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THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone, welcome. It is nice to see you -- well, I actually can't see you, but hopefully I will see some of you on the video soon; I know you are here. I see we have a number of participants.

We see somebody there.
I think everyone is going to turn their video off initially and then as the speakers come on. Even though we have been doing the Zoom thing for better part of a year we have to keep restraining ourselves. We had a number of criminal matters this morning from the jail and as much as we put time in on the front end to make sure everything went smoothly, we still had some hiccups. That's just the way it is.

So, no one worry if you inadvertently pop up or do something that you feel is embarrassing on Zoom, although I am sure nobody will go so far as to replicate what some of you may have seen go viral last week when a litigant was appearing before a judge, $I$ think in the State of Texas -- not a litigant, but an attorney actually, and he had some sort of a virtual setting and he appeared as a cat, and had to convince the Court that he was not a cat.

That was very funny, but I think more people were amazed that the other lawyer who was on the Zoom had a very stone face and wasn't cracking a smile at all. I thought the judge handled it really well, was very patient and very
understanding of what could have been a very difficult situation.

That is all to say presumably none of you will show up as cats today, so anything other than that should be considered a free pass.

It is good to check in again. It is kind of an interesting time. We are about a year out from when the Court received as the transferee judge in this MDL -- I think it was about February 6th or 7 th this case was transferred to me, so it has been about a year.

I have a few opening remarks that I have prepared. It's nice to be here with Judge Reinhart and we have so enjoyed working on this case and working with leadership and the attorneys we have come to know and the special master. The year has in many ways just flown by, and in so many other ways probably for you maybe as much as us, it feels like it has been going on for years and years and years, and has not been just one year since this case commenced.

This will be sort of the one year address, if you will, state of MDL Zantac at the one year mark.

I wanted to let you know that I very much look forward to the year coming ahead, and I say year, let's take it year by year, because I know from the case management order that the Court has issued that there is a lot on the horizon, so I view this as a pivotal point, a pivotal juncture in the MDL.

Why is that?
Well, I think the bulk of the discovery is going to be taking place right now, and discovery is a big part of any case, even our non-MDL smaller cases. Discovery is what the fights are about, where the disagreements arise, where Judge Reinhart tends to see a lot of counsel more often than on any other issue, and it impacts so much of the case.

If the discovery is not on track, it impacts the parties' ability to meet other deadlines, whether they are -in non-MDL cases usually the dispositive motion deadlines, summary judgment motions. In this case, it would be the Daubert motions, following on the heels after that, class certification motions and things of that nature.

Discovery is just so very important, it gets to the essence of the case, the essence of the claims, the essence of the defenses. It informs, it educates, it helps strategize, helps the parties' strategize, and it is a lot of work, especially in a case of this nature, it's so large, it's so complex, there are so many parties. Zantac has been on the market for a long time, so just the span of time means that there are going to be a lot of documents, electronic documents, hard documents, depositions to take.

So, the Court understands it, maybe not as much as you all do, "you" meaning the counsel, because you are doing it day in and day out.

It is Judge Reinhart's and my desire to know as much as we can, to be informed as much as we can so that we can be as helpful, we can serve as pillars of guidance, and then ultimately, of course, those critical rulings that are necessary, whether they are the substantive rulings on things loke Motions to Dismiss, ultimately Daubert motions, and any other motions that come along the way, and then the discovery motions that have come, albeit a few of them, but we anticipate could very well come in larger numbers. That is okay. We need to work through those so we can keep the discovery process moving forward.

Based on the feedback at the recent in-chambers meeting -- so, the last discovery conference that we had, we had it as an in-chambers conference because we had indicated that we did want to meet monthly on discovery and meet monthly for the status conferences, the last discovery conference was as in-chambers conference, and at that conference I asked our special master, Jaime Dodge, to work with everybody to conduct a very thorough assessment of the state of discovery, and particularly to take a hard look at the timelines that we have set in this MDL and how we are going to meet them.

This is not the first time I have asked her to do it, it is not going to be the last time, but coming out of that in-chambers meeting, it became very, very clear to me that there is a lot to do, and while we have set timelines in the
past, and several of the orders that the Court has issued reflect those timelines for the brands, while I know core discovery agreements have been entered into with other Defendants, so it is not as if timelines are something new, but timelines are as critical as ever right now, and organization and keeping things moving forward even when maybe all of the documents have not been produced and the question arises whether to go forward with depositions or not.

The train has to keep moving, but it only can move when both parties, that is all parties, both sides, if you will, do their part, and it really is a collective and collaborative effort with the oversight of the Court ultimately and the special master's special organizational skills, which I had highlighted at the last in chambers.

She truly is remarkable in her ability to try to reach consensus and resolution on matters and keep everyone organized, but she knows, and she has heard it from me and she has heard it on the record at these conferences, that where things can't be resolved, get into court, get into court quickly. Judge Reinhart and $I$ are here so that a dispute can be resolved so it doesn't hang you up and you can move forward.

So, I realize we are in February, and we have an August deadline for -- that you set in the case management order that was adopted based on the input from all sides that fact discovery is to be completed for general causation.

So, she is going to be expressing, in her role as a special master, with my support, Judge Reinhart's support, very aggressive expectations of you in terms of creating a vision for discovery and figuring out what can be resolved and what needs to come to the Court through motion practice.

Those aggressive deadines are not intended to be punitive, they are not intended to make you go through unnecessary hoops, they are not being set for the sake of being set. They are being set so as to ensure that you can meet the deadlines that you set for yourself in this case, and so that we can achieve them in the way that everybody had envisioned from the outset.

So, I am very eager and will be checking in regularly both through the conferences and through my dialogue with the special master to see the output of your work with her so that I can make a candid assessment of where you are, the viability of your plans moving forward, and engaged to ensure that we complete the discovery in this case in a way that matches the excellence that you have shown in all aspects of the case, but the focus now is on discovery.

I also realize that as we have come to the end of this first year we are entering a new phase with respect to the registry, and I am not going to take away from those who will be addressing me and Judge Reinhart on the first topic of the agenda, which is the registry, but I did want to note, finding
it fitting if unintentional, that we are beginning the process at this point of exiting claims from the registry exactly at the same time that we are beginning to pull the proof of use and injury records, all of this happening at the one-year mark.

I don't know that $I$ can say I planned it that way or that it was always intended to match up or align in the way that it has, but it is notable that that is where we are at the one-year point.

We have had a recent PTO 59, which I know the participants will address, that speaks to some of the exiting issues and the process in which that is occurring, and then there are just various other PTOs, but I think that was the only one that has been entered since our last case management conference on January 21st.

The registry, as I have always mentioned, has been a truly remarkable vehicle in this case, and I expect that this year we will see it enter a new phase as each side begins to see the fruits of the labor of this past year. This year not only will we see vetting and records assistance, but we will also see it being used for data analytics in Defendant matching and later to aid in framing the bellwether discussions.

I just want to conclude by taking a moment today to recognize where we have come from, the next phase that we are entering, and while we have a lot of difficult and substantial challenges to work through in the next weeks, the next months,
we have come very far. So much has been accomplished in this case and $I$ think it is always important to take inventory on where you were, remember the day that you put in for leadership application, you were interviewed, you were selected, you got appointed to a committee, you were asked to serve on a committee, you have taken a deposition, you have been involved in document review.

Each and every aspect of the case day by day, project by project, a lot has been done, and I know that there is great trepidation to some extent, maybe stress and anxiety about moving forward and how do we get there, but $I$ don't know that you ever could have a year ago envisioned that you would accomplish as much as you have accomplished to date.

That is to applaud you and to let you all recognize and take note of what you have done. You should feel good about it, but no rest for the weary.

You have to keep going, and to some extent, maybe even ramp it up even more and the expectations might even be greater because of the great groundwork you have laid. In many ways you discovered exactly what you need, how you need it, and the timeframe in which it must get done. So, I recognize that there is much to do over these next months and critically with the discovery process.

So, I did want to thank everyone for all of the work, I want you to know it is much appreciated. As judges, it is
always a pleasure to preside over cases where lawyers are working hard, where they are trying to do the right thing, where they are trying to get along, where they are always being professional with one another even if they are frustrated with one another and they disagree with one another.

We are here to resolve disputes. Professor Dodge, she is a professor as well as our special master, is there to see whether you can resolve it before it becomes to a dispute that needs to come to the Court, so work with her. She has our full endorsement, and her vision aligns with what I have expressed our vision to be, which I understand to be your vision.

So, I don't think anybody is working at cross purposes, and when you hit bumps in the road, let her try to help you work it out. If it can't be worked out, come on into court and we will try to get you in as quickly as possible and get our rulings out equally expeditiously. We recognize that that is part of how these cases stay on track.

So, I think those are consistent themes that I have said each and every time and I don't think they can be said enough. We need to have that reinforcement each time we get together to remind ourselves what we are doing, how we are doing it, and that it is a partnership, all of us working together to make sure that the case remains consistent with the vision that we have set for it.

So, with that, I want to turn it over to those of you
who will be addressing the Court today to give the Court an update. I received an agenda, and I understand that the first topic is the registry.

And I would just remind counsel that when you turn your video on -- and those of you who are presenting, you can turn your video on -- always state your name before you speak so that our court reporter, Pauline Stipes, whom I know you are all familiar with, can make sure that her record is as perfect as she demands of the record, so announcing your name is always helpful to her.

So, with that, good afternoon, Mr. Petrosinelli and Mr. Pulaski.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Good afternoon, your Honor.
MR. PULASKI: Good afternoon, Judge.
MR. PETROSINELLI: Your Honor, with your permission, Mr. Pulaski is having problems with his computer system given the power outage, (inaudible) so I will cover most of the presentation, then he can add things at the end, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Okay. You were coming in and out a little bit, Mr. Petrosinelli. Let me mute my line.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Okay. Thank you, your Honor, again Joe Petrosinelli for the Defendants.

Your Honor, I think we are at a stage with the census where we kind of have a mature census and registry, which is
really great to see, especially in this stage in the litigation. We have Census Plus forms on file, we have identified deficiencies in those forms and are in the process of correcting them.

We have done defense mapping, meaning the information that the Defendants provided to LMI, the census vendor, has been matched with the information that the claimants provided on the census forms in terms of what products they potentially used and which Defendants made those products.

And I would say the next stage, which your Honor alluded to, will be more analytical tools like records collection where we then map using those records.

So, for example, if a claimant said that their recollection was they took a branded Zantac, and they were matched to certain Defendants on that basis, but then the records show they took generic Ranitidine, we'll do a shuffle of that and rematch, if you will. So, that is where we are headed next.

I think there have been two significant developments since we last met, or one of them was right before we last met, but that impact the census and spurred PTO 59. One is that the Plaintiffs' leadership, as the Court knows, specified the injuries that, at this point, that they intend to pursue in the litigation, and that has an impact on the census in a way that I will explain in a second.
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And we had the deadline pass for the correction of the first tranche of deficiencies, which are the largest tranche of claim forms in the census, so we had to deal with, as your Honor alluded to, a process for exit notices.

That resulted in us presenting to the Court PTO 59. I know the Court knows what is in the PTO, but perhaps for the benefit of others on the phone, just to my mind the two or three most important things are, number one, as I mentioned, with the Plaintiffs' leadership having designated the injuries that they intend to pursue in the litigation on behalf of all Plaintiffs, we have a number of census forms where people have alleged different injuries, and what Mr. Pulaski and I decided, along with Special Master Dodge, is the best thing to do with those would be to sort of hit the pause button for those right now.

So, in the PTO we say we are not going to collect medical records for those forms right at the moment. Those claimants who have deficiencies and allege those injuries, they don't have to correct those deficiencies at the moment, but they can stay in the registry while we figure out what the best way is to deal with those claims.

And I think the next PTO that your Honor will see, Mr. Pulaski and Special Master Dodge and I are working on a PTO for how to deal with those claimants and the timeline for doing that. For now, we have sort of just paused them and put them
aside.

So, that was a big part of PTO 59.
I think the second thing is, as your Honor knows, we have had some technical issues with -- just given the mass of data that we have, and I think the Plaintiffs had some concern, and I think it was legitimate, that if someone -- a claimant or a claimant's counsel had submitted their data on time, but for some technical reason it didn't get to LMI until sometime later, they wanted to be sure that they weren't being penalized for that, and that it was clear that their census form had been submitted on time and they were getting the benefit of the registry, so we made that clear in PTO 59.

Then, the final thing is what the Court mentioned, we needed a process for dealing with a substantial number of claim forms that -- or Census Plus forms that are still deficient for whatever reason, and in PTO 59, your Honor, it gave the special master the discretion to come up with a process for that.

She, as she always does, jumped on that very quickly and we have a process. Without getting into the details of it, what $I$ think $I$ can say is, it's sort of a rolling notice period over the next 30 days where certain tranches of claimants' counsel will get notices, the so-called five-day notices that, absent good cause shown, certain claimants would be exited from the registry.

The first set of those notices went out on Monday of
this week, and then we have three other tranches over the next 30 days, and so LMI is doing a terrific job getting those out.

I will say with the ones that went out on Monday, you know, several people are affected by the weather we have had in the middle of the country where they can't get access to their computer systems, and so, I think Mr. Pulaski and Special Master Dodge and I will be very lenient about extensions for people who are affected by IT issues or other computer issues brought about by the terrible weather we have been having in the middle of the country, or anywhere in the country for that matter. It is sleeting out in D.C. today, so it is not so nice here either.

The point is, that process is well under way. It is very organized. As you know, the special master is a stickler for organization, and that is needed for this because it is just a herculean task. So, that is kind of the summary of PTO 59. I think we are right where we want to be.

I would say to the Court on this last piece about exiting claimants, I am not discouraged by that, nor do I think it is at all unexpected. In any large MDL, and this one is quite large, there are claimants who -- they decide they don't want to participate in the litigation any more, they decide they don't want to provide certain information, which is totally fine. It is a normal part of this process that we will exit out probably quite a number of claimants, but a small
number, I would guess, as compared to the entire corpus of claim forms that we have.

So, I don't view that at all as a negative; $I$ view that actually as a positive. That is exactly part of the vetting that the MDL Rules Committee and others have talked about as really essential in litigations of this size, so I think that is right on track.

The final thing I will say, then I will turn it over to Mr. Pulaski, that relates -- this sort of relates to the census, which is that we are also going to be talking about potential amendments to the short form complaint order. So you have filed Plaintiffs who have Census Plus forms in the census, but now we have had an amended master personal injury complaint, and so the original short form complaint was tagged to the original personal injury complaint, so we are talking about an amendment to that order to streamline the process for amendments.

There are also some other potential amendments to the short form complaint order that we, on the Defense side, are thinking about, so I wanted to tell the Court that we will be speaking with the Plaintiffs about that over the next week or so and I imagine the Court will see a PTO with respect to that as well. It is sort of indirectly related to the census, so we put it here in the agenda.

That is the report on the census and registry from my
perspective, your Honor, and I will ask Mr. Pulaski if he has anything to add.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. PULASKI: Thank you, Joe.
Judge, may I proceed?

THE COURT: You may. Sorry, I had to put my
microphone back on. You may proceed.

MR. PULASKI: Adam Pulaski, Pulaski and Kherkher, for the Plaintiffs, your Honor.

So, let me start off. As Joe said, there were a number of items in PTO 59 that we created that were really a benefit for everyone, for the Court, for the Defense, for the Plaintiffs. I want to briefly go over that for some of the people that may be on this call that haven't read PTO 59. I am going to urge you to go back and please reread it as, at least on the Plaintiffs' side, it affects how you proceed in litigation with not only your current CPFs, but future CPFs that you may file.

We did -- as Mr. Petrosinelli stated, we did away with the quarterly filing requirements because, at this point, it doesn't really serve a purpose for us, and now that the registry process is well under way and starting to run very smoothly, we are not requiring people to have a quarterly deadline to submit their CPF.

It just needs to be submitted when ready, and this
will allow everybody to fill out and complete full CPFs without any deficiencies so that we don't really have a deficiency process going forward, hopefully.

