 / 6 \quad 25 / 23 \quad 26 / 11 \quad 26 / 14$ | physicians [1] 40/5 |

## P

pick [5] 35/4 53/1 53/2 54/6 71/4
picked [2] 69/8 71/14
picking [3] 9/22 $14 / 15$ 15/4 Pierce [1] 2/5
pill [5] 52/17 71/17 71/17 71/18 71/19
pitched [1] 9/18
place [7] 18/18 47/12 58/1 58/15 58/18 59/15 74/23
Plaintiff [30] 8/23 12/25 15/20 19/10 23/8 23/15 24/9 25/20 26/1 27/20 39/4 40/8 41/8 41/21 43/8 43/11 47/20 47/21 48/15 48/17 50/9 53/3 53/5 53/14 53/18 54/7 55/14 55/18 71/14 73/4
Plaintiff's [7] 26/12 $26 / 15$ 27/24 41/22 43/6 47/10 50/11
PLAINTIFFS [62] $1 / 12 \quad 3 / 12$ 9/7 9/9 9/11 10/4 10/9 10/10 $10 / 20 \quad 11 / 311 / 8 \quad 12 / 5 \quad 12 / 6$ $13 / 2$ 13/3 $13 / 4$ 13/9 $14 / 13$ 15/5 16/10 16/10 17/7 18/24 19/5 19/9 19/14 20/18 21/22 21/24 22/21 26/14 29/11 $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 14 & 35 / 14 & 36 / 11 & 36 / 20\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 23 & 40 / 20 & 42 / 4 & 42 / 8 & 42 / 12\end{array}$ 42/13 42/16 42/17 42/22 $\begin{array}{lllll}4 / 22 & 46 / 24 & 49 / 4 & 51 / 14 & 53 / 7\end{array}$ 55/11 55/17 55/25 56/1 56/7 56/13 56/17 56/20 57/5 69/1 69/4 69/9
Plaintiffs' [3] 24/25 42/9 54/6
Plaintiffs/claimants [3] 13/2 18/24 19/5
plan [6] 1/9 3/5 8/7 52/24
57/23 73/18
plans [1] 73/5
plastered [1] 5/14
platform [1] 3/10
play [1] 72/22
playing [1] 34/10
plead [2] 53/15 53/16
pleading [1] 53/11
pleadings [1] 61/20
pled [1] 53/13
plexiglass [1] 5/14
PLLC [1] 1/13
plugs [1] 55/22
plus [4] $4 / 19$ 13/5 $25 / 3$
59/16
point [43] 5/25 16/8 20/4 24/23 25/5 25/14 25/16 28/18 $30 / 1530 / 2030 / 2130 / 24$ 31/12 32/7 37/5 37/10 40/15 44/6 44/20 44/22 45/1 46/2 48/22 49/11 51/17 52/20 52/24 53/6 53/9 53/10 53/17 53/24 55/24 56/6 56/13 58/22 59/3 59/21 59/25 67/1 67/7 68/4 73/17
pointed [1] 13/9
points [5] 5/2 5/2 12/24 13/12 73/19
pool [45] 8/16 9/15 10/1
10/5 11/19 11/23 11/24 12/13 13/24 14/20 14/21 16/8 16/23 16/25 17/1 17/9 18/25 19/7 19/12 19/13 20/3 20/23 23/3 23/9 24/2 24/25 28/6 28/19 30/24 32/7 34/24 36/24 36/25 38/16 40/15 40/21 45/2 49/16 52/25 53/7 53/8 53/19 54/12 70/3 70/4
pools [3] 11/16 13/22 44/21
popping [1] 60/13
population [2] 9/23 9/24
position [5] 29/21 44/8
55/17 58/2 73/21
possibility [1] 24/4
possible [6] 34/21 40/20
46/25 49/17 60/3 65/21
possibly [1] 46/9
potential [4] 14/18 $14 / 19$ 34/14 42/14
pound [1] 52/17
power [6] 10/14 15/13 26/10
26/19 26/20 28/15
powers [1] 38/25
practical [1] 70/1
practice [7] 14/19 14/20
14/23 14/25 14/25 52/8 56/6
pre [1] 59/5
predict [1] 55/15
prejudice [17] 24/19 25/17
25/25 26/5 27/5 29/8 29/16
29/25 36/10 36/23 37/1 37/7
37/9 37/18 44/4 44/17 45/6
prepared [1] 73/10
prescribing [3] 20/9 35/23 35/24
prescription [1] 35/25
presentations [2] 64/19 66/7
presented [1] 38/19
press [1] 69/14
pressed [1] 11/8
presumably [4] 10/15 25/2 72/23 75/16
presume [1] 61/24
presumptive [1] 51/18
pretrial [8] 4/3 4/19 4/22
7/17 7/20 58/1 59/21 71/22
pretty [2] 10/24 22/6
prevalence [1] 70/3
prevent [1] 53/5
previous [2] 49/4 58/10
previously [1] 14/3
Prilosec [1] 46/12
primary [2] 20/8 35/20
privy [1] 5/10
probably [13] $4 / 12$ 4/15 $13 / 2$
17/13 20/22 $34 / 12 \quad 37 / 19$
43/24 47/20 48/3 54/14 69/23 74/12
problem [5] 10/7 10/9 13/16 31/10 62/2
problems [4] $10 / 6$ 10/14 $42 / 8$ 43/14
procedural [1] 10/12
procedure [1] 45/6
proceed [17] 23/9 23/12 23/16 23/21 24/16 24/18

25/21 25/21 25/22 26/1 26/3 26/6 28/20 28/25 32/1 32/6 35/2
proceeding [1] 63/21
proceedings [1] 76/10
process [48] 7/14 8/5 8/20
9/8 9/20 11/1 11/7 19/4 19/8 19/15 25/9 25/13 25/23 26/22 27/1 28/2 28/25 29/15 32/19 33/4 37/1 37/16 38/10 39/7 $\begin{array}{llllll}39 / 18 & 40 / 10 & 42 / 2 & 45 / 14 & 45 / 17\end{array}$ 46/19 49/1 $49 / 11$ 50/2 50/11
53/10 53/21 54/1 54/2 54/21 57/14 58/12 59/12 59/16 61/8 66/15 70/24 70/25 74/24
processes [1] 5/11
produce [1] 8/15
product [6] 13/21 30/5 46/5
46/17 47/2 50/5
PRODUCTS [2] $1 / 5$ 3/2
program [1] 24/11
project [1] 59/19
projecting [1] 56/5
projective [1] 67/14
prolific [1] 63/8
promise [1] 5/21
promised [1] 10/21
promising [1] 29/13
proper [1] 30/12
properly [2] 40/3 60/4
proposal [15] 3/23 3/23 4/1
4/1 4/4 6/8 6/17 6/22 7/8
7/13 9/3 14/7 33/17 33/19 69/2
proposals [3] 4/10 4/16 54/22
propose [3] 4/18 $18 / 14$ 58/13
proposed [2] 31/11 54/17
proposing [1] 5/4
prosecute [1] 27/20
provide [8] 14/8 20/5 26/13
48/7 50/9 54/22 57/23 70/4
provided [2] 3/23 6/23
providers [2] 38/14 47/1
PTO [7] $17 / 7$ 32/25 45/3
45/15 51/9 51/15 63/9
PULASKI [11] $1 / 12 \quad 1 / 13 \quad 3 / 11$ 7/25 8/4 8/8 8/9 8/19 12/4 13/8 74/11
pull [1] 23/18
pulling [1] 14/22
pulls [1] 23/3
punitive [2] 19/9 53/4
purpose [1] 25/8
purposeful [1] 55/15
purposes [3] $4 / 3$ 9/19 $9 / 25$
pursuant [4] 3/3 $27 / 8$ 28/14 45/3
pursue [1] 30/18
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { pursued [3] } & 11 / 5 & 11 / 6 & 62 / 21\end{array}$
push [2] 25/4 60/25
pushed [2] 63/17 66/17
pushing [3] 19/25 21/17 64/16
put [11] 5/4 8/8 $33 / 23 \quad 39 / 16$ 44/11 44/23 51/6 51/7 51/7 63/14 76/1
puts [2] 37/3 53/20