Secondly, we have the agreement between the Defense and Plaintiffs, in conjunction with Special Master Dodge, that for the ten non-designated cancers that we currently have, they will remain intact in the $C P F$, in the registry, and deficiencies will need to be cured, and you will be allowed to order not only your loyalty program records and prescription records through the retail process that we have set up at no cost to the Plaintiffs' Bar, but also, we will begin now ordering records through Lexitas, which is the vendor that has been agreed to by the Defense and Plaintiffs, to start ordering the protocol records for proof of use and proof of injury through the medical records provider where both Defense and Plaintiffs are sharing in the cost of those records.

So, that process will now take place for those that have clients in the registry that are of the ten designated cancers.

For those that aren't the ten designated cancers, as Mr. Petrosinelli said, we have agreed to stay the process for curing deficiencies and for moving forward and actively participating in the record process. It is all on stay.

Obviously, your Honor, we have some time to amend our notices as to designated cancers, and we will continue to do
that, and at some time in the future, so that it is on the Court's radar, Mr. Petrosinelli and I and Special Master Dodge will be getting together to discuss how we treat these non-designated cancers in the future, going forward. It's a little premature to do that right now, but we are discussing it, working on it, and you will probably see a PTO from us in the near term.

Secondly, to address the short form complaint issue briefly that Mr. Petrosinelli just brought up, in our mind it is a bit premature to start discussing the short form complaint issue. We know that we would like the short form complaint to follow along with the master complaint.

It may be a bit premature to work with anything on that yet, although we will be in discussions with Mr. Petrosinelli, and the entire Defense, with Special Master Dodge.

And the reason why I say it may be premature is that now that we have repled our master complaints there will probably be a second round of Motions to Dismiss, and to go ahead now and change the short form complaints and really make a determination on what to do with those, and then only to see some changes need to be made to the master complaints would just be inefficient, and $I$ think a small wait on clarifying and correcting issues that we have with each other on the short form complaint would be best served if we just put that off
until after we looked at the Motions to Dismiss from the Defense that may be coming.

Again, we are thinking about items, how to handle them, certainly as it relates to those who will be filing cases from today forward with respect to short form complaints, and which short form complaint they should start using for filing, and we will definitely get with Defense and work on that and work on a PTO to turn over to the Court.

Finally, as it relates to the registry, there are 70,000 plus Plaintiffs in the registry, perhaps 15 to 20 percent of those are the non-designated cancers. So, that gets us down to still a very large number. We have had challenges with data transfer between LMI and certain vendors and certain law firms just because it is an arduous process with the large number of columns with all of our claims, but $I$ think it is now running as smoothly as we can hope and very well.

You know, the deficiency process was long and it took a lot of man hours and a lot of work on the Plaintiffs' side, but we have worked through it. As Mr. Petrosinelli said, Special Master Dodge has been incredible to work with on this, and she is working diligently, I mean harder -- as hard or harder than Joe and I are, on ensuring that those who have attempted to cure the deficiencies and had issues that were out of their control, or other issues, she is talking to them about
extensions and everything else, and I think that we will see a very good smooth process.

Obviously, some Plaintiffs will be exited, but just so the Plaintiff Bar understands and everybody on the call understands, this is not the end of the litigation. Once you get your five-day deficiency notice, you have five days to continue to cure. After that, you are removed from the registry, but still have 90 days to continue with the tolling, and 90 days to cure, to reenter into the registry with the continued tolling that has stayed in effect.

So, there are a number of items in place to protect Plaintiffs and their claims, while at the same time enough of a bite for the Defense also to ensure that there are going to be claims that exit the registry if they are not handled properly.

That is about everything $I$ have for today, your Honor.
THE COURT: I appreciate that excellent presentation, you covered a lot of ground.

I just want to respond to a few points. I had a question, but $I$ think you answered it. I want to make sure I heard it correctly. It is not critical, it is precise, but I was just trying to get a sense of the claimants who have listed non-designated cancers, the non-ten for now. As you note, Mr. Pulaski, correctly, it is a first list, a preliminary list, if you will. You have the ability to amend that under the case
management order.
Did you say it was about 15 to 20 percent of the claimants who didn't --

MR. PULASKI: I believe that is correct.
THE COURT: Okay. So, yes, I just wanted to echo a couple of points that you both have raised.

What has struck me about the census and registry process is its fairness, its practicality, its usefulness, in other words. I view it as a way for people to participate in the litigation, but not actively litigate.

So, you have the active litigants, and that is what we have going on with the filed Plaintiffs, and the Defendants are vigorously defending those claims brought by the filed Plaintiffs, but then you have the number that, Mr. Pulaski, you have used, which is 70,000 people who are utilizing this registry to, you know, protect their rights insofar as the tolling of Statute of Limitations, just seems so eminently fair.

This exiting process and deficiency process, as complicated as it may seem to the outsider, and even to the Court as she enters her orders, in essence, distills down to what I think the intent by the Court, and shared by the parties, which is not to set anybody up for failure and, you know, a gotcha situation where, gee, you missed your deadine, you are out, one up for the Defendants because now that is one
fewer claimant that they have to worry about, not at all.
It is truly about having those people in who deserve to be in, who have -- what I mean by that is viable claims. No one knows the merits of anything yet, nothing has really been determined yet from a merits standpoint. We have just been through one round of Motions to Dismiss, and we have repleadings, one already repled and others coming in.

So, it is not about the merits, it is about allowing the parties to preserve rights, to make an ultimate decision about whether they are going to become a filed Plaintiff or not at some point down the road.

So many processes have been put in place through all of the PTOs to provide ample notice to counsel representing the claimants or, to the extent the claimants are unrepresented, the unrepresented claimants, both during the time that they are in the registry about the deficiencies they have, aid being brought to their side to try to help them cure those deficiencies, giving them notice when the deficiencies still haven't been cured all the way up to a five-day notice, and even at that, only a handful are going to be exited in that first tranche, recognizing that there are quite a few, quite frankly, that have varying degrees of deficiencies.

So, the parties seem to be working together to try to help the claimants who have deficiencies to at least understand that they have the deficiencies. At the end of the day, it is
up to counsel and the claimants to cure the deficiencies. Nobody can do that but them. But the idea is to give you every opportunity to do it.

So, if there is a viable claim that you believe you have, that you remain in the registry, but if after a period of time -- and those who are exiting now have been in at least six months, if not longer -- that they are exited, but they still have this 90 -day period to cure and come back.

So, it just strikes me as eminently fair. It was very important to me that there was transparency, due process, opportunity to cure, and I think, as Mr. Petrosinelli referenced, it is true that there is one issue, among others, but one predominant issue that has arisen in the discussions within the Judicial Conference Rules Committee MDL subcommittee about how to look at MDLs and do they need rules or not, but separate and apart from whether one is in favor of rule making or not, there seems to be consensus on both the Plaintiff and the Defense side that early vetting is really important to both sides.

That is exactly what the registry is doing and that is exactly what the exiting process does as well. It allows the parties to have greater clarity on those who are going to be litigating and those who are not.

Now, it will be an interesting observation -- I asked, actually, Special Master Dodge if there was any way to track
those who leave the registry, whether they ultimately file. I don't know how easy that is to track, but I think at the end of the day, that might be an interesting data point, to know whether when they exit, that that is the end of their involvement in the litigation, or whether they emerge in a new forum at a different time in a different way. That will speak to questions that we on the MDL subcommittee are looking at with respect to vetting.

That isn't a critical issue in terms of understanding, at least for purposes of this litigation, if claimants are exiting and that means that they either don't want to pursue the case -- and that is not a bad thing or a good thing, it is just the reality of what the case ultimately will become.

So, I just want to really remark on the fairness, the transparency, the processes that have been put in place by both sides to basically keep claimants in, but with full recognition that some claimants don't want to stay in, shouldn't stay in, don't belong in, and that is why you have an exit process, a deficiency process, a cure period.

I just want to commend the parties for taking a cutting edge approach, a novel approach, an approach that is fraught with, I know, hurdles and frustrations, particularly when you are dealing with vendors and technology and the various hiccups, but you don't seem to give up. You keep plowing through and I am very pleased with how it is going.

I would just encourage anyone who isn't in the smaller bubble of those charged with working on the registry and census that just get onto the website and look at the PTOs that have been entered from the inception setting up the registry and the initial census and Census Plus forms, and then upwards of eight implementing census orders, and it will tell a story, and I think you will understand it. So, these comments will kind of make sense to you when you go back and reread these orders.

I want you to know that the Court finds that it is a very fair and beneficial process for all parties, and it is not designed to benefit or hurt anybody, but to help everyone, and so, I thank you for your work on this and thank you for your presentation.

Unless you wanted to make any response to my comments or further comments, I am pleased with the presentation today.

MR. PULASKI: Thank you, Judge. Thank you, Judge Reinhart. I appreciate it.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Thank you, your Honor. Good to see you both.

THE COURT: Good to see you. Okay.
I guess I will just say that I look forward, you know, to seeing what you come up with on the short form complaints. I appreciate that there may be a differences of opinion as to not whether short form complaints should be amended, but when they should be amended, and I trust that you will meet and
confer and likely reach consensus.

It is okay if you don't, and I'd want to hear more in, obviously, greater detail the pros and cons of doing it in the two different ways that you seem to generally speak to, whether it is now or waiting after the second round, but $I$ am confident that that is a fixable problem if it, in fact, becomes a problem.

MR. PETROSINELLI: I think if Mr. Pulaski wants to stipulate to the granting of some of our Motions to Dismiss, we will be fine.

MR. PULASKI: Let me think about that.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. PULASKI: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: The next matter we have on the agenda is the State/Federal. I know at the last conference we were able to meet, $I$ think for the first time at least formally, Mr. Matthews, who is serving as the State/Federal coordinator for the Plaintiffs, and then we have met Mr. Agneshwar and we had Ms. Harris, who also is welcome to turn her screen on, who will speak to the State/Federal coordination issues from the Defense standpoint.

So, I look forward to hearing your presentation, as I know it is very important to the parties to have that coordination and, you know, to know what is happening and to
keep this Court informed about what is happening, and I know that State Court judges appreciate knowing who you are and what you are doing to try to coordinate the efforts that are going on in Federal versus those which are going on in the various State Court cases around the country.

So a very important topic, and I will turn my mike off and look forward to hearing you present.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Thank you, your Honor, Anand Agneshwar. I will just kick it off.

We are still not at the point where we feel that we need the Court's intervention on anything, but we have a couple of things, and I am going to turn it over to Ms. Harris to fill the Court in on future jurisdictions and to introduce herself. She is a next gener.

MS. HARRIS: Good afternoon, your Honor, TaCara Harris, a senior associate from King and Spalding in Atlanta, here representing Boehringer Ingelheim, but presenting today on behalf of all the Defendants.

I appreciate the opportunity from you and our more seasoned lawyers to present today, to provide the Court with a few brief updates from our State Court litigation, but as the next generation designee, I thought I would begin by sharing a little bit about myself, and my background, and a few fun facts, if that is okay.

I was originally born in Rome, Georgia, not Italy,
it's a small town about 60 miles north of Atlanta. I am an only child and my father served in the U.S. Army for 24 years, so growing up in a military family, I lived all over the country, including a two-year stint in Fort Greely, Alaska. Interestingly enough, in 1996, my parents and I actually drove from Augusta, Georgia to Alaska on an eight-day road trip through Canada and without GPS and cell phone.

I attended high school in Augusta, Georgia and played second base for the varsity boys baseball team. I then attended Vanderbilt University where I obtained my undergraduate degree in sociology, and then attended Vanderbilt for law school as well. Apparently we were referred to as double doors.

Following law school, I actually began my practice in 2013 at Baker Donaldson in Nashville, Tennessee, where I practiced general commercial and health care litigation, as well as labor and employment. Then in 2016, my husband matched for his residency in general surgery at Emory, so we moved to Atlanta and $I$ joined King and Spalding's trial and global disputes practice, focusing specifically on pharma and medical device product liability litigation.

Last year, in May, in the height of the pandemic, I gave birth to my son, Lincoln Elijah. He is now a nine month old bouncing baby boy who has spent most of his life in quarantine, but loves to smile and dance and is certainly

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter
keeping me on my toes these days.
Since my return to work from maternity leave, I have served as BI's jurisdictional lead for the Tennessee docket overseeing case management and strategy, and assisting with any State and Federal Court coordination issues.

So, today I would like to just update the Court briefly as to a few developments in state court since our last status conference, particularly in California, Illinois, and Tennessee where we have had some movement.

First, in Cook County, Illinois there are currently six total cases, but only one case, the Hawkins case, names the brand Defendants. Last month, on January 19th, the Northern District of Illinois granted Plaintiffs' motion to remand that case back to the Circuit Court of Cook County, so we are now back in State Court. Since there is no consolidation yet in Cook County, the parties are to meet and confer to develop a schedule for case management moving forward there.

Secondly, in California, in Alameda County, Plaintiffs have filed a petition for a judicial counsel coordinating proceeding, referred to as a JCCP, to consolidate and coordinate the cases before Judge Winifred Smith and to determine the coordination venue.

There is currently a hearing schedule on that petition for March 3rd, and although the cases sought to be coordinated currently name only California based retailers and Doe

Defendants, and the brand Defendants are actually not yet named in those cases, we expect that they will be named down the road, and therefore we filed an unopposed motion for leave to respond to that petition and to also join in on the oral argument at that coordination hearing on March 3rd. We are currently awaiting an order from Judge Smith on that motion.

Finally, in Tennessee is where we have had most activity in State Court. As you know, we have cases both in Hamilton County and in Shelby County.

In Hamilton, 53 cases total have been filed, three of those cases were voluntarily dismissed as to all Defendants. Pfizer has also been voluntarily dismissed from all the cases, and Sanofi and Chattem, which is the only non-diverse party, were dismissed from eight cases in Hamilton County, and so BI and GSK have removed those eight cases to Federal Court, and they have been conditionally transferred to the MDL.

So, that leaves us with 42 cases in the Circuit Court for Hamilton County, and they are all assigned to Judge J. B. Bennett of Division One for coordination on all pretrial matters, including responsive pleadings, discovery, and dispositive motions.

Judge Bennett held a case management conference last month on the 22 nd, and at the beginning of that conference he mentioned, Judge Rosenberg, that you reached out to him via email offering to provide any assistance, so we wanted to thank
you. We appreciate you reaching out to him to offer up your assistance.

THE COURT: I will just interrupt and -- it is a beautiful presentation, so $I$ hate to interrupt you, but I just wanted to -- I am looking for where my telephone notes are. I have since spoken with him. So, if at that time he said I had emailed him, that was accurate, and $I$ followed up, and we in fact had a telephone call, a very nice telephone call, and it was a pleasure to speak with him.

I think there was great benefit in being able to answer any questions that he had about the status of the MDL and, you know, any questions that $I$ had about that litigation before him.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you, thank you so much for reaching out to him. Of course, we are looking for ways that we can coordinate and be more efficient, so we appreciate you reaching out on that.

At that status conference on the 22 nd last month, Judge Bennett addressed Motions to Dismiss, which have now been fully briefed in Hamilton County. Defendants moved to dismiss Plaintiffs' complaints on preemption grounds, as well as Plaintiffs' failure to plead valid claims under the Tennessee Products Liability Act and the Tennessee Consumer Protection Act.

Judge Bennett has now scheduled a full day, March 9,

2021, for argument on those motions. Assuming the cases survive Motions to Dismiss, the Court also set a scheduling conference for April 30th, and Judge Bennett plans at that scheduling conference to establish a discovery and case management schedule.

And then, in the meantime, the parties are finalizing a confidentiality order, privilege protocol and ESI protocol to govern discovery and document production. We actually have a meet and confer scheduled for today to try and get those finalized. Also, the Plaintiffs have served requests for production in Hamilton County and Defendants' responses to those are due next week.

Then, over in Shelby County, Defendants have been served in 15 cases, but Pfizer has been nonsuited from all 15 there as well. Those 15 cases, plus three that were recently filed, are consolidated for pretrial purposes before Judge Jerry Stokes in Division Six of Hamilton County Circuit Court.

Defendants have filed Motions to Dismiss complaints and amended complaints in all but three of those recently filed cases, but a hearing has not yet been set on those motions in Shelby County.