| Q | 5 47/18 49/6 50/ | t [1] 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| question [8] 5/23 25/11 $36 / 8$ | recovered [1] 8/2 | reverse [1] 35/6 |
| 39/10 57/21 59/10 65/11 |  | Richmond [1] 1/13 |
| questioning [2] 37/8 | reference [1] 3/25 | rid [6] 19/1 46/23 47/6 |
| questions [16] 5/20 5/21 6/2 | references [1] 17/25 | 49/10 52/16 53/3 |
| 6/4 6/8 6/24 7/11 12/11 | reflection [1] 4/11 | right [45] 3/1 16/15 17/21 |
| 12/14 15/1 21/5 23/23 40/12 | regard [1] 69/17 | 22/19 25/ |
| 41/23 43/1 44/3 | regarding [1] 7/10 | 28/3 29/20 34/2 35/7 36/11 |
| quick [1] 6/18 | regardless [2] 32/19 33/20 | $\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 25 & 37 / 4 & 38 / 5 & 39 / 16 & 43 / 10\end{array}$ |
| quickly [1] | registry [18] 9/6 10/20 | $44 / 11$ 46/22 49/5 50/23 51/9 |
| quit [2] 25/17 2 | 11/20 11/24 11/25 12/9 13/5 | 51/11 51/17 53/21 55/25 |
| quite [1] 15/10 | 14/12 14/12 15/10 15/10 30/5 | 56/21 57/17 58/11 58/16 |
| R | $38 / 2541 / 2$ | 69/25 $70 / 7$ 71/7 $73 / 18$ |
|  |  |  |
| raises [1] 36/8 | regular [1] 14/1 <br> reiterate [1] 8/18 | rights [3] 26/16 26/16 26/17 |
| random [4] 19/6 69/3 69/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { relates [3] } & 64 / 14 & 64 / 15 & 73 / 3\end{array}$ | $\text { righty [2] } 16 / 6 \text { 45/24 }$ |
| randomization [3] 43/17 | relating [1] 17/10 | ripe [9] 33/13 51/11 60/25 |
| 68/24 69/10 [3] | relationship [1] 6/21 | 61/2 61/4 61/16 62/2 65/4 |
| randomize [1] 21/25 | relief [1] 33/1 | 65/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { randomizer [21] } & 18 / 18 & 18 / 20\end{array}$ | rely [1] 48/22 | ripeness [2] 63/5 63/13 |
| 19/6 19/13 22/25 24/8 24/24 | remain [1] 52/2 | ripening [1] 68/14 |
| 25/14 25/16 30/25 32/21 35/1 | remaining [1] 54/11 | road [1] 44/12 |
| 35/5 40/25 41/9 52/1 52/4 | remains [1] 18/25 | ROBIN [2] 1/9 2/4 |
| 52/12 52/15 69/8 75/16 | remember [3] 52/13 56/23 | robust [1] 15/16 |
| randomizers [1] 22/13 | 64/1 | Rogers [2] 55/21 72/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { randomly [3] } \\ & 32 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | renegotiated [1] 20/25 | rolling [4] 20/5 20/17 35/11 |
| RANITIDINE [4] 1/4 20/9 | repeat [1] 70/13 | 41/25 |
| 35/22 35/24 | replace [2] 19/4 | Roman [6] 28/16 28/17 40/1 |
| rather [2] 49/11 67/16 | replacement [9] 19/5 19/1 | 40/14 51/1 59/10 |
| RE [1] 1/4 | 19/14 19/21 24/23 25/13 42/8 | ROSENBERG [3] 1/3 1/9 2/4 |