The parties in Shelby County have also begun to engage in discovery. Defendant served responses to Plaintiffs' interrogatories and requests for production in one Shelby County case last week, and like in Hamilton, the parties are
working to finalize those discovery orders governing confidentiality, privilege, and ESI, and hope to have those on file soon.

That is it for me, your Honor, and I look forward to the brown bag lunch on the 24 th. Thanks so much for having me today.

THE COURT: Thank you for your presentation.
I was going to mention that I had reached out to Judge Stokes as well, but have not heard back yet. That is the status, and I want to thank you for your presentation.

I would say that is quite a bit that has gone on in your life over the last nine months. I want to congratulate you on your nine month old baby boy, and what a gift, and among many silver linings that $I$ think I try to remember to highlight when we all meet, because this whole case has been during COVID and I know there have been a lot of tragedies and setbacks and difficulties, but some silver linings are stories such as yours where you have given birth to your first baby boy, and I presume that you are able to spend probably a little bit more time with him because of COVID, as many parents are with their even adult children.

So, that is a gift, and what a remarkable career you've had and thank you for the presentation.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you, your Honor.
MR. MATTHEWS: Judge, I think I will go next. This is

David Matthews. Good afternoon, Judges Rosenberg and Reinhart.
I have recently been appointed the State Court liaison in this MDL, so I am catching up, if you will, on some matters, but in that role I have reached out to all the known Plaintiffs' counsel with State Court cases pending throughout the country, and that includes cases -- and I will try not to repeat what Ms. Harris just talked about -- but I did reach out to and have communicated with the attorneys in Memphis, Tennessee, as well as Chattanooga, in Chicago, Cook County, as well as the California litigation that is ongoing and the lawyers predominantly in Alameda County, as well as lawyers in Texas that have cases pending in Nueces and Jim Wells County.

So, we have opened up lines of communication, if you will, and will continue to communicate as directed by the court or as questions arise.

I have litigated -- my main office is in Houston, Texas, but $I$ have offices in California and in New York, and have litigated throughout the country for over 30 years in both MDLs and in State Courts, and have tried cases in both MDLs and State Courts throughout the country, so I certainly have a great deal of background in the issues that arise with coordination and communications with Federal Courts and then, of course, the State Court judges and litigants across the country.

That is a little bit of my background. I will say
that, again without repeating, overall the State Court cases are in the early stages of litigation. Some have Motions to Dismiss pending, some negotiating ESI protocols and confidentiality orders, discovery protocols, and those are ongoing. All the lawyers $I$ have talked to on the Plaintiffs' side believe that they will be agreed upon shortly, and I think they are making tremendous progress across the country.

As stated, in California, where there are over a thousand cases pending in Alameda County, the State Court litigation is in the process of being coordinated through the judicial counsel coordinating proceedings, and that is set for March 3rd, which is in a couple weeks.

Other than that, the numbers are fairly small in the counties that $I$ just mentioned; 25 cases in Judge Stokes' court, approximately ten in Cook County, although some are being filed as we speak, and then over a thousand in California, and just two in Texas State Courts.

So, I remain at the ready. At the Court's direction, I will continually reach out as needed to secure that we have proper coordination with the Courts, and we do so in an orderly manner, and in that regard, $I$ am at the Court's direction as needed.

THE COURT: Well, with all of your experience and all the years you have been litigating in Federal and State and around the country with MDLs and non-MDLs, what do you think is
most important for this court to do to be mindful of Federal/State coordination?

It is one thing for this Court to be kept apprised, and that certainly is what you are doing, and $I$ appreciate that so $I$ know what is happening, and can reach out to certain judges when asked to do so or when appropriate, but do you think that there is something more that this Court can and should do to effectuate State/Federal coordination, however one defines that?

One aspect of coordination is just simply both sides knowing what the other is doing; State Courts knowing what we are doing, we know what states are doing. I know that Judge Bennett found that very helpful. I think a complement to all of the lawyers in this case because you have in large part proposed the pretrial orders, the 59 of them, you have reached consensus, you have presented them to the Court. Judge Bennett said he has adopted a lot of those orders, so I think that is a high compliment to all of you who have done the work in this case.

So, I guess that is one way that -- with the state Court judge knowing what a Federal Court judge is doing. I think I have told you before $I$ was a state Court judge and State Court judges have it hard, they have higher case dockets and they don't have the help and resources that we Federal judges have, so to have the benefit of being able to be aware
of other orders and at least elect to use part or all of those orders as he or she deems fitting is really a tremendous asset to a State Court judge.

I know Judge Bennett raised issues like depositions, is there a way that there could be coordination of depositions. I am sure there are a myriad of issues, but, Mr. Matthews, do you have any suggestions as to what you think this Court should do to facilitate, not interrupt, not intrude, not step on toes, not command, direct, or usurp, but just to facilitate coordination that is beneficial for all, all of the participants at this stage?

MR. MATTHEWS: Your Honor, David Matthews again.
Yes, I have certainly referenced the Manual for Complex Litigation, and I certainly have experienced a number of issues and they arise as they arise.

I do think the coordination of depositions is almost always the number one priority because of just the number of litigants and try to do it -- take the depositions in an orderly fashion where a certain amount of time is allotted for State Court litigants, State Court lawyers. I think a protocol could be developed where we have coordination.

I think it is going to have to be -- as I am the one appointed, it will have to be a certain communication through me to the Plaintiffs' counsel. I think setting up that type of protocol is very important.

Obviously, Courts vary from state to state, the state laws and state jurisdictions vary. As an example, priority trial settings in state Court where a case has to be tried, as an example, where imminent death may occur, there are certain states that require expedited trial settings. That would be something that could come up. Again, that is really going to be a case-by-case example of what $I$ think the variances between the states entails.

I perceive my job as to understand an issue before it becomes one and then present it to the Court and the CMCs and address those as they come up.

I think that there is going to be issues because there always are, and $I$ don't think that is a bad thing, it is just try to make these compatible. I perceive my job as identifying those problems and helping out as I can and bringing those up with CMCs.

THE COURT: With respect to deposition protocol, do you think that is something that this Court would enter, like contemplate an order that relates to a deposition protocol? Would it be a mandatory situation, would it be guidance?

I don't know if you have talked to the Defense about it, or talking to the leads.

I am not sure where the noise is coming from in the background.

Maybe that is something to be able to, you know, talk
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to others about and see whether it might be appropriate to consider such a protocol.

MR. MATTHEWS: I think that is a good idea, and I am certainly willing to reach out to the leads on both sides of this case and discuss those matters.

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, if I may --

THE COURT: I was just going to say -- sorry to cut you off, Mr. Pulaski. As long as we are talking about this, if any of the leads for either side, if you have already given thought to that, or you have any ideas, or you think it is something that needs to really be addressed first amongst yourselves, $I$ don't want to spring a topic up or an issue, but it is something that certainly would be of interest to the Court to know others views on that.

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, I can tell you we already have our depo protocol in this case. Like Mr. Matthews stated, there are problems that arise. We don't know what the problems are until they are -- (inaudible).

Sorry, can you hear me?
And so, at this point, again, $I$ think it may be premature to start talking about depo protocols. We have issues, we have the California cases. I know that the brands are getting involved there to some degree in discussions with the attorneys out there.

But I think at this point it is just, one, we weren't
prepared to discuss it at this CMC because it wasn't on the agenda. We would like to talk ourselves, Mr. Matthews, and go ahead, but $I$ think we won't know what the problems are or the coordination issues are until they come up, and I don't want to pretend that $I$ can guess what every situation may be in all of the different courts that are out there.

And I think, again, it is just, at this point, a little bit premature to get into that, and I would certainly like the ability to get with everybody on our side to discuss it before we really brought it up with the court.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Your Honor, could I speak to your question?

THE COURT: Yes, that makes sense. Yes, absolutely. And I do know that we obviously have orders. That is why my eyes are diverted over here, because I have an iPad over here with all of the orders.

I know that we have done some deposition orders, so, you know, it may be that $I$ am not recalling if there is something in one of those orders or not, but by all means it is something that you can take the time to mull over and discuss.

Yes, Mr. Agneshwar, what did you want to say?
MR. AGNESHWAR: I just wanted to respond to your question from the Defense perspective about what can an MDL Court do about coordination.

I think, number one, is something that you have
already done, your Honor, is the open line of communication. Sometimes the parties submit orders, the MDL Court did this, the MDL Court did that. Having an open line of communication between the judges can give -- the judge can understand why a certain order was done, why a timeframe is what it is, what are the different moving parts, what are the complexities. That in itself is a huge push forward in getting coordination.

As we move forward in the litigation, the reality is that some State Court litigations are going to go very smoothly, coordinated with the MDL and not duplicating discovery and things like that, but there are going to be situations where that is not the case, and that is when the line of communication becomes extra helpful.

Your Honor has also pointed out depositions as one place where there can be coordination, and the types of things that I have seen are deposition limits on how many hours, how many people questioned, and the use of depositions in various litigations. That is definitely one thing.

Also, in prior litigations what $I$ have seen is sometimes joint hearings on things that are going to be recurring throughout litigation and coming up in Federal and State Courts, and if there is briefing at the same time or at similar times, it makes sense to have judges preside jointly over the case, State and Federal judges. That has been a helpful thing at times.
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Sometimes I have even seen when a CMC is addressing something of nationwide importance in the whole litigation to invite State Court judges to join the CMCs.

I think right now, where $I$ see it, is so far the MDL Court -- because things are going so fast in the MDL Court, it is so far ahead of anything that is happening in State Court, so I think so far we have seen we are getting off the ground with case management orders and things, and in the JCCP, we are seeing like we don't have a coordinated proceeding yet.

I suspect in a month or two we are going to have a coordination judge in California, and when you have that kind of State Court mini MDL and the Federal MDL, that kind of coordination becomes all the more paramount.

So, right now we are just kind of tipping our toe in the water and keeping your Honors informed and providing the names of the judges to begin the line of communication, but $I$ think there definitely will be things when we go down the road where we are going to want more close coordination on substantive things, or at least to request it.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, if I may briefly respond. THE COURT: Yes.

MR. PULASKI: While Mr. Agneshwar may believe that everything needs to be completely succinct and coordinated, there is some autonomy with the State Courts. I know there are
issues with -- not issues, but the State Courts have their own agendas, Federal Courts have their agenda, and while you are the lead in the MDL on this, $I$ know that while we will be coordinating, we certainly respect our brethren on the state Court side of things and how they want to proceed in this litigation and do not want to, like you said, step on toes and control them.

There are, obviously, certain issues where we need to discuss coordination, some issues where we may not be able to coordinate certain circumstances, which shouldn't be a problem. We will figure that, again, out as these issues come about.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. McGLAMRY: Your Honor, Mike McGlamry. If I might address one of your earlier questions sort of directly.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MCGLAMRY: We have PTO 54 that is in place. That is the deposition protocol and, obviously, most of us who were involved in negotiating that and working that up, that was a long time ago, and initially in the discussions --

THE COURT: It was only November, just for the record, but yes, it does seem like a long time ago.

MR. MCGLAMRY: To us, that is a long time ago, your Honor. My point is this, initially there was language in it that contemplated coordination, but there weren't any coordinations, so the language went then to essentially trying
to cooperate with a state court case and there are mechanisms s for cross notices in depositions and things of that sort and discussions as we go.

So, I just didn't want there not to be a reference -there is something in place, and that order, as you know, is very comprehensive in terms of sort of all, you know, dotting the I's and crossing the T's for depositions for something this complicated and it has that component it.

I also think that ultimately, as Adam was mentioning, and Anand and others, too, that as it relates to the State Court issue, not only is it sort of a state Court issue, but it's also a timing issue as to when people are up and running and what they are doing and who their parties are, et cetera.

So, obviously, we are prepared to do what the court needs us to do. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. For the record, I was just glancing now at 54, page seven of 31 , cross noticing of depositions. It talks about cross notices, the coordination of depositions, questioning attorneys, subsequent depositions. What could possibly have been said in 31 pages? Let me just see. It obviously covered a lot of other things, but yes, it is 31 pages.

Thank you for reminding us of that, Mr. McGlamry.
I think this has been very helpful and I appreciate your thoughts and $I$ appreciate the update, and $I$ imagine this
will be an important topic, really, at every case management conference, I suppose, just to at least keep me updated on what you are learning at the ground level of what is happening in the State Court, and if you have suggestions and you think that we can do things in this MDL that is helpful to that coordination, $I$ know you will talk among yourselves. Yes, it is never the intent of the Court to surprise or spring anything.

As you know, I like order and structure, and I am not a surprise person, so I don't want you to surprise me, and I will try not to surprise you with issues or put anybody ever on the spot of having to commit to something or answer something if you haven't had ample opportunity to think about it.

Anything more on State Court or shall we move on to next gen. Ms. Harris, are you going to stay on for next gen?

MR. PULASKI: Thank you, Judge.
MS. HARRIS: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. Good luck with everything. You have your hands full.

Okay, so we have the next gen update. Let's have our participants join. So we have Ms. McGlamry and Ms. Nino. How are you?

MS. NINO: Good, thanks, your Honor.
MS. McGLAMRY: Yes, thank you.
THE COURT: I am going to turn my mic off because that
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makes it difficult for everybody to hear. I will let you take over right now.

MS. McGLAMRY: Ms. Nino, I will let you go ahead and go if you'd like.

MS. NINO: Sure. Thanks so much.
Good afternoon, your Honor. My name is Emma Nino, I am an associate at Williams and Connelly and I represent Pfizer in this litigation.

I am someone who is new to multi-district legislation, and relatively new to this case, $I$ just joined this past September. I am so grateful to the Court for putting such an emphasis on the mentorship and development of the more junior attorneys. This is something that $I$ have already felt in my experience so far.

From the moment $I$ joined the case, Mr. Petrosinelli and the rest of the Williams and Connelly team made sure to bring me really quickly up to speed so that $I$ could jump in on substantive work across various aspects of the litigation.

One thing that $I$ have been working on in particular is, I have been quite involved in the defense of Pfizer in the State Court cases in New York, Illinois, and Puerto Rico. This has been really great because it gave me an opportunity to work closely with members of the LDC and other attorneys at the firms who represent Pfizer co-defendants.

Getting to know them and work with them, many of whom
are on this call $I$ am sure, has really been a pleasure and one of the highlights of my time on the case so far.

It has also been great to be a part of every aspect of those cases from strategy discussions with co-defendants and our client through to the drafting and filing of motions, which really has been a great experience and given me valuable insight into the litigation process.

More recently, I have been preparing for Pfizer's upcoming pharmacovigilance $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition and $I$ am really looking forward to seeing that process through and getting a chance to interact with Plaintiffs' counsel a bit more. I know we have many depositions that are coming up in this case so I am sure $I$ will have lots of opportunities to get more experience in that area, which is something I am particularly interested in.

I feel very fortunate to have such a great opportunity not only to observe the work of the many highly skilled and experienced attorneys in this case, but also to feel like $I$ can contribute, especially at such an early stage in my career, and I really appreciate having the opportunity to address you today as well.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, and well done on the pronunciation of that very difficult word, which I am not going to say because I didn't get it right the last time.

Pharmacovigilance, you did that well, and very nice presentation and I am very pleased that you have been able to play such an integral role in this case.

I guess you are a little late to the party if you just joined in September, but maybe that gives you fresh eyes and a fresh perspective for those who may be feeling a little worn out after a year of being in the trenches. As I've said before, $I$ think that the attorneys in each of your firms and leadership as a whole deserve so much credit for enabling you to play such a meaningful role, like a real role, really being able to do the work and not just sit on the sidelines.

It is always different to do versus observe, and you really learn most when you do, and people have to have confidence in you to do, and that is when you can shine and show off, so, that is wonderful. So, I appreciate your presentation, thank you so much.

Ms. McGlamry.
MS. McGLAMRY: Yes, good afternoon, your Honors. I am Caroline McGlamry on behalf of Plaintiffs, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you all toady.