| reach [10] 23/14 23/17 23/18 | 42/9 42/17 [3] 35/1 35/2 | round [1] 62 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 25/19 } & 28 / 20 & 28 / 21 & 29 / 1 & 29 / 3\end{array}$ | replacements [3] 35/1 35/2 53/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { Roundup } & {[3]} & 64 / 1 & 68 / 14 & 68 / 19 \\ \text { row [2] } & 7 / 16 & 58 / 24 \end{array}$ |
| 31/16 63/3 | replacing [1] 19/22 | rule [15] 12/10 17/14 $26 / 3$ |
| reached [1] 14/5 | replies [2] 51/15 61/20 | 26/16 26/16 26/17 27/16 |
| reaches [1] 28/21 | reply [1] 33/14 | 27/18 27/23 28/13 51/19 |
| read [1] 17/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { report [4] } & 12 / 6 & 12 / 8 & 12 / 2\end{array}$ | 51/20 61/23 61/25 63/22 |
| readily [1] 73/ | 14/2 | ruled [4] 33/12 65/1 65/3 |
| readiness [1] 57 | Reporter [3] $2 / 4$ 76/13 $76 / 14$ | 65/6 |
| readings [1] 5/11 | reports [5] 12/5 13/22 14/1 | rules [1] 33/21 |
| ready [9] $23 / 18$ 52/9 54/19 | 14/4 32/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { ruling [9] } & 42 / 21 & 61 / 9 & 61 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 57/18 $58 / 8 \quad 72 / 19$ 73/9 $73 / 10$ | Repose [1] | 62/4 64/5 64/24 65/22 66/2 |
| 73/11 | represent [1] 24/1 | 68/15 |
| real [1] 6/18 | representative [17] 8/16 9/9 | rulings [9] 51/4 59/6 61/5 |
| $64 / 9 \quad 73 / 22 \quad 74 / 13$ | 9/25 10/11 11/23 13/4 13/16 | 61/6 61/15 61/22 62/7 64/19 |
|  | 13/20 13/24 14/10 14/20 | 64/22 |
| reality | 14/21 15/8 15/20 $25 / 1$ 48/4 | run [1] 21/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { really [25] } & 4 / 9 & 8 / 6 & 9 / 1 & 12 / 2\end{array}$ | 49/4 | runner [1] 52/16 |
| 13/19 13/23 14/5 21/15 $31 / 11$ | request [1] 64/17 |  |
| 34/22 35/10 36/24 39/5 39/10 | require [1] 63/21 |  |
| 42/11 45/18 45/20 47/23 | required [2] 18/17 40/5 | Sachse's [1] 71/1 |
| 49/12 61/19 63/23 65/11 | requiring [1] 26/7 | said [16] 7/9 8/5 8/19 11/19 |
| 71/23 73/25 75/17 | research [1] 14/17 | 35/13 46/25 47/9 55/19 63/14 |
| reason [9] 19/4 19/9 36/17 | resolution [1] 7/6 | 65/25 67/19 68/3 69/5 70/2 |
| 41/19 44/19 52/18 66/18 | resolve [4] 7/4 7/7 31/14 | 70/14 75/6 |
| 69/18 75/7 | 45/13 | sake [1] 55/18 |
| reasons [2] 9/20 47/14 | resources [4] 11/7 46/15 | Sally [1] 47/20 |
| recently [1] 67/25 | 48/24 63/22 | same [25] 12/3 21/21 34/24 |
| recognize [1] 4 | respect [13] 9/14 11/1 16/3 | 35/2 36/8 37/16 37/23 41/15 |
| recognizing [1] | 29/14 30/1 32/24 42/16 42/19 | 42/2 43/7 43/21 43/22 44/1 |
| record [4] 3/9 | 52/1 52/11 54/21 55/9 57/23 | 44/3 50/1 54/19 57/18 57/19 |
| 76/10 | respond [2] 33/14 53/25 | 58/24 60/17 60/21 67/9 72/10 |
| records [11] 20/12 38/12 | response [1] 60/24 | 72/23 72/25 |
| $\begin{array}{rrrrl}\text { records } \\ 41 / 14 & 41 / 22 & 46 / 4 & 46 / 10 & 46 / 20\end{array}$ | responses [1] 61/20 <br> rest [2] 51/19 52/6 | San [1] 1/17 <br> sanctioned [1] 39/8 |





| V |
| :---: |
| VI [3] 59/10 60/6 65/1 |
| via [3] 32/12 40/22 43/24 |
| viable [1] 73/3 |
| vice [1] 48/17 |
| view [5] 33/6 33/9 59/19 |
| 63/20 67/21 |
| views [1] 69/20 |
| VII [1] 59/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { violate [1] } & 12 / 10 \\ \text { violated [1] } & 17 / 14\end{array}$ |
|  |  |
|  |
| virtue [1] 69/13 |
| visuals [1] 5/14 |
| voluntarily [9] 22/10 24/19 |
| 25/7 25/24 26/7 28/9 36/16 |
| 36/22 39/4 |
| voluntary [4] 27/18 32/10 |
| 39/5 39/7 |

## W

wait [4] 17/21 41/4 70/24 71/8
waiting [1] 54/18
waiver [2] 10/13 15/5
waivers [3] $10 / 6$ 15/3 $15 / 12$
walk [1] 6/7
walking [2] 5/6 6/16
want [76] $4 / 6$ 6/1 6/7 7/11
$\begin{array}{lllll}7 / 15 & 12 / 15 & 16 / 24 & 18 / 7 & 22 / 3\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 19 & 23 / 23 & 24 / 6 & 25 / 12 & 25 / 21\end{array}$ 25/21 25/22 26/1 26/3 26/3 26/6 26/7 26/24 27/13 28/1 28/7 28/24 30/18 33/1 33/8 33/16 33/21 36/21 38/12 $39 / 10$ 40/1 43/11 $43 / 1244 / 21$ $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 23 & 45 / 24 & 46 / 1 & 46 / 15 & 47 / 8\end{array}$ $47 / 10$ 48/24 50/3 51/10 51/18 52/9 54/7 55/19 55/25 57/17 57/17 58/14 58/24 60/23 61/13 62/10 65/22 66/14 66/22 67/9 67/17 67/21 67/23 $\begin{array}{llll}70 / 19 & 70 / 20 & 70 / 24 & 71 / 3 \\ 71 / 4\end{array}$ 71/5 $72 / 17 \quad 72 / 18 \quad 72 / 20 \quad 74 / 14$
wanted [8] 4/22 8/18 14/24 18/6 58/10 68/23 69/21 70/8
wants [1] 24/9
was [60] $3 / 22$ 4/5 5/3 5/3 5/7 5/20 6/10 7/2 7/24 8/5 8/20 $9 / 11$ 12/1 $12 / 22$ 13/14 13/14 13/16 13/19 13/20 13/24 14/2 14/24 14/25 15/1 15/2 16/7 17/16 18/6 20/24 21/13 23/13 25/1 32/20 34/22 37/9 37/21 38/9 42/6 46/15 47/22 49/22 54/3 60/3 60/6 62/13 62/15 63/25 64/1 64/4 64/4 65/6 66/22 67/19 68/1 68/2 68/13 68/19 69/19 74/20 $76 / 7$
Washington [1] 2/2
wasn't [6] 12/11 14/14 14/15 36/16 37/8 46/10
waste [2] 47/7 49/1
wasting [1] 11/6
watching [1] 50/19
WATTS [20] 1/15 1/16 3/14
$7 / 22$ 8/8 8/14 8/23 11/18
$\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 10 & 15 / 14 & 17 / 20 & 18 / 3 & 37 / 2\end{array}$ $41 / 8$ 45/10 60/5 63/14 66/20 $70 / 2 \quad 70 / 13$
way [17] $11 / 6 \quad 13 / 15 \quad 14 / 3$
$14 / 20 \quad 15 / 4 \quad 20 / 11 \quad 30 / 12 \quad 33 / 21$