I have been practicing law since 2013 with the firm of Pope McGlamry here in Atlanta, so just down the street from Ms. Harris. While not officially appointed to the Plaintiffs' LDC, I was appointed to the bellwether and deposition committees and have had the opportunity to be involved in a number of other
discovery related projects throughout this litigation.
Prior to the Zantac litigation, my experience primarily involved hip device litigation and the NFL concussion litigation, although largely on the claim side for our clients. This MDL has really been an eye opener to me as far as the commitment required by the firms and leadership. I certainly appreciate the opportunity $I$ have been given to work with and get to know such an impressive and hard-working group of attorneys all over the country.

It has also been a special pleasure to work with Special Master Dodge, as she taught my complex litigation class in law school.

In addition to my work for the PFC, I spend about twice as much time on CPFs and registry issues for our firm's own clients, and although the approximately 650 clients we represent is modest compared to other mass tort firms, it still involves the work of three attorneys and seven staff members on a daily basis to communicate with clients, complete the CPFs, collect records, determine the appropriate Defendants, cure deficiencies, supplement CPFs and medical records, proof of use and other information, both status conference calls with the clients and a myriad of other tasks that are involved with diligently representing our clients.

Collectively, we have spent thousands of professional hours on this case in the last year, which makes sense because
each individual case is important, and you have to invest time in your clients and get to know their stories, especially when you are dealing with an injury like cancer because, unfortunately, a lot of our clients have terminal cancer and won't live to see the end of this litigation.

Additionally, many of those clients are obviously undergoing chemotherapy and radiation right now, so they are constantly thinking about this litigation and wondering if they will see the end of it. Just in the last few months alone, more than a dozen of our clients have passed away, and finding a family member or a friend who either knew that they were pursuing this litigation or knew the information needed to continue with their claim can be pretty difficult.

All that to say, though, that this is still the best justice system in the world and being here in front of you all provides for married people like our clients with a meaningful opportunity to obtain justice through the court system.

With approximately -- I think it was referenced earlier -- 70,000 claimants, dozens of Defendants, individual litigation doesn't make sense for Plaintiffs or Defendants in a case like this. I believe that is why so much work is being put in on the front end between Plaintiffs' and Defendants' counsel to try and work cooperatively and resolve issues on our own.

I have truly never seen so much work put in every day,
at all hours of the day, to move the case forward, and that hard work by both parties is why the issues that do make it before the Court are really just the very important ones that can't get resolved and need the benefit of your guidance and intervention.

So, with all that, it has been a pleasure to watch this Court and these litigants in action, and an honor to play a small role in it, and I appreciate all the work that the Court has put into this case and continues to put in this case. So, thank you.

THE COURT: You are welcome. It sounds like you are putting a lot of work in, that you are playing a large role, and if you take McGlamry times two, then you are really clocking the hours.

Are we allowed to ask what it is like to work with your father?

MS. MCGLAMRY: It is great.

MR. MCGLAMRY: That was the right answer, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Did you ever think you would appear on a screen together like this?

MS. MCGLAMRY: I did not.

THE COURT: Maybe another silver lining. That is wonderful. Thank you so much, very eloquent presentation, and, yeah, I mean the fact that you have become a partner already

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter
and I understand you had an integral role with the NFL -- you were involved with the NFL case as I understand it.

MS. McGLAMRY: Yes, ma'am, that is continuing and apparently will last my entire career and maybe my children's career.

THE COURT: So, you have accomplished quite a bit. I hardly even imagine you in the next generation there, with all you have accomplished, but that is a real complement to how much you have done and the good fortune you have had to be able to work with your father and to have Professor Dodge, now Special Master Dodge, as your professor. So, I am sure you have learned some wonderful things from her and continue to do so through this case.

So, thank you both, thank you for your presentation, and with you on the screen, $I$ am really looking forward to the brown bag lunch we have coming up next week. I know this is something that Judge Reinhart and I have been speaking about from the inception of -- really the creation of the LDC and trying to think more creatively about how you, as younger lawyers, whether you are on the LDC, even if you are a partner, but you are still in the, you know, younger next gen category, you know, to have an opportunity to interact with other lawyers who are more senior to you, and also with the Court.

I hope that the leads know that we will invite them to the lunch, too, so they are invited, and I know that Special

Master Dodge is working out the details of exactly who will be joining us for the lunch.

I think we are going to have it for about an hour at noon and Judge Reinhart and I will be available to talk and answer questions and have a back and forth for maybe the first part of the lunch, and then we have a wonderful guest who is going to join us for the second half.

I don't know whether Special Master Dodge has mentioned that or not yet, but Judge Dow, Robert Dow, who sits in Illinois, who formerly was the head of the MDL subcommittee and is now the new chair of the Civil Rules -- Advisory Civil Rules Committee of the Judicial Conference is going to join us to give a presentation on what the rules process is like, how the committee works, and what the role of those of us -- and I have sat on the civil rules committee for now two years -- what we do, how we do it, why we do it.

So, we thought that was a tremendous opportunity to educate you on an area that not many people talk about. Even as judges, I wasn't really familiar with how the whole rules process worked until I became part of the committee. For you to learn about it at earlier stages in your career I think would be very helpful, particularly when one of the subcommittees of the civil rules is MDL.

There is a lot of discussion right now about issues that you are living and breathing and seeing and experiencing
every day, so we are really grateful to Judge Dow for agreeing to spend a half an hour of his time because he is awfully busy between his docket and being now the head of the rules committee, a lot of meetings and whatnot.

So, I will look forward to seeing you next Wednesday, the 24 th. Let me make sure, I don't want to confuse anybody.

Yes. We will get the -- I think we have already sent those out.

Good to see both of you, and thank you for your presentations.

MS. McGLAMRY: Thank you.
THE COURT: Judge Reinhart, was there anything that you want to say to the group?

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Judge Rosenberg.

First of all, to any of you who are in Texas, or anywhere else, who have been affected by the storms, we in Florida know what it's like when the weather knocks out your power, knocks you off kilter. So, our thoughts are with you and if there is anything that any of us can do to help you get through this difficult situation, please let us know. It is difficult and we know that.

Secondly, I just wanted to thank everybody for their presentations today, it was very helpful. I also wanted to tell everyone who participated in the in-chambers that we had a
few weeks ago on the discovery, that $I$ found it very helpful, very informative, and I appreciated the candid back and forth that we were able to have. So, I thank you for that.

It did inform my thinking a great deal, gave me a lot to think about and to discuss with Judge Rosenberg and with the special master. I appreciate having that opportunity to hear from you.

One thing that I did want to piggyback on how Judge Rosenberg opened these proceedings, it's something I did say at the in-chambers, but since not everyone was there, $I$ will repeat it now it particular went to discovery, but really all aspects of the case.

Stuff happens in big cases like this. Things are going to fall through the cracks, people are going to miss deadlines, pleadings get lost, things don't get served properly. We understand that. No one is going to be -- as Judge Rosenberg said, we are not playing gotcha here. We believe in due process, we believe everyone should have a fair chance and that mistakes do happen.

Now, if someone has been prejudiced and there is a need for a judicial remedy, we stand ready and able to give the remedy that people are entitled to, but on the other hand, we are not looking to hang people high for simple mistakes.

I do want to encourage everyone, and this is really the take-away, when those things happen, don't let it derail
everything else that is going on in the case. You can bifurcate the ultimate remedy you may get if you are ultimately shown to have prejudice from the need to continue on with the process. So, fix the problem, fix the mistake if it happens, move forward on that.

If you want to open a second front to seek some other remedy, that is fine, but let's not let the normal hiccups that occur in this sort of litigation bring us to a stop.

With that, the only other thing, I will echo what Judge Rosenberg said, I look forward very much to having a discussion with the LDC members and the next gen lawyers and getting to know you all a little bit better. Thank you very much, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. We will conclude, we did pretty well. We did this in an hour and a half. We are always here to give as much time of ourselves as is warranted, needed, and as you want, but we certainly don't want to intrude on your time and take away from your work and your other obligations.

We don't ever want to have these conferences be perceived as kind of time wasters. I hope you don't feel that way. We certainly don't, and we feel communication is important and this is one critical way for us to communicate with one another.

Again, while the Court may have more ongoing communication with, say, the leads, there are many others out
there -- I see now there are about 143 participants, and they don't necessarily hear from the court on a regular basis. So, to have these regular conferences, at a minimum, to communicate to those who are not in the inner circle, but $I$ trust the leads are even during the periods between the conferences keeping everybody apprised.

I feel very strongly that our leaders need to be leaders and not get so lost in what you are doing day-to-day that you forget that you are leading a team of hundreds or thousands of other lawyers in this case, and that you need to communicate, which I am sure you are doing, so I am not saying anything that $I$ have reason to believe you are not doing.

I am just telling you that $I$ think it is really important that you have to remember that you are practicing lawyers representing your clients in a difficult case, but you are also leaders of a massive litigation, and you have a constituency out there, if you will, and you need to keep them apprised, informed.

As I always say, you need to act like leaders and model your behavior in a way that you would like others to emulate, and I think you are doing all of those things, so keep it up.

Great to hear from each of you today, and thank you to the others who have taken the time to attend, and we look forward to our next event together, which will be currently the

LDC next gen lunch, but then we will have our discovery and status conferences to follow and I will memorialize those dates shortly in an order.

As always, be well, everyone, take care. Thank you so much.
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|  | $\begin{array}{\|lll} \hline 300 & {[1]} & 1 / 18 \\ 30309 & {[1]} & 2 / 2 \end{array}$ | access [1] 16/5 <br> accomplish [1] 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: [1] $56 / 13$ | 30326 [1] 1/18 | accomplished [4] 10/1 10/13 |
| MR. AGNESHWAR: [3] 29/7 | 30th [1] 34/3 | 54/6 54/8 |
| 42/10 42/21 | 31 [3] 46/17 46/20 46/22 | accurate [1] 33 |
| MR. MATTHEWS : [3] 35/24 | 3391 $[1]$ $1 / 17$   <br> 3rd [3] $31 / 24$ $32 / 5$ $37 / 12$  | achieve [1] $8 / 11$   <br> across [3] $36 / 23$ $37 / 7$ $48 / 18$ |
| 39/11 41/2 MR. McGLAMRY: [4] 45/12 |  | act [3] 33/23 33/24 59/19 |
| MR. McGLAMRY: [4] 45/12 | 4 | action [1] 53/7 |
| 45/15 45/21 53/17 <br> MR. PETROSINELLI: | 404-523-7706 [1] 1/19 | active [1] 23/11 |
|  | 404-572-4600 [1] 2/3 | actively [2] 19/22 23/10 |
| MR. PULASKI: [12] 12/13 | 42 [1] 32/17 | activity [1] 32/8 |
| 18/3 18/7 23/3 27/15 28/10 | 4555 [1] 1/15 | actually [8] 3/2 $3 / 19$ 17/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 28 / 13 & 41 / 5 & 41 / 14 & 44 / 20 & 44 / 22\end{array}$ | 4600 [1] 2/3 | 25/25 30/5 30/14 32/1 34/8 |
| 47/15 | 5 | ADAM [3] 1/13 $18 / 8$ 46/9 |
| MS. HARRIS: [4] 29/14 33/13 35/23 47/16 | 5250 [1] 2/6 | addition [1] 51/13 |
| MS. McGLAMRY: [7] 47/23 | 53 [1] 32/10 | Additionally [1] 52/6 |
| 48/2 50/17 53/16 53/21 54/2 | 54 [2] 45/16 46/17 | address [6] 4/19 9/10 20/8 |
| 56/10 | 5567 [1] 1/22 | 40/11 45/14 49/20 |
| MS. NINO: [2] 47/22 48/4 | 55th [1] 1/24 | addressed [2] 33/19 41/11 |
| THE COURT: [30] $2 / 9$ 12/19 | 59 [10] 9/9 13/21 $14 / 5$ 15/2 | addressing [3] 8/24 12/1 |
| 18/2 18/5 22/16 23/4 27/19 | $\begin{array}{llll} 15 / 12 & 15 / 16 & 16 / 17 & 18 / 11 \\ 18 / 14 & 38 / 15 \end{array}$ |  |
| 28/12 $28 / 14$ 33/2 35/6 37/22 | 18/14 38/15 | adopted [2] 7/24 38/17 |
| 40/16 41/6 42/12 44/19 44/21 | 6 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}45 / 11 & 45 / 14 & 45 / 19 & 46 / 15\end{array}$ | 60 miles [1] 30/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { affected [3] } & 16 / 4 & 16 / 8 & 56 / 17\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}47 / 17 & 47 / 24 & 49 / 22 & 53 / 10\end{array}$ | 650 [1] 51/15 | affects [1] 18/16 |
| 53/19 53/22 54/5 56/11 58/13 | 6th [1] 4/9 | after [6] 5/12 21/1 22/7 |
| / | 7 | 25/5 28/5 50/7 |
| /s [1] 60/12 |  | afternoon [8] 3/1 $12 / 11$ |
| 1 | 713-522-5250 [1] 2/6 | 50/18 |
| 10019 [1] 1/24 | 713-664-4555 [1] 1/15 | again [10] 4/6 12/22 21/3 |
| 1180 [1] 2/2 | 725 [1] 1/21 | 37/1 39/12 40/6 41/20 42/7 |
| 12th [1] 1/21 | 7706 [1] 1/19 | 45/11 58/24 |
| 143 [1] 59/1 | 77098 [2] 1/14 2/5 | agenda [6] 8/25 12/2 $17 / 24$ |
| 15 [5] 21/10 23/2 $34 / 14$ | $\begin{array}{\|lrl} 772.467 .2337 & \text { [1] } & 2 / 9 \\ 7 \text { th [1] } 4 / 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ccc} 28 / 15 & 42 / 2 & 45 / 2 \\ \text { agendas [1] } & 45 / 2 \end{array}$ |
| 34/14 34/15 |  |  |
| 1600 [1] 2/2 | 8 |  |
| 1725 [1] 1/14 | 8011 [1] 1/25 | $29 / 9 \quad 42 / 21 \quad 44 / 23$ |
| 18 [1] 1/5 |  | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { ago [5] } & 10 / 12 & 45 / 19 & 45 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 1996 [1] 30/5 | 9 | $45 / 22 \quad 57 / 1$ |
| 19th [1] 31/12 | 90 [2] 22/8 22/9 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { agreed [3] } & 19 / 13 & 19 / 21 & 37 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 2 | 90-day [1] 25/8 | agreeing [1] 56/1 |
| 20 [1] 60/11 | A | agreement [1] 19/4 |
| 20 percent [2] 21/11 23/2 | a need [1] 57/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { ahead [5] } & 4 / 22 & 20 / 20 & 42 / 3\end{array}$ |
| 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG [1] 1/3 | ability [4] 5/9 7/15 $22 / 25$ | $44 / 648 / 3$ |
| 20005 [1] 1/21 | able [11] 28/16 33/10 35/19 | aid [2] 9/21 24/16 <br> Alameda [3] 31/18 36/11 |
| 2013 [1] 30/15 | 38/25 40/25 45/9 50/2 50/11 | Alaska [2] 30/4 30/6 |
| 2013 with [1] 50/21 | $54 / 957 / 3$ 57/21 | albeit [1] 6/8 |
| 2016 [1] 30/17 | about [52] $4 / 7$ 4/9 4/10 $5 / 5$ | align [1] 9/6 |
| 202-434-5567 2021 [1] | 10/10 10/16 16/7 16/9 16/18 | aligns [1] 11/10 |
|  | 17/6 17/10 17/16 17/20 17/21 | all [56] 3/24 4/3 5/24 7/6 |
| 212-836-8011 [1] $1 / 25$ 21st [1] 9/14 | 21/3 21/25 22/16 23/2 23/7 | 7/10 7/24 8/19 9/4 10/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 21st [1] } & 9 / 14 \\ \text { 22nd [2] } & 32 / 23 & 33 / 18\end{array}$ | 24/1 24/2 24/8 24/8 24/10 | 10/24 11/22 12/8 14/10 16/20 |
| 22nd [2] 32/23 33/18 | 24/16 25/15 28/11 29/1 29/23 | 17/3 19/23 21/15 24/1 24/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}24 \quad \text { [1] } 30 / 2 & \\ \text { 24th [2] } & 35 / 5 & 56 / 6\end{array}$ | 30/1 33/11 33/12 36/7 40/21 | 24/19 27/10 29/18 $30 / 3 \quad 32 / 11$ |
| 24th [2] $35 / 5$ 56/6 25 [1] $37 / 14$ | 41/1 $41 / 8$ 41/21 $42 / 23$ 42/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 12 & 32 / 18 & 32 / 19 & 34 / 14\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llr}\mathbf{2 5} & \text { [1] } & 37 / 14 \\ \mathbf{2 5 0} & {[1]} & 1 / 24\end{array}$ | 45/11 $46 / 18$ 47/13 51/13 $52 / 8$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 19 & 35 / 15 & 36 / 4 & 37 / 5 & 37 / 23\end{array}$ |
| 250 [1] $1 / 24$ | 54/17 54/19 55/3 55/18 55/21 | 37/23 38/13 38/18 39/1 $39 / 10$ |
| 2905 $[1]$ $2 / 5$ <br> 2925 $[1]$ $1 / 14$ | 55/24 57/5 59/1 |  |
| 2925 [1] 1/14 | above [1] 60/9 | 46/6 50/20 51/9 52/14 52/15 |
| 3 | absent [1] 15/23 | 53/1 53/6 53/8 54/7 56/16 |
| 30 [4] 15/21 16/2 36/18 49/9 | absolutely [1] 42/13 | 57/11 58/12 59/21 |


| A | anywhere [2] 16/10 56/17 | aware [1] 38/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| allege [1] 14/18 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{y}\left[\begin{array}{llll} 5] & 8 / 23 & 18 / 19 & 52 / 1 \\ / 25 & 58 / 18 \end{array}\right. \end{aligned}$ |
| alleged [1] 14/12 | appear <br> [1] 53/20 | awfully [1] 56/2 |
| allow [1] 19/1 | appeared [1] 3/20 | B |
| allowed [2] 19/8 53/15 | applaud [1] 10/14 | baby [3] 30/24 35/13 |
| allowing [1] 24/8 | application [1] 10/4 | back [9] 18/7 18/15 25/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { allows [1] } & 25 / 21 & \\ \text { alluded [2] } & 13 / 11 & 14 / 4\end{array}$ | appointed [5] 10/5 36/2 | 27/8 31/14 31/15 35/9 55/5 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { alluded [2] } & 13 / 11 \\ \text { almost [1] } & \text { /4/ }\end{array}$ | 39/23 50/23 50/24 | 57/2 |
| almost [1] <br> alone [1] 52/9 | appreciate [16] 22/17 27/17 | background [4] 29/23 36/21 |
| along [4] 6/7 11/3 14/13 | 27/23 29/2 29/19 33/1 33/16 | 36/25 40/24 |
| 20/12 | 38/4 46/24 46/25 49/20 50/15 | bad [2] 26/12 40/13 |
| already [7] $24 / 7$ 41/9 41/15 | 50/19 51/7 53/8 57/6 | bag [2] 35/5 54/16 |
| 43/1 48/13 53/25 56/7 | appreciated [2] 10/25 57 | Baker [1] |
| also [23] 2/4 8/21 9/20 | apprised [3] 38/3 59/6 59/18 | Bar [2] 19/11 22 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll} & 17 / 10 & 17 / 18 & 19 / 11 & 22 / 13\end{array}$ | approach [3] 26/21 26/21 | base [1] 30 <br> baseball [1] |
| 28/20 $32 / 4$ 32/12 $34 / 2$ 34/10 | appropriate [3] 38/6 41/1 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}34 / 22 & 43 / 14 & 43 / 19 & 46 / 9 & 46 / 12\end{array}$ |  | basically [1] 26/16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49 / 3 ~ 49 / 18 ~ 51 / 10 ~ 54 / 23 ~ 56 / 24 \\ & 59 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | approximately [3] 37/15 | basis [3] 13/15 51/18 59/2 |
| although [6] 3/15 20/14 | 51/15 | be [105] |
| 31/24 37/15 51/4 51/15 | April [1] 3 | be claims [1] |
| always [14] 9/6 9/15 10/2 | April 30th [1] 34/3 | BEACH [3] 1/2 $1 / 5$ 2/8 |
| 11/1 11/3 12/6 12/9 15/18 | arduous [1] 21/14 | beautiful [1] 33/4 |
| 39/17 40/13 50/12 58/15 | area [2] 49/14 55/18 | became [2] 6/24 55/20 <br> because [22] 4/23 5/24 6 |
| 59/19 60/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { area [2] } \quad 49 / 14 \text { 55/18 } \\ & \text { aren't [1] } 19 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | 10/19 16/15 18/20 21/14 |
| am [35] $3 / 15$ 8/13 $8 / 23$ 16/19 | argument [2] 32/5 | 23/25 35/15 35/20 38 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 14 & 26 / 25 & 27 / 15 & 28 / 5 & 29 / 12\end{array}$ | arise [6] 5/5 36/15 36/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}39 / 17 & 40 / 12 & 42 / 1 & 42 / 15 & 44 / 5\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 1 & 33 / 5 & 36 / 3 & 37 / 21 & 39 / 6 \\ 39 / 22 & 40 / 23 & 41 / 3 & 42 / 18 & 47 / 9\end{array}$ | 39/15 39/15 41/17 | 47/25 48/22 49/25 51/25 52/3 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}39 / 22 & 40 / 23 & 41 / 3 & 42 / 18 & 47 / 9 \\ 47 / 25 & 48 / 7 & 48 / 9 & 48 / 11 & 49 / 1\end{array}$ | arisen [1] 25/13 | 56/2 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}47 / 25 & 48 / 7 & 48 / 9 & 48 / 11 & 49 / 1 \\ 49 / 9 & 49 / 13 & 49 / 14 & 49 / 24 & 50 / 2\end{array}$ | arises [1] 7/7 | become [3] 24/10 26/13 53/25 |
| $\text { 49/9 49/13 49/14 49/24 } 50$ $50 / 18 \text { 54/11 54/15 59/11 }$ | Army [1] 30/2 | becomes [5] 11/8 28/6 40/10 |
| 59/11 59/13 | Arnold [1] 1/23 | 43/13 44/13 |
| amazed [1] | around [2] 29/5 37/25 | been [56] 3/8 |
| amend [2] 19/24 22/25 | as [138] | $\begin{array}{llllll}4 / 17 & 5 / 19 & 7 / 3 & 7 / 7 & 9 / 13 & 9 / 15\end{array}$ |
| amended [4] 17/13 27/24 | aside [1] | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 1 & 10 / 6 & 10 / 9 & 13 / 7 & 13 / 19\end{array}$ |
| 27/25 34/19 | ask [2] 18/1 53/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 10 & 16 / 9 & 19 / 13 & 21 / 21 & 24 / 4\end{array}$ |
| amendment [1] | asked [5] 6/17 6/22 10/ | $\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 5 & 24 / 12 & 24 / 19 & 25 / 6 & 26 / 15\end{array}$ |
| amendments [3] 17/11 17/17 | 25/24 38/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}27 / 4 & 32 / 10 & 32 / 12 & 32 / 16 & 33 / 19 \\ 34 / 13 & 34 / 14 & 34 / 20 & 35 / 15\end{array}$ |
| amendments [3] 17/11 | aspect [3] $10 / 8$ $38 / 10$ $49 / 3$ <br> aspects $[3]$ $8 / 19$ $48 / 18$ $57 / 12$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 34 / 13 & 34 / 14 & 34 / 20 & 35 / 15 \\ 35 / 16 & 36 / 2 & 37 / 24 & 43 / 24 & 46 / 20 \end{array}$ |
| among [3] 25/12 $35 / 13 \quad 47 / 6$ | assessment <br> [2] $6 / 198 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 35 / 16 & 36 / 2 & 37 / 24 & 43 / 24 & 46 / 20 \\ 46 / 24 & 48 / 19 & 48 / 20 & 48 / 22 & 49 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| ngst [1] | asset [1] 39/2 | 49/3 49/6 49/8 50/2 50/21 |
|  | assigned [1] 32/18 | 51/5 51/7 51/10 53/6 54/17 |
| ample [2] 24/13 47/13 | assistance [3] 9/19 32/25 | 56/17 57/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { analytical [1] } & 13 / 11 \\ \text { analytics [1] } & \text { 9/20 }\end{array}$ | 33/2 | before [13] 1/9 3/18 1 |
| analytics [1] 9/20 | assisting [1] 31/ | 12/6 13/20 31/21 33/13 34/16 |
| ANAND [3] 1/23 $29 / 8$ 46/10 | associate [2] 29/16 48/7 | 38/22 40/9 42/10 50/8 53/3 |
| announcing [1] 12/9 | Associates [1] 2/4 | began [1] 30/14 |
| another [5] 11/4 11/5 11/ 53/23 58/23 | Assuming [1] 34/1 | begin [3] 19/11 29/22 44/16 |
| 53/23 58/23 | Atlanta [6] 1/18 2/2 29/16 | beginning [3] 9/1 9/3 32/23 |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { answer } \\ 55 / 5}}{\operatorname{anc}}[43 / 11 \quad 47 / 12 \quad 53 / 18$ | 30/1 30/19 50/22 | begins [1] 9/17 |
| answered [1] | attempted [1] 21/2 | begun [1] 34/22 |
| anticipate [1] 6/8 | attend [1] 59/24 | behalf [3] 14/10 29/18 50/19 |
| anxiety [1] 10/10 | attended [3] 30/8 30/10 | behavior [1] 59/20 |
| any [18] 5/3 5/6 6/6 16/20 | attorney | being [16] 8/8 8/8 8/9 9/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 22 & 19 / 2 & 25 / 25 & 27 / 14 & 31 / 4\end{array}$ | attorneys [10] 4/14 36/8 | $37 / 16 \quad 38 / 25 \quad 50 / 7 \quad 50 / 10 \quad 52 / 15$ |
| 32/25 33/11 $33 / 12$ 39/7 41/9 | 41/24 46/19 48/13 48/23 | $52 / 21 \quad 56 / 3$ |
| 41/10 45/24 56/16 56/20 | $49 / 1850 / 8 \text { 51/9 51/17 }$ | believe [8] 23/4 25/4 37/6 |
| anybody [5] 11/12 23/23 | August [1] 7/23 | 44/23 52/21 57/18 57/18 |
| 27/11 47/11 56/6 | Augusta [2] 30/6 30/8 | $59 / 12$ 2/21 57/18 57/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { anyone [1] } & 27 / 1 \\ \text { anything [11] } & 4 / 4 & 18 / 2 & 20 / 13\end{array}$ | autonomy [1] 44/25 | bellwether [2] 9/21 50/24 |
| anything [11] $4 / 4$ 18/2 20/13 24/4 29/11 $44 / 6$ 47/8 $47 / 14$ | available [1] 55/4 | belong [1] 26/18 |
| 24/4 $29 / 11$ $56 / 12$ $56 / 20$ | Avenue [1] 1/14 | beneficial [2] 27/10 39/10 |
| 56/12 56/20 59 | awaiting [1] 32/6 | benefit [7] 14/7 15/11 18/12 |

## B

benefit... [4] 27/11 33/10
38/25 53/4
Bennett [8] 32/19 32/22
33/19 33/25 34/3 38/13 38/16 39/4
best [4] 14/13 14/20 20/25 52/14
better [2] 3/8 58/12
between [7] 19/4 21/13 40/7 43/4 52/22 56/3 59/5
BI [1] 32/14
BI's [1] 31/3
bifurcate [1] 58/2
big [3] 5/3 15/2 57/13
birth [2] 30/23 35/18
bit [11] 12/21 20/10 20/13
29/23 35/11 35/19 36/25 42/8 49/11 54/6 58/12
bite [1] 22/13
Boehringer [1] 29/17
born [1] 29/25
both [19] 7/10 7/10 8/14
19/15 23/6 24/15 25/17 25/18 26/15 27/19 32/8 $36 / 18 \quad 36 / 19$ 38/10 41/4 51/21 53/2 54/14 56/9
bouncing [1] 30/24
boy [3] 30/24 35/13 35/18
boys [1] 30/9
brand [2] 31/12 32/1
branded [1] 13/14
brands [2] 7/2 41/22
breathing [1] 55/25
brethren [1] 45/4
brief [1] 29/21
briefed [1] 33/20
briefing [1] 43/22
briefly [4] 18/13 20/9 31/7 44/21
bring [2] 48/17 58/8
bringing [1] 40/15
brought [5] 16/9 20/9 23/13 24/17 42/10
brown [2] 35/5 54/16
BRUCE [1] 1/10
bubble [1] 27/2
bulk [1] 5/2
bumps [1] 11/13
busy [1] 56/2
button [1] 14/14

## C

California [9] 31/8 31/18
31/25 36/10 36/17 37/8 37/17
41/22 44/11
California based [1] 31/25
call [5] 18/14 22/4 33/8
33/8 49/1
called [1] 15/22
calls [1] 51/21
can [40] 6/2 6/2 6/2 6/3
6/10 7/9 7/20 7/21 8/4 8/9
8/11 8/16 9/5 11/8 11/19
12/5 12/8 12/18 14/20 15/20 21/16 25/2 33/15 38/5 38/7 40/15 41/15 41/19 42/5 42/20
$\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 23 & 43 / 4 & 43 / 4 & 43 / 15 & 47 / 5\end{array}$ 49/18 50/14 52/13 56/20 58/1
can't [5] 3/2 7/19 11/14
16/5 53/4
Canada [1] 30/7
cancer [2] 52/3 52/4
cancers [7] 19/6 19/19 $19 / 20$
19/25 20/4 21/11 22/23
candid [2] 8/16 57/2
care [2] 30/16 60/4
career [5] 35/22 49/19 54/4
54/5 55/21
CAROLINE [2] 1/16 50/19
case [62]
case in [1] 51/25
case-by-case [1] 40/7
cases [32] 5/4 5/10 11/1
11/17 21/4 29/5 31/11 31/21
$31 / 24 \quad 32 / 2 \quad 32 / 8 \quad 32 / 10 \quad 32 / 11$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}32 / 12 & 32 / 14 & 32 / 15 & 32 / 17 & 34 / 1\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 14 & 34 / 15 & 34 / 20 & 36 / 5 & 36 / 6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 12 & 36 / 19 & 37 / 1 & 37 / 9 & 37 / 14\end{array}$
41/22 48/21 49/4 57/13
cat [2] 3/20 3/21
catching [1] 36/3
category [1] 54/21
cats [1] 4/4
causation [1] 7/25
cause [1] 15/23
cell [1] 30/7
census [21] 12/24 12/25 13/2
$\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 6 & 13 / 8 & 13 / 21 & 13 / 24 & 14 / 3\end{array}$
$14 / 11$ 15/10 15/15 17/10
17/12 17/12 17/23 17/25 23/7
27/2 27/5 27/5 27/6
certain [13] 13/15 15/21
15/23 16/23 21/13 21/14 38/5
39/19 39/23 40/4 43/5 45/8
45/10
certain order [1] 43/5
certainly [13] 21/4 30/25
36/20 38/4 39/13 39/14 41/4
41/13 42/8 45/4 51/6 58/17
58/21
certification [1] 5/13
certify [1] 60/8
cetera [1] 46/13
chair [1] 55/11
challenges [2] 9/25 21/13
chambers [7] 6/12 6/14 6/17
6/24 7/14 56/25 57/10
chance [2] 49/11 57/19
change [1] 20/20
changes [1] 20/22
charged [1] 27/2
Chattanooga [1] 36/9
Chattem [1] 32/13
check [1] 4/6
checking [1] 8/13
chemotherapy [1] 52/7
Chicago [1] 36/9
child [1] 30/2
children [1] 35/21
children's [1] 54/4
circle [1] 59/4
Circuit [3] 31/14 32/17
34/17
circumstances [1] 45/10