$49 / 8 \quad 49 / 10 \quad 53 / 8 \quad 65 / 25 \quad 67 / 10$
67/21 69/21 70/1 71/13
way that [1] $14 / 3$
ways [3] 7/3 32/9 61/7
we [409]
we'll [7] $18 / 16$ 20/4 $36 / 3$
47/18 47/19 55/21 58/13
we'll get [1] $36 / 3$
we're [2] 21/16 53/22
We've [1] 18/19
wedged [1] 9/11
week [9] $24 / 16 \quad 36 / 20 \quad 38 / 6$ 60/10 $64 / 5 \quad 72 / 6 \quad 74 / 12 \quad 75 / 4$ 75/5
weekend [3] $17 / 4$ 18/13 $50 / 14$
weeks [8] 18/11 $19 / 25$ 20/18 41/5 53/25 63/17 63/18 $72 / 4$
weeksish [1] 71/24
well [30] 7/1 8/1 10/17 $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 10 & 14 / 19 & 15 / 11 & 16 / 5 & 18 / 9\end{array}$ $26 / 8 \quad 26 / 10 \quad 28 / 8 \quad 33 / 11 \quad 34 / 1$ $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 18 & 37 / 19 & 37 / 24 & 44 / 7 & 47 / 25\end{array}$ $48 / 7 \quad 50 / 24 \quad 57 / 10 \quad 59 / 13 \quad 64 / 14$ $65 / 3 \quad 66 / 3 \quad 68 / 21 \quad 71 / 1 \quad 74 / 14$ 75/21 76/6
went [2] 47/11 71/24
were [51] 5/4 5/6 5/8 5/8 $\begin{array}{llllll}5 / 8 & 5 / 21 & 5 / 21 & 6 / 24 & 7 / 3 & 7 / 25\end{array}$ $10 / 20 \quad 14 / 3 \quad 15 / 4 \quad 17 / 3 \quad 17 / 17$ $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 18 & 17 / 22 & 17 / 25 & 20 / 25\end{array}$ $21 / 19 \quad 23 / 21 \quad 32 / 18 \quad 32 / 19$ $35 / 10 \quad 36 / 14 \quad 37 / 21 \quad 40 / 5 \quad 40 / 12$ $46 / 11 \quad 46 / 12 \quad 47 / 1 \quad 47 / 2 \quad 47 / 3$ $47 / 9 \quad 49 / 3 \quad 50 / 20 \quad 50 / 20 \quad 57 / 13$ $59 / 23 \quad 62 / 13 \quad 63 / 10 \quad 63 / 10 \quad 64 / 7$ $65 / 17$ 65/18 66/11 $69 / 6 \quad 71 / 12$ 72/24 74/11 74/16
weren't [1] 47/10
WEST [3] $1 / 2 \quad 1 / 5 \quad 2 / 5$
what [73] $4 / 2 \quad 5 / 3 \quad 5 / 8 \quad 5 / 8$ $\begin{array}{llllll}5 / 18 & 6 / 7 & 8 / 4 & 8 / 18 & 8 / 24 & 9 / 15\end{array}$ $11 / 20 \quad 12 / 11 \quad 13 / 6 \quad 14 / 9 \quad 15 / 7$ $15 / 25 \quad 18 / 25 \quad 20 / 7 \quad 23 / 11 \quad 23 / 12$ 23/20 $23 / 21 \quad 25 / 21 \quad 26 / 4 \quad 26 / 6$ $26 / 7$ 26/11 $31 / 8 \quad 31 / 25 \quad 33 / 3$ $35 / 17$ 37/11 38/22 39/15 $39 / 25 \quad 40 / 3 \quad 40 / 16 \quad 40 / 19 \quad 41 / 20$ $41 / 21 \quad 41 / 23 \quad 42 / 19 \quad 43 / 5 \quad 43 / 6$ $44 / 9 \quad 45 / 16 \quad 47 / 5 \quad 47 / 23 \quad 48 / 6$ 49/6 49/22 51/23 53/11 53/22 $55 / 6 \quad 55 / 12 \quad 55 / 21 \quad 56 / 2 \quad 56 / 9$ $59 / 5$ 59/18 60/8 61/3 61/5 $63 / 14 \quad 63 / 22 \quad 64 / 21 \quad 64 / 23$ $\begin{array}{llll}68 / 19 & 70 / 14 & 71 / 5 & 71 / 23 \\ 73 / 13\end{array}$