Civil [4] 55/11 55/11 55/15 55/23
claim [6] 14/3 15/14 17/2 25/4 51/4 52/13
claimant [3] $13 / 13$ 15/6 $24 / 1$
claimant's [1] 15/7
claimants [18] 13/7 14/18 14/24 15/23 16/19 16/21 16/25 22/22 $23 / 3 \quad 24 / 14 \quad 24 / 14$ 24/15 24/24 25/1 26/10 26/16 26/17 52/19
claimants' [1] 15/21
claims [9] 5/15 9/2 14/21 21/15 22/12 22/14 23/13 24/3 33/22
claims from [1] 9/2
clarifying [1] 20/23
clarity [1] 25/22
class [2] 5/12 51/11
clear [3] 6/24 15/10 15/12
client [1] 49/5
clients [13] 19/18 51/4 51/15 51/15 51/18 51/22 51/23 52/2 52/4 52/6 52/10 52/16 59/15
clocking [1] 53/14
close [1] 44/18
closely [1] 48/23
CMC [2] $42 / 1$ 44/1
CMCs [3] 40/10 40/16 44/3
co [2] 48/24 49/4
co-defendants [2] 48/24 49/4
collaborative [1] 7/12
collect [2] 14/16 51/19
collection [1] 13/12
collective [1] 7/11
Collectively [1] 51/24
columns [1] 21/15
come [18] 3/7 4/14 6/7 6/8 6/9 8/5 8/21 9/23 10/1 11/9 $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 14 & 15 / 17 & 25 / 8 & 27 / 22 & 40 / 6\end{array}$ 40/11 42/4 45/11
coming [9] 4/22 6/23 12/20
21/2 24/7 40/23 43/21 49/12 54/16
command [1] 39/9
commenced [1] 4/18
commend [1] 26/20
comments [3] 27/7 27/14
27/15
commercial [1] 30/16
commit [1] 47/12
commitment [1] 51/6
committee [9] $10 / 5$ 10/6 $17 / 5$
25/14 55/12 55/14 55/15 55/20 56/4
committees [1] 50/24
communicate [5] 36/14 51/18 58/22 59/3 59/11
communicated [1] 36/8
communication [8] 36/13
39/23 43/1 $43 / 3$ 43/13 44/16 58/21 58/25
communications [1] 36/22
compared [2] 17/1 51/16
compatible [1] 40/14
complaint [11] 17/11 17/14
17/14 17/15 17/19 20/8 20/10



| E | few [9] 4/11 6/8 22/19 24/21 | frankly [1] 24/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| everyone... [4] 57/10 57/18 57/24 60/4 | 29/21 29/23 31/7 52/9 57/1 fewer [1] $24 / 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fraught [1] } 26 / 22 \\ & \text { free [1] } 4 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| everything [6] 3/11 22/1 | fights [1] 5/5 | fresh [2] 50/5 50/6 |
|  | figure [2] 14/20 45/11 | friend [1] 52/11 |
| exactly [6] 9/2 10/20 17/4 | figuring [1] 8/4 | front [4] 3/11 52/15 52/ |
| 25/20 25/21 55/1 | file [4] 13/2 18/ |  |
| example [4] $13 / 13$ 40/2 $40 / 4$ | $35 / 3$ filed [11] | fruits [1] 9/18 |
| 40/7 | $24 / 10 \quad 31 / 19 \quad 32 / 3 \quad 32 / 10 \quad 34 / 16$ | frustrated [1] frustrations |
| excellence [1] 8/19 | $34 / 18 \quad 34 / 19 \quad 37 / 16$ | Ft [1] $2 / 8$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { excellent [1] } & 22 / 17 & \\ \text { exit [5] 14/4 } & 16 / 25 & 22 / 14\end{array}$ | filing [4] 18/20 21/4 21/6 |  |
| exit [5] 14/4 $26 / 4 / 26 / 18$ | 49/5 [4] 18/20 21/4 21/6 | 33/25 47/19 |
| $26 / 4 \text { 26/18 }$ <br> exited [4] 15/23 22/3 24/20 | fill [2] 19/1 29/12 | fully [1] 33/20 |
| ```exited [4] 15/23 22/3 24/20``` | final [2] 15/13 17/8 | fun [1] 29/23 |
| exiting [7] 9/2 9/10 | finalize [1] 35/1 | funny [1] 3/22 |
| 23/19 25/6 25/21 26/11 | finalized [1] 34/10 | further [1] 27/ |
| expect [2] 9/16 32/2 | finalizing [1] 34/6 | future [4] 18/17 20/1 20 |
| expectations [2] 8/3 10/18 | Finally [2] 21/9 32/7 |  |
| expedited [1] 40/5 | finding [2] $8 / 25$ 52/ | G |
| expeditiously [1] 11/16 | fine [3] 16/24 28/10 58/7 | GA [2] 1/18 2/ |
| experience [5] 49/6 49/14 51/2 | firm [1] 50/21 | gave [4] 15/16 30/23 48/2 |
| experienced [2] | firm's [1] 51/14 | 57/4 |
| experiencing [1] 55/25 | firms [5] 21/14 48/24 50/8 | gee [1] |
| explain [1] 13/25 | 51/6 51/1 | gen [6] |
| expressed [1] 11/10 | rst [14] 6/22 8/22 | /21 58/11 60/1 |
| expressing [1] 8/1 | 2/2 14/2 15/25 22/24 24/21 | gener [1] 29 |
| extensions [2] 16/7 22/1 |  | general [3] <br> generally [1] |
| extent [3] 10/10 10/17 24/14 | fitting [2] 9/1 39/2 | generation [2] 29/22 54/7 |
| extra [1] 43/13 | five [4] 15/22 22/6 22/6 | generic [1] 13/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { eye [1] } & 51 / 5 \\ \text { eyes [2] } & 42 / 15 & 50 / 5\end{array}$ | $24 / 19$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { generic } \\ \text { Georgia [3] } & \text { [39/25 } & 30 / 6 & 30 / 8\end{array}$ |
| eyes [2] 42/15 50/5 | five-day [3] 15/22 22/6 | get [29] 7/19 7/19 10/11 |
| F | 24/19 | 10/21 11/3 11/15 11/16 11/20 |
| face [1] 3/24 | fix [2] 58/4 58/ | $15 / 8$ $15 / 22$ $16 / 5$ $21 / 7$ <br> $1 / 6$    |
| facilitate [2] $39 / 8 \quad 39 / 9$ | fixable [1] 28/6 | $\begin{array}{llllll}22 / 22 & 27 / 3 & 34 / 9 & 42 / 8 & 42 / 9\end{array}$ |
| fact [4] 7/25 28/6 33/8 | FL [2] 1/5 2/8 | 49/13 49/25 51/8 52/2 53/4 |
| 53/25 | FLORIDA [2] 1/1 56/18 | 56/7 56/20 57/15 57/15 58/2 |
| facts [1] | flown [1] 4/15 | 59/8 |
| failure [2] 23/23 33/22 | focus [1] 8/2 | get the [1] 56 |
| fair [4] 23/18 25/9 27/10 | focusing [1] 30/20 | gets [2] 5/14 21/1 |
| 57/18 | follow [2] 20/12 60/ | getting [10] |
| fairly [1] | followed [1] 33/7 | 16/2 20/3 41/23 43/7 44 |
| fairness [2] 23/8 26/14 | following [2] 5/12 30/14 | 48/25 49/10 58/12 |
| fall [1] 57/14 | foregoing [1] 60/8 | getting a [1] 49/1 |
| familiar [2] 12/8 55/19 | forget [1] 59/9 | gift [2] 35/13 35/22 |
| family [2] 30/3 52/11 | form [13] 15/10 17/11 17/14 | give [7] 12/1 25/2 26/2 |
| far [8] $3 / 16$ <br> 10/1 $44 / 4$ <br> $1 / 6$  | 17/19 20/8 20/10 20/11 20/20 | 43/4 55/13 57/21 58/16 |
| 44/7 48/14 49/2 51/5 | 20/25 21/5 21/6 27/22 27/24 | given [6] 12/16 15/4 35/18 |
| fashion [1] 39/19 | formally [1] 28/17 | 41/9 49/6 51/7 |
| fast [1] $44 / 5$ | formerly [1] 55/10 | gives [1] 50/5 |
| father [3] 30/2 | forms [11] 13/2 13/3 13/8 | giving [1] 24/18 |
| $\text { favor [1] } 25 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 3 & 14 / 11 & 14 / 17 & 15 / 15 & 15 / 15\end{array}$ | glancing [1] 46/1 |
| February [4] 1/5 4/9 | 17/2 17/12 27/5 | global [1] 30/19 |
| February [4] $60 / 11$ | Fort [1] 30/4 | go [15] $3 / 16$ 3/17 $7 / 8$ 8/7 |
| Federal [17] 28/16 28/18 | forth [2] 55/5 | $\begin{array}{lll} 18 / 13 & 18 / 15 & 20 / 1 \\ 42 / 2 & 43 / 9 & 44 / 17 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 21 & 29 / 4 & 31 / 5 & 32 / 15 & 36 / 22\end{array}$ | fortune [1] 54/9 | $\begin{aligned} & 42 / 2 \\ & 48 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 24 & 38 / 2 & 38 / 8 & 38 / 21 & 38 / 24 \\ 43 / 21 & 43 / 24 & 44 / 12 & 45 / 2 & 60 / 12\end{array}$ | forum [1] 26/6 | going [44] 3/6 4/17 5/2 5/21 |
| $\begin{array}{cccc}\text { 43/21 } & 43 / 24 & 44 / 12 & 45 / 2 \\ \text { Federal/State [1] } & 38 / 2\end{array}$ | forward [25] 4/21 6/11 7/6 | 6/21 6/23 8/1 8/23 10/17 |
| Federal/State [1] 38/2 feedback [1] 6/12 | 7/8 7/21 8/17 10/11 19/3 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}14 / 16 & 17 / 10 & 18 / 15 & 19 / 3 & 20 / 4\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { feedback [1] } & 6 / 12 \\ \text { feel [8] } & 3 / 15 & 10 / 15 & 29 / 10\end{array}$ | 19/22 20/4 21/5 27/21 28/23 | 22/13 23/12 24/10 24/20 |
| feel [8] 3/15 10/15 29/10 $49 / 16 \text { 49/18 58/20 58/21 59 }$ | 29/7 $31 / 17$ 35/4 $43 / 7$ 43/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}25 / 22 & 26 / 25 & 29 / 3 & 29 / 4 & 29 / 12\end{array}$ |
| 49/16 49/18 58/20 58/21 | 49/10 53/1 54/15 56/5 58/5 | 35/8 39/22 40/6 40/12 41/7 |
| $\text { feels [1] } 4 / 16$ | 58/10 59/25 | 43/9 43/11 $43 / 20$ 44/5 44/10 |
| feels [1] 4/16 | found [2] 38/13 57/1 | $\begin{array}{lllllllll} & 44 / 18 & 47 / 15 & 47 / 25 & 49 / 24 & 55 / 3\end{array}$ |
| felt [1] 48/13 | framing [1] 9/21 | 55/7 55/12 57/14 57/14 57/16 |


| G | $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 12 & 33 / 25 & 34 / 14 & 34 / 20\end{array}$ | Honors [2] 44/15 50/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| going... [1] 58/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 11 & 35 / 15 & 38 / 17 & 40 / 3 & 43 / 1\end{array}$ | hoops [1] 8/8 |
| gone [1] 35/11 | $43 / 24 \text { 46/8 46/24 48/22 49) }$ $49 / 3 \text { 49/6 51/5 51/10 53/6 }$ | hope [4] 58/20 |
| good [20] 3/1 4/6 10/15 | 53/9 55/8 57/20 | hopefully [2] 3/3 19/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 11 & 12 / 13 & 12 / 14 & 15 / 23 & 22 / 2\end{array}$ | hate [1] 33/4 | horizon [1] 4/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}26 / 12 & 27 / 18 & 27 / 20 & 29 / 15 & 36 / 1 \\ 41 / 3 & 47 / 18 & 47 / 23 & 48 / 6 & 50 / 18\end{array}$ | have [219] | hour [3] 55/3 56/2 58/15 |
| $54 / 9 \quad 56 / 9$ | haven't [3] 18/14 24/19 | hours [5] 21/19 43/16 51/25 |
| got [1] 10/4 | 47/13 | 53/1 53/14 |
| gotcha [2] 23/24 57/17 | having [10] 12/16 14/9 16/9 | Houston [3] |
| govern [1] 34/8 | /2 35/5 43/3 47/12 49/20 | how [22] 6/21 10/11 10/20 |
| governing [1] 35/1 | Hawkins [1] 31/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 21 / 3 & 25 / 15 & 26 / 2 & 26 / 25 & 43 / 16\end{array}$ |
| GPS [1] 30/7 | he [12] 3/19 3/20 3/21 12/18 | 43/16 $45 / 5$ 47/21 54/8 54/ |
| granted [1] 31/13 | $\begin{array}{ccccccl}18 / 1 & 30 / 23 & 32 / 23 & 33 / 6 & 33 / 11\end{array}$ | 55/13 55/16 55/19 57/8 |
| granting [1] $28 / 9$ | 38/17 39/2 56/2 | however [1] 38/8 |
| grateful [2] 48/11 56/1 great [12] 10/9 10/19 13 | head [2] 55/10 56/3 | huge [1] 43/7 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} t & {[12]} & 10 / 9 \\ 10 & 10 / 19 \end{array}$ | headed [1] 13/18 | hundreds [1] 59/9 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 33 / 10 & 36 / 21 & 48 / 22 & 49 / 3 \\ 49 / 16 & 53 / 17 & 57 / 4 & 59 / 23 \end{array}$ | health [1] 30/16 | hurdles [1] 26/22 |
| greater [3] 10/18 25/22 28/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { hear [6] } & 28 / 2 & 41 / 19 & 48 / 1\end{array}$ | hurt [1] 27/11 |
| Greely [1] 30/4 | 57/6 59/2 59/23 | husband [1] 30/17 |
| ground [3] 22/18 44/7 47/3 | $35 / 9$ | I |
| rounds [1] 33/21 | hearing [5] 28/23 29/7 31/23 | I actually [1] 3 |
| up [2] 51/8 | 32/5 34/20 | I'd [1] 28/2 |
| growing [1] 30/3 | hearings [1] 43/20 | I's [1] 46/7 |
| GSK [1] 32/15 | heels [1] 5/12 | I've [1] 50/7 |
| guess [5] 17/1 27/21 38/20 | height [1] 30/22 | idea [2] 25/2 41/3 |
| 42/5 50/4 | held [1] 32/22 | ideas [1] 41/10 |
| guest [1] 55/6 | help [6] 11/14 24/17 24/24 | identified [1] 13/3 |
| guidance [3] 6/3 40/20 53/4 | 27/11 38/24 56/20 | identifying [1] 40 |
| H | 43/13 $43 / 2546 / 2447 / 5$ 55/22 | 31/13 48/21 55/10 |
| had [37] 3/9 3/12 3/19 3/20 | 56/24 57/1 | Illinois granted [1] |
| 3/23 6/13 6/14 6/14 7/14 | helping [1] 40/ | imagine [3] 17/22 46/25 54/7 |
|  | helps [2] 5/16 5/17 | imminent [1] 40 |
| 15/7 15/10 $16 / 4$ 17/13 18/6 | her [12] 6/22 7/15 8/1 8/15 | impact [2] 13/21 13 |
| 21/12 21/24 22/19 28/19 31/9 | $23 / 21 \text { 28/20 54/12 }$ | impacts [2] 5/7 5/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 7 & 33 / 6 & 33 / 8 & 33 / 11 & 33 / 12\end{array}$ | herculean [1] 16/16 | importance [1] 44 |
| 35/8 35/23 47/13 50/25 54/1 | here [13] 3/4 4/12 $7 / 20$ 11/6 | important [14] 5/14 10/2 |
|  | 16/12 17/24 29/17 42/15 | 14/8 25/10 25/18 28/24 29/6 |
|  | 42/15 50/22 52/15 57/17 | 38/1 39/25 47/1 52/1 53/3 |
| ilton [8] | 58/16 | 58/22 59/14 |
| 7 7 /25 | herself [1] 29/13 | impressive [1] 51/8 |
| and [1] 57/22 | hiccups [3] 3/12 26/24 58/7 | in non-MDL [1] 5/10 |
|  | high [3] 30/8 38/18 57/23 | in on [1] 48/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lr} \text { rdful }[1] & 2 \\ \text { adle }[1] & 21 \end{array}$ | higher [1] 38/23 | in-chambers [6] 6/12 6/1 |
| handled [2] 3/25 2 | highlight [1] 35/14 | 6/17 6/24 56/25 57/10 |
| hands [1] 47/19 | highlighted [1] 7/14 | inadvertently [1] 3/1 |
| hang [2] 7/21 57/23 | highlights [1] 49/2 | inaudible [2] 12/17 41/18 |
| happen [2] 57/19 57/25 | highly [1] 49/17 | inception [2] 27/4 54/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { happening [6] } 9 / 4 \text { 28/25 29/1 } \\ & 38 / 544 / 647 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccc} \text { him [8] } & 32 / 24 & 33 / 1 & 33 / 6 & 33 / 7 \\ 33 / 9 & 33 / 13 & 33 / 15 & 35 / 20 & \end{array}$ | includes [1] $36 / 6$  <br> including [2] $30 / 4$ $32 / 20$ |
| happens [2] 57/13 58/4 | hip [1] 51/3 | incredible [1] 21/21 |
| hard [7] 5/22 6/20 11/2 | his [5] 12/16 30/18 $30 / 24$ | indicated [1] 6/14 |
| 21/22 38/23 51/8 53/2 | 56/2 56/3 | indirectly [1] 17/23 |
| hard-working [1] 51/8 | hit [2] 11/13 14/14 | individual [2] 52/1 52/19 |
| harder [2] 21/22 21/23 | HON [1] 2/8 | inefficient [1] 20/23 |
| hardly [1] 54/7 | honor [35] 12/13 $12 / 15$ 12/22 | inform [1] 57/4 |
| HARRIS [7] 2/1 28/20 29/12 | 12/24 13/10 14/4 14/22 15/3 | information [5] 13/5 13/7 |
| 29/16 36/7 47/15 50/23 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}15 / 16 & 18 / 1 & 18 / 9 & 19 / 24 & 22 / 16\end{array}$ | 16/23 51/21 52/12 |
| has [48] 4/10 4/15 4/16 $4 / 17$ | /18 $28 / 12$ 29/8 $29 / 15$ 35/4 | informative [1] 57/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} \\ 4 / 24 & 5 / 19 & 7 / 1 & 7 / 9 & 7 / 17 & 7 / 18\end{array}$ | 35/24 39/12 41/6 41/15 42/11 | informed [4] 6/2 29/1 44 |
| 9/7 9/13 9/15 10/1 10/9 11/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll}1 & 43 / 14 & 44 / 21 & 45 / 13 & 45 / 23\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 6 & 13 / 24 & 18 / 1 & 19 / 12 & 21 / 21 \\ 22 / 10 & 23 / 7 & 24 / 4 & 25 / 13 & 30 / 24\end{array}$ | $53 / 753 / 18$ | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { informs [1] } \\ \text { Ingelheim [1] } & \text { 29/17 }\end{array}$ |
| 22/10 23/7 24/4 25/13 30/24 | HONORABLE [2] 1/9 1/10 | initial [1] 27/5 |


| I | Jim [1] 36/12 | known [1] 36/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| initially [3] 3/7 45/19 | job [3] 16/2 40/9 40/1 | knows [5] 7/17 13/22 $14 / 6$ |
| 45/23 | Joe [4] 12/23 18/4 |  |
| injuries [4] 13/23 14/9 | join [5] 32/4 44/3 47/21 | L |
| 14/12 14/18 | 55/755/12 | labor [2] 9/18 30/17 |
| $\begin{array}{\|cccc} \text { injury } & \text { [5] } 9 / 4 & 17 / 13 & 17 / 15 \\ 19 / 14 & 52 / 3 \end{array}$ |  | laid [1] 10/19 |
| inner [1] 59/4 | joining [1] 55/ | language [2] 45/23 45/25 <br> large [7] 5/18 16/20 16/21 |
| input [1] 7/24 | joint [1] 43/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 21 / 12 & 21 / 15 & 38 / 14 & 53 / 12\end{array}$ |
| insight [1] $49 / 7$ <br> insofar [1] $23 / 16$ | jointly [1] 43/23 | largely [1] 51/4 |
| insofar [1] 19/7 | JOSEPH [1] 1/20 | larger [1] 6/9 |
| integral [2] 50/3 54/1 | $\begin{array}{clllll} \text { judge } & {[49]} & 1 / 10 & 1 / 11 & 3 / 18 \\ 3 / 25 & 4 / 8 & 4 / 12 & 5 / 5 & 6 / 1 & 7 / 20 \end{array}$ | ```largest [1] 14/2 last [21] 3/17 6/13 6/16``` |
| intend [2] 13/23 14/10 | $8 / 2 \text { 8/24 12/14 } 18 / 5 \text { 27/16 }$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cccc} \text { last }[\mathbf{2 1 ]} & 3 / 17 & 6 / 13 & 6 / 16 \\ 6 / 23 & 7 / 14 & 9 / 13 & 13 / 20 \\ 13 / 20 \end{array}\right.$ |
|  | 27/16 $28 / 14$ 31/21 $32 / 6 \quad 32 / 18$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 18 & 28 / 16 & 30 / 22 & 31 / 7 & 31 / 12\end{array}$ |
| intent [2] 23/22 47 <br> interact [2] 49/11 | $32 / 22$ 32/24 33/19 33/25 34/3 | 32/22 $33 / 18 \quad 34 / 25 \quad 35 / 12$ |
| interact [2] ${ }_{\text {interest [1] }}$ | 34/16 35/8 35/25 37/14 38/12 | 49/25 51/25 52/9 54/4 |
| interested [1] 49/15 | 38/16 38/21 38/21 38/22 39/3 | late [1] 50/4 |
| interesting [3] 4/7 25/24 | 39/4 43/4 $44 / 1147 / 16$ 54/17 | later [2] 9/21 15/9 |
| 26/3 | 55/4 55/9 56/1 56/12 56/14 | law [5] 21/14 30/12 30/14 |
| Interestingly [1] 30/5 | 57/5 57/8 57/17 58/10 58/13 | 50/21 51/ |
| interrogatories [1] 34/24 | judges [13] 10/25 29/2 $36 / 1$ | laws [1] 40/2 |
| interrupt [3] 33/3 33/4 39/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 23 & 38 / 6 & 38 / 23 & 38 / 25 & 43 / 4\end{array}$ | lawyer [1] 3/23 |
| intervention [2] 29/11 53/5 | 55/19 | lawyers [12] 11/1 29/20 |
| interviewed [1] 10/4 | judicial [5] 25/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 36 / 11 & 36 / 11 & 37 / 5 & 38 / 14 & 39 / 20 \\ 54 / 20 & 54 / 22 & 58 / 11 & 59 / 10 \end{array}$ |
| introduce [1] 29/13 | 37/11 55/12 57/21 | 59/15 |
| intrude [2] 39/8 58/17 | jump [1] 48/17 | LDC [6] 48/23 50/23 54/18 |
| inventory [1] 10/2 | jumped [1] 15/18 | 54/20 58/11 60/1 |
| invest [1] $52 / 1$ | juncture [1] 4/25 | lead [2] 31/3 45/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { invite [2] } & 44 / 3 & 54 / 24 \\ \text { invited [1] } & 54 / 25\end{array}$ | junior [1] 48/12 | leaders [4] 59/7 59/8 59/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llrl}\text { invited [1] } & 54 / 25 \\ \text { involved [8] } & 10 / 6 & 41 / 23\end{array}$ | jurisdictional [1] 31/3 | 59/19 |
| involved [8] <br> $45 / 18$ <br> $8 / 20 / 6$ <br> $50 / 25$ 41/23 $51 / 3 \quad 51 / 22$ | jurisdictions [2] 29/13 40/2 | leadership [6] 4/13 10/3 |
| 45/18 48/20 50/25 51/3 51/22 54/2 | just [59] 3/12 4/15 4/17 | 13/22 14/9 50/9 51/6 |
| jnvolvement | 5/14 5/20 9/12 9/22 12/4 | leading [1] |
| involves [1] 5 | 14/7 14/25 15/4 16/16 18/25 | leads [6] 40/22 41/4 41/9 |
| iPad [1] 42/15 | 20/9 20/23 20/25 21/14 22/3 | 54/24 58/25 59/4 |
| is [246] | 22/19 22/22 23/5 23/17 24/5 | learn [2] 50/13 55/21 |
| isn't [2] 26/9 27/1 | 25/9 26/13 26/14 26/20 27/1 | learned [1] 54 |
| issue [11] 5/7 20/8 20/11 | 27/3 27/21 29/9 31/6 33/3 | learning [1] 47/3 |
| 25/12 25/13 26/9 40/9 41/12 | $33 / 436 / 7$ 37/14 $37 / 17$ 38/10 | least [8] 18/15 24 |
| 46/11 46/11 46/12 | 39/9 39/17 $40 / 13$ 41/7 41/25 | 26/10 $28 / 17$ 39/1 44/19 47/2 |
| issued [2] 4/24 7/1 | 42/7 $42 / 2244 / 14$ 45/20 $46 / 4$ | leave [3] 26/1 31/2 32/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { issues [26] } & / 11 & 15 / 4 & 16 / 8\end{array}$ | 46/16 $46 / 20 \quad 47 / 2$ 48/10 $50 / 4$ | leaves [1] 32/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 8 & 20 / 24 & 21 / 24 & 21 / 25 & 28 / 21\end{array}$ | 50/11 50/22 52/9 53/3 56/23 | legislation [1] 48/9 |
| 31/5 $36 / 21 \quad 39 / 4 \quad 39 / 6 \quad 39 / 15$ |  | legitimate [1] 15/6 |
| 40/12 41/22 $42 / 4 \quad 45 / 1 \quad 45 / 1$ | justice [2] 52/15 52/17 | lenient [1] 16/ |
| 45/8 45/9 45/11 47/11 51/14 | K | 3] 4/21 10/14 11/13 |
| 52/23 53/2 55/24 | Kaye [1] 1/23 | 48/3 56/6 56/21 57/25 58/7 |
|  | keep [11] 3/9 6/10 7/9 7/16 | let's [3] 4/22 47/20 58/7 |
| it's [9] $15 / 20$ 20/4 | 10/17 26/16 26/24 29/1 47/2 | level [1] 47/3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15 / 20 \text { 20/4 } 30 / 1 \text { 46/12 } 56 / 18 \\ & 57 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | 59/17 59/21 | Lexitas [1] 19/12 |
| Italy [1] 29/25 | keeping [4] 7/6 31/1 44/15 | liability [3] $1 / 5$ 30/21 |
| items [3] 18/11 21/3 22/11 | kept [1] 38/3 | liaison [1] 36/2 |
| its [3] 23/8 23/8 23/8 | Kherkher [2] 1/13 18/8 | life [2] 30/24 35/12 |
| itself [1] 43/7 | kick [1] 29/9 | like [29] $4 / 16$ 13/1 |
| J | kilter [1] 56/19 | 31/6 34/25 39/4 40/18 41/16 |
| jail [1] 3/10 | kind [8] 4/6 12/25 16/16 <br> 27/7 44/11 44/12 44/14 58/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 2 & 42 / 9 & 43 / 11 & 44 / 9 & 45 / 6 \\ 45 / 21 & 47 / 9 & 48 / 4 & 49 / 18 & 50 / 10\end{array}$ |
| Jaime [1] 6/18 | King [3] 2/1 29/16 30/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 45 / 21 & 47 / 9 & 48 / 4 & 49 / 18 & 50 / 10 \\ 52 / 3 & 52 / 16 & 52 / 21 & 53 / 11 & 53 / 15 \end{array}$ |
| January [2] 9/14 $31 / 12$ | knew [2] 52/11 52/12 | 53/21 55/13 56/18 57/13 |
| January 19th [1] 31/12 | knocks [2] 56/18 56/19 | 59/19 59/20 |
| January 21st [1] 9/14 JCCP [2] li/20 | know [65] | likely [1] 28/1 |
| Jerry [1] 34/17 | knowing <br> [4] 29/2 $38 / 11$ 38/11 38/21 | Limitations [1] 23/17 <br> limits [1] 43/16 |