whatever [12] $12 / 15 \quad 29 / 12$ 30/11 35/23 37/22 41/16 $41 / 23 \quad 42 / 6 \quad 43 / 24 \quad 52 / 9 \quad 52 / 18$ 53/4
whatsoever [1] 61/17
when [41] $4 / 8 \quad 4 / 10 \quad 4 / 17 \quad 9 / 9$ 10/3 16/9 16/16 $16 / 2317 / 3$ 17/8 18/14 21/1 21/21 25/23

26/12 $26 / 21 \quad 33 / 25 \quad 34 / 7 \quad 35 / 16$ $\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 15 & 40 / 24 & 42 / 21 & 44 / 19 & 45 / 2\end{array}$ $47 / 9 \quad 47 / 13 \quad 49 / 23 \quad 51 / 6 \quad 51 / 20$ $\begin{array}{lllll}53 / 24 & 55 / 24 & 57 / 17 & 58 / 4 & 59 / 22\end{array}$ $63 / 14$ 64/2 64/10 65/17 69/10 $70 / 19$ 74/12
whenever [4] $24 / 3$ 51/4 $51 / 7$ 67/23
where [43] $7 / 2 \quad 7 / 3 \quad 13 / 10$ 19/4 19/10 20/2 20/12 21/18 $\begin{array}{llllll}22 / 6 & 23 / 14 & 23 / 16 & 24 / 11 & 25 / 7\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}27 / 20 & 28 / 18 & 29 / 9 & 30 / 4 & 32 / 11\end{array}$ $34 / 9 \quad 36 / 14 \quad 36 / 19 \quad 43 / 11 \quad 45 / 3$ $\begin{array}{llllll}46 / 11 & 46 / 19 & 49 / 15 & 50 / 9 & 54 / 1\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}55 / 24 & 56 / 6 & 57 / 14 & 58 / 4 & 58 / 6\end{array}$ $58 / 10 \quad 58 / 12 \quad 59 / 25 \quad 61 / 10$ 62/24 68/1 69/3 $73 / 24 \quad 74 / 1$ 75/13
whether [19] $4 / 18 \quad 6 / 10 \quad 9 / 16$ $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 5 & 15 / 2 & 15 / 3 & 23 / 15 & 38 / 9\end{array}$ $40 / 4$ 41/10 48/23 61/1 62/2 $62 / 22$ 68/25 69/2 72/23 74/16 $75 / 4$
which [48] $3 / 4 \quad 3 / 6 \quad 3 / 23 \quad 4 / 20$ $5 / 125 / 20 \quad 6 / 25 \quad 10 / 21 \quad 12 / 12$ $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 5 & 14 / 21 & 15 / 9 & 20 / 3 & 21 / 23\end{array}$ $31 / 10 \quad 31 / 10 \quad 31 / 19 \quad 31 / 19$ $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 25 & 36 / 7 & 37 / 13 & 39 / 14 & 42 / 13\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 20 & 44 / 16 & 45 / 5 & 47 / 25 & 50 / 3\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}55 / 10 & 55 / 14 & 58 / 23 & 58 / 23 & 60 / 8\end{array}$ $60 / 23 \quad 63 / 5 \quad 63 / 19 \quad 64 / 4 \quad 64 / 22$ 65/9 65/25 67/1 67/9 69/13 $69 / 20 \quad 71 / 14 \quad 73 / 13 \quad 74 / 7 \quad 74 / 20$
while [4] 15/21 58/7 73/8 75/2
white [1] 74/2
who [19] $8 / 6$ 23/9 $23 / 12$ 23/20 $24 / 11 \quad 25 / 2 \quad 25 / 19 \quad 26 / 17$ $\begin{array}{llllll}27 / 12 & 29 / 3 & 29 / 17 & 37 / 11 & 38 / 3\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 23 & 44 / 5 & 46 / 16 & 48 / 13 & 49 / 4\end{array}$ 62/13
whole [4] $13 / 17$ 39/18 $47 / 3$ 70/5
whom [1] 48/14
whose [1] 71/19
why [17] 9/11 14/24 20/17
$\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 10 & 32 / 3 & 37 / 3 & 37 / 6 & 44 / 19\end{array}$
$44 / 20 \quad 45 / 21 \quad 46 / 15 \quad 47 / 14 \quad 51 / 6$
63/9 63/13 65/24 75/7
wide [1] 9/23
wildly [1] 15/21
will [137]
will provide [1] 50/9
Williams [1] 2/1
willing [1] 11/2
willingness [1] 24/2
win [1] 50/20
winter [2] 63/19 64/16
wish [2] 6/1 24/16
within [14] $7 / 5 \quad 20 / 16 \quad 20 / 18$ 23/3 24/16 25/11 31/1 $31 / 13$ 39/14 54/23 60/7 62/1 62/3 64/6
without [5] $18 / 14$ 29/8 $30 / 7$ 45/6 72/21
witnesses [1] 10/15
won't [7] 16/19 17/12 $22 / 7$ 34/4 41/4 47/15 65/3

| W |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| wondering [1] 44/7 |  |
| word [2] 22/16 54/14 |  |
| words [7] 5/17 27/17 27/25 |  |
| 48/21 65/8 69/7 71/16 |  |
| work [25] 4/10 4/17 7/13 8/5 |  |
| 8/8 8/12 8/19 12/21 18/22 |  |
| 31/12 37/22 37/24 52/22 66/9 |  |
| 66/22 67/13 67/24 67/24 68/9 |  |
| 68/20 70/23 71/6 72/16 74/1 |  |
| 76/1 |  |
| worked [3] 37/22 73/9 74/7 |  |
| working [21] 4/7 6/13 6/21 |  |
| 6/21 7/12 9/1 11/7 16/20 |  |
| 17/4 30/19 31/5 36/12 41/16 |  |
| 66/19 68/2 $72 / 3 \quad 73 / 20 \quad 74 / 18$ |  |
| 74/25 75/2 75/3 |  |
| world's [1] 54/7 |  |
| worried [2] 32/3 61/15 |  |
| worries [1] 50/25 |  |
| worry [3] 5/22 15/12 15/13 |  |
| worst [1] 53/2 |  |
| would [100] |  |
| wouldn't [10] 29/5 37/14 |  |
| 39/15 44/21 47/6 47/21 49/3 |  |
| 61/24 65/21 75/3 |  |
| wrapped [1] 39/10 |  |
| write [1] 61/13 |  |
| writer [1] 63/8 |  |
| writing [1] 5/18 |  |
| written [1] 52/20 |  |
| wrong [3] 46/17 47/11 47/21 |  |
| Wyoming [1] 9/23 |  |
| Y |  |
| yeah [1] 43/23 |  |
| year [2] 13/11 60/14 |  |
| years [1] 46/6 |  |
| yes [18] 12/16 $12 / 19$ 12/20 |  |
| 13/8 15/14 16/18 18/8 21/7 |  |
| 35/7 35/8 48/19 50/13 51/3 |  |
| 51/12 55/2 56/15 57/6 62/11 |  |
| yet [10] 22/3 24/5 31/10 |  |
| 43/3 43/4 45/23 56/2 60/24 |  |
| 62/6 73/12 |  |
| yield [1] 21/13 |  |
| you [388] |  |
| you envision [1] 27/7 |  |
| you want [1] 71/3 |  |
| you'd [1] 42/24 |  |
| your [109] |  |
| yourselves [1] 39/15 |  |
| Z |  |
| ZANTAC [11] $1 / 4$ 3/2 3/24 |  |
| 25/4 27/3 27/4 46/8 $46 / 12$ |  |
| 47/3 49/5 73/6 |  |
| zero [4] 51/20 66/1 66/1 |  |
| 66/19 |  |
| Zoom [2] 1/9 3/9 |  |
| ZOUSMER [15] 1/23 3/18 6/20 |  |
| 8/6 9/1 10/18 11/9 17/17 |  |
| 17/22 18/5 21/2 29/22 45/9 |  |
| 66/24 68/10 |  |
| Zousmer's [2] 20/19 36/2 |  |