| L | making [2] 25/16 37/7 | [3] 5/20 26/11 42/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lincoln [1] 30/23 | man [1] 21/19 <br> management [10] 4/23 7/23 | ntime [1] 34/6 hanisms [1] 46/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { line [5] } 12 / 21 \text { 43/1 } 43 / 3 \\ & 43 / 1344 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{rlllll}\text { management } \\ 9 / 13 & 23 / 1 & 31 / 4 & 31 / 17 & 32 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { medical [4] } & 14 / 17 & \text { 19/15 }\end{array}$ |
| lines [1] 36/13 | 544 | 21 51/ |
| lining [1] 53/23 | mandatory [1] 40/20 | medical device [1] |
| linings [2] 35/14 35/17 | manner [1] 37/21 | meet [10] 5/9 6/15 6/15 6/21 |
| list [2] 22/24 22/24 | Manual [1] 39/13 | 8/9 27/25 28/17 31/16 34/9 |
| listed [1] 22/22 | many [15] 4/15 4/15 5/19 | 35/15 |
| litigant [2] 3/17 3/19 | 10/19 $24 / 12$ 35/14 $35 / 20$ | meeting [2] 6/13 6/24 |
| litigants [5] 23/11 36/23 | 43/16 $43 / 17$ 48/25 49/12 | meetings [1] 56/4 |
| 39/18 39/20 53/7 | 49/17 52/6 55/18 58/25 | member [1] 52/11 |
| litigate [1] 23/10 | map [1] 13/12 | members [3] 48/23 51/17 |
| litigated [2] 36/16 36/18 | mapping [1] | 58 |
| litigating [2] 25/23 37/24 | March [4] 31/24 32/5 33/25 | memorialize [1] 60/2 |
| litigation [36] $1 / 5$ 13/2 | 37/12 | Memphis [1] 36/8 |
| 13/24 14/10 16/22 18/17 22/5 | M | mention [1] 35/8 |
| 23/10 26/5 26/10 29/21 30/16 | mark [2] 4/20 9/ | mentioned [6] 9/15 |
| 30/21 33/12 36/10 37/2 37/10 | market [1] 5/20 | 15/13 32/24 37/14 55 |
| 39/14 $43 / 8 \quad 43 / 2144 / 2 \quad 45 / 6$ | married [1] 5 | mentioning [1] |
| 48/8 $48 / 18$ 49/7 $51 / 1$ 51/2 | mass [2] 15/4 51/16 | mentorship [1] 48/12 |
| 51/3 51/4 51/11 52/5 52/8 | massive [1] 59/16 | merits [3] 24/4 24/5 |
| 52/12 52/20 58/8 59/16 | master [24] 4/14 6/18 8/2 | met [3] 13/20 13/20 28/19 |
| litigations [4] 17/6 43/9 | 8/15 11/7 $14 / 1314 / 2315 / 1$ | mic [1] 47/25 |
| 43/18 43/19 | 16/7 16/14 17/13 19/5 20/2 | MICHAEL [1] 1/16 |
| little [9] 12/20 20/5 29/23 | 0/12 20/15 20/18 20/22 | microphone [1] 18 |
| 35/19 36/25 42/8 50/4 50/6 | 51/11 54/11 55/1 | middle [2] 16/5 16/10 |
| 58/12 | 57/6 | might [4] 10/18 26/3 41/1 |
| live [1] 52/5 | ['s [1] |  |
| lived [1] 30/3 | match [1] | mike [2] 29/6 45 |
| living [1] 55/25 | matched [3] 13/7 13/15 30/17 | miles [1] 30/1 |
| LLP [2] 1/23 2/1 | matches [1] 8/18 | military [1] 30/3 |
| LMI [4] 13/6 15/8 $16 / 2$ 21/13 | matching [1] 9/20 | mind [2] 14/7 20/9 |
| loke [1] 6/6 | maternity [1] 31/2 | mindful [1] 38/1 |
| long [6] 5/20 21/18 41/8 | matter [3] 16/11 28/15 60/9 | mini [1] 44/12 |
| 45/19 45/21 45/22 | matters [5] 3/10 7/16 32/20 | minimum [1] 59/3 |
| longer [1] 25/7 | 36/3 41/5 | miss [1] 57/1 |
| look [11] 4/21 6/20 25/15 | MATTHEWS [8] $2 / 4 \quad 2 / 4 \quad 28 / 18$ | missed [1] |
| 27/3 27/21 28/23 29/7 35/4 | 36/1 39/6 39/12 41/16 42/2 mature [1] 12/25 | $\begin{array}{ll} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \text { mistake [1] } & 58 / 4 \\ \text { mistakes [2] } & 57 / 19 \end{array}\right. \end{array}$ |
| 56/5 58/10 59/24 | may [23] $3 / 16$ 18/5 $18 / 6$ 18/7 | model [1] 59/20 |
| looked [1] 21/1 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}18 / 14 & 18 / 18 & 20 / 13 & 20 / 17 & 21 / 2\end{array}$ | modest [1] 51/16 |
| looking [6] 26/7 33/5 33/15 49/10 54/15 57/23 | $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 14 \\ 23 / 20 & 27 / 23 & 30 / 22 & 40 / 4 \\ 41 / 6\end{array}$ | moment [4] 9/22 $14 / 1714 / 19$ |
| 49/10 54/15 57/23 <br> ost [2] 57/15 59/8 | 41/20 42/5 42/18 $44 / 21$ 44/23 | 48/15 |
|  | 45/9 50/6 58/2 58/24 | Monday [2] 15/25 16/3 |
| $6 / 25 \quad 9 / 24 \quad 10 / 9 \quad 21 / 19$ 21 | maybe [10] 4/16 5/23 7/6 | month [6] 30/23 31/12 32/23 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 22 / 18 & 35 / 16 & 38 / 17 & 46 / 21 & 52 / 4\end{array}$ | 10/10 10/17 40/25 50/5 53/23 | 33/18 35/13 44/10 |
| 53/12 55/24 56/4 57/4 | 54/4 55/5 | monthly [2] 6/15 6/15 |
| lots [1] 49/13 | McGLAMRY [10] 1/16 1/16 1/17 | months [5] 9/25 10/22 25/7 |
| loves [1] 30/ | 45/13 46/23 47/21 50/17 | 35/12 52/9 |
| loyalty [1] 19/9 | 50/19 50/22 53/13 | more [21] 3/22 5/6 10/18 |
| luck [1] 47/18 | md [1] 1/3 | 13/11 16/22 28/2 29/19 33/16 |
| lunch [6] | MDL [26] 4/8 4/20 4/25 5/4 | 35/19 38/7 $44 / 13$ 44/18 $47 / 14$ |
| $\begin{array}{rl} \text { runcn } & \text { lod } \\ 55 / 2 & 55 / 6 \end{array}$ | 5/10 6/21 16/20 17/5 25/14 | 48/12 49/8 49/11 49/13 52/10 |
| M | 43/2 43/3 43/10 44/4 |  |
|  |  |  |
| ma'am [1] 54/3 | $\begin{array}{llllll}44 / 12 & 44 / 12 & 45 / 3 & 47 / 5 & 51 / 5\end{array}$ | most [7] 12/17 $14 / 8$ 30/24 |
| made [4] 13/9 15/12 20/22 | 55/10 55/23 | 32/7 38/1 45/17 50/13 |
| 48/16 | MDLs [5] 25/15 36/19 36/19 | motion [5] 5/10 8/5 31/13 |
| MAGISTRATE [1] 1/11 | $\begin{array}{\|rrrrr} 37 / 25 & 37 / 25 & & \\ \text { me [24] } & 4 / 9 & 6 / 24 & 7 / 17 & 8 / 24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 32 / 3 & 32 / 6 \\ \text { motions [19] } & 5 / 11 & 5 / 12 & 5 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| main [1] 36/16 | $\begin{array}{cclll}\text { me } \\ 12 / 21 & 18 / 10 & 23 / 7 & 25 / 9 & 25 / 10\end{array}$ | 6/6 6/6 6/7 6/8 20/19 21/1 |
| make [14] 3/11 8/7 8/16 | 28/11 31/1 35/4 35/5 39/24 | 24/6 28/9 32/21 33/19 34/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}11 / 23 & 12 / 8 & 20 / 20 & 22 / 20 \\ 24 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 41 / 19 & 46 / 20 & 47 / 2 & 47 / 10 & 48 / 17\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 34 / 2 & 34 / 18 & 34 / 20 & 37 / 2 & 49 / 5\end{array}$ |
| 27/8 27/14 40/14 52/20 53/2 | 48/22 49/6 51/5 56/6 57/4 | move [6] $7 / 9$ 7/21 $43 / 8$ 47/14 |
| makes [4] $42 / 13$ 43/23 $48 / 1$ 51/25 | mean [3] 21/22 24/3 53/25 meaning [2] 5/24 13/5 | $\begin{array}{llll} 53 / 1 & 58 / 5 \\ \text { moved }[2] & 30 / 18 & 33 / 20 \end{array}$ |



| 0 | Ey [2] 32/13 50/ | ad [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| other... [19] 17/18 20/24 | pass [2] $4 / 5$ 14/1 | pleadings [2] 32/20 57/15 |
| 21/25 23/9 37/13 38/11 39/1 | passed [1] 52/10 | please [2] |
| $\begin{array}{lll}46 / 21 & 48 / 23 ~ 50 / 25 ~ 51 / 16 ~\end{array}$ | past [3] 7/1 9/18 48/10 | pleased [3] 26/25 27/15 50/2 |
| 51/21 51/22 54/22 57/22 58/6 | patient [1] 3/25 <br> Pauline [3] 2/7 12/7 60 | pleasure [5] |
| 58/9 58/18 59/10 | pause <br> [1] $14 / 14$ | PLLC [1] 1/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { others } & {[10]} & 14 / 7 & 17 / 5 & 24 / 7\end{array}$ | paused [1] 14/25 | plowing [1] 26/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}25 / 12 & 41 / 1 & 41 / 14 & 46 / 10 & 58 / 25 \\ 59 / 20 & 59 / 24 & \end{array}$ | Peachtree [2] 1/17 2/2 | plus [6] 13/2 15/15 17/12 |
| our [33] 5/4 6/17 9/13 11 | penalized [1] 15/9 | 21/10 $27 / 5$ 34/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 11/9 } & 11 / 11 & 11 / 16 & 12 / 7 & 19 / 24\end{array}$ | pending [4] 36/5 36/12 37/3 | point [13] 4/25 9/2 9/8 |
| 20/9 20/18 $21 / 15$ 28/9 29/19 | 37/9 | 13/23 16/13 18/20 $24 / 11$ 26/3 |
| 29/21 $31 / 7$ 41/16 $42 / 9 \quad 44 / 14$ | people [17] 3/22 14/11 1 | 29/10 41/20 41/25 42/7 45/23 |
| 45/4 47/20 49/5 51/4 51/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 8 & 18 / 14 & 18 / 23 & 23 / 9 & 23 / 15\end{array}$ | pointed [1] 43/14 |
| 51/23 52/4 52/10 52/16 52/23 | /2 43/17 46/12 50/13 52/16 | points [2] 22/19 23/6 |
| 56/19 59/7 59/25 60/1 | 55/18 57/14 57/22 57/23 | pop [1] 3/ |
| ourselves [4] 3/9 11/21 42/2 | people are [1] 57/22 | pe [2] 1/17 |
| 58/16 | perceive [2] 40/9 40/1 | Porter [1] 1/ |
| out [38] $4 / 7$ 5/25 6/23 8/4 | perceived [1] 58/20 | positive [1] |
| 11/14 11/14 11/16 12/20 | percent [2] 21/11 23/2 | possible [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 20 & 15 / 25 & 16 / 2 & 16 / 3 & 16 / 11\end{array}$ | perfect [1] 12/8 | possibly [1] 46/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll}16 / 25 & 19 / 1 & 21 / 24 & 23 / 25 & 32 / 24\end{array}$ | perhaps [2] 14/6 21/10 | potential [2] 17/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 1 & 33 / 15 & 33 / 17 & 35 / 8 & 36 / 4\end{array}$ | period [4] 15/20 25/5 25/8 | potentially [1] 13/8 |
| 36/7 37/19 38/5 40/15 41/4 | 26/19 | power [2] |
| 41/24 $42 / 6$ 43/14 $45 / 11 \quad 50 / 7$ |  | practicality [1] 23/8 |
| 55/1 56/8 56/18 58/25 59/17 | permission [1] <br> person [1] $47 / 10$ | practiced [1] 30/16 |
| outage [1] 12/17 | personal [2] 17/13 17/15 | practicing [2] 50/21 59/14 |
| output [1] 8/15 | perspective [3] 18/1 42/23 | precise [1] 22/21 |
| outset [1] 8/12 outsider [1] 23 | 50/6 | predominant [1] 25/13 |
| over [22] 10/22 11/1 11/25 | petition [3] 31/19 31/23 | predominantly [1] 36/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 21 & 16 / 1 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 21 & 18 / 13\end{array}$ | 32/4 | preemption [1] 33/21 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 21 / 8 & 29 / 12 & 30 / 3 & 34 / 13 & 35 / 12\end{array}$ | PETROSINELLI [12] 1/20 12/11 | prejudice [1] 58/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 18 & 37 / 8 & 37 / 16 & 42 / 15 & 42 / 15\end{array}$ | 12/21 12/23 18/19 19/21 20/2 | prejudiced [1] 57/20 |
| 42/20 43/24 48/2 51/9 | 20/9 20/15 21/20 25/11 48/15 | preliminary [1] |
| overall [1] 37/1 | PFC [1] 51/13 | premature [6] 20/5 20/10 |
| overseeing [1] 31/4 | Pfizer [5] 32/12 $34 / 14$ 48/7 | 20/13 20/17 41/21 42/8 |
| oversight [1] 7/12 | 48/24 | prepared [3] 4/11 42/1 46/14 |
| own [3] 45/1 51/15 52/24 | s | preparing [1] 49/8 |
| P | pharmacovigilance [2] 49/9 | present [3] |
|  | 50/1 | presentation [14] 12/18 |
| page [1] 46/17 | phase [3] 8/22 9/17 9/23 | 22/17 27/13 27/15 28/23 33/4 |
| pages [2] 46/20 46/22 | phone [2] 14/7 30/7 | 35/7 35/10 35/23 50/2 50/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { PALM [3] } & 1 / 2 & 1 / 5 & 2 / 8\end{array}$ | piece [1] 16/18 | 53/24 54/14 55/13 |
| pandemic [1] 30/22 | Pierce [1] 2/8 | presentations [2] 56/10 |
| paramount [1] 44/13 | Pierce/West [1] 2/8 | 12 |
| parents [2] 30/5 35/20 | piggyback [1] 57/8 | presented [1] 38/16 |
| part [12] 3/8 5/3 7/11 11/17 | pillars [1] 6/3 | presenting [3] 12/5 14/5 |
| 15/2 16/24 17/4 38/14 39/1 | pivotal [2] 4/25 4/25 | 29/17 |
| 49/3 55/6 55/20 | place [8] 5/3 19/17 22/11 | preserve [1] 24/9 |
| participants [5] 3/4 9/10 | 24/12 26/15 43/15 45/16 46/5 | preside [2] 11/1 43/23 |
| 39/11 47/21 59/1 | Plaintiff [3] 22/4 24/10 | presumably [1] 4/3 |
| participate [2] | 25/17 | presume [1] 35/19 |
| participated [1] 56/25 | PLAINTIFFS [20] 1/13 14/11 | pretend [1] 42/5 |
| participating [1] 19/23 | 15/5 17/12 17/21 18/9 18/13 | pretrial [3] 32/19 34/1 |
| particular [2] 48/19 57/11 | 19/5 19/13 19/16 21/10 22/3 | 38/15 |
| particularly [5] 6/20 26/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 12 & 23 / 12 & 23 / 14 & 28 / 19\end{array}$ | pretty [2] 52/13 58/15 |
| 31/8 49/14 55/22 | 31/18 34/10 50/19 52/20 | primarily [1] 51/3 |
| parties [17] 5/19 7/10 7/10 | Plaintiffs' [15] 13/22 14/9 | prior [2] 43/19 51/2 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Pa/23 } & 24 / 9 & 24 / 23 ~ 25 / 22 ~ & 26 / 20\end{array}$ | 18/16 19/11 21/19 $31 / 13$ | priority [2] 39/17 40/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 27 / 10 & 28 / 24 & 31 / 16 & 34 / 6 & 34 / 22\end{array}$ | 33/21 $33 / 22$ 34/23 $36 / 5 \quad 37 / 5$ | privilege [2] 34/7 35/2 |
| 34/25 43/2 46/13 53/2 | 39/24 49/11 50/23 52/22 | probably [5] 4/16 16/25 20/6 |
| parties' [2] 5/9 5/17 | planned [1] 9/5 | 20/19 35/19 |
| partner [2] 53/25 54/20 | plans [2] 8/17 34/3 | problem [4] 28/6 28/7 45/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { partnership [1] } & 11 / 22 \\ \text { parts [1] } & 43 / 6 & \end{array}$ | played [1] 30/8 | problems [5] 12/16 40/15 |



| R | 59 | uations [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| resulted [1] 14/5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seeing [5] } 27 / 22 \text { 44/9 } 49 / 10 \\ & 55 / 25 \text { 56/5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { six [3] } 25 / 6 \text { 31/11 } 34 / 1 \\ & \text { size [1] } 17 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| retail [1] 19/10 | seek [1] 58/6 | skilled [1] 49/17 |
| retailers [1] <br> return [1] 31/2 | seem [5] 23/20 24/23 26/24 | skills [1] 7/1 |
| review [1] 10/7 | 28/4 45/21 | sleeting [ |
| Richmond [1] 1/14 |  | ll [5] 16/25 20/23 30 |
| Rico [1] 48/21 | $44 / 1 \quad 44 / 7 \quad 52 / 25$ | smaller [2] 5/4 27 |
| right [16] 5/3 7/5 11/2 | selected [1] 10/4 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { smile [2] } & 3 / 24 & 30 / 25\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 20 & 14 / 14 & 14 / 17 & 16 / 17 & 17 / 7 \\ 20 / 5 & 44 / 4 & 44 / 14 & 48 / 2 & 49 / 25\end{array}$ | senior [2] 29/16 54/23 | Smith [2] 31/21 32/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}20 / 5 & 44 / 4 & 44 / 14 & 48 / 2 & 49 / 25 \\ 52 / 7 & 53 / 18 & 55 / 24\end{array}$ | senior [6] sense [6] | smooth [1] 22/2 |
| rights [2] 23/16 24/9 | 43/23 51/25 52/20 | smoothly [4] 3/ |
| road [6] 1/17 11/13 24/11 | sent [1] 56/7 | 21/16 43/10 |
| 30/6 32/3 44/17 | separate [1] 25/ | [147] |
| Robert [1] 55/9 | September $[2]$ $48 / 11$ $50 / 5$ <br> serve [3] $6 / 3$ $10 / 5$ $18 / 21$ | so-called [1] $15 / 22$ <br> sociology [1] $30 / 11$ |
| ROBIN [2] 1/9 2/8 <br> role [9] 8/1 36/4 50/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { served [7] } & 20 / 25 & 30 / 2 & 31 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { some [32] } & 3 / 3 & 3 / 12 & 3 / 16 & 3 / 19\end{array}$ |
| 50/10 53/8 53/12 54/1 55/14 | $34 / 10$ 34/14 34/23 57/15 | 9/10 10/10 10/17 15/4 15/5 |
| rolling [1] 15/20 | served as [1] 31/3 | 15/8 17/18 18/13 19/24 |
| Rome [1] 29/25 | serving [1] 28/18 | 20/22 22/3 24/11 26/17 28/9 |
| ROSENBERG [10] $1 / 3$ 1/9 $2 / 8$ | set [14] 6/21 6/25 7/23 8/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 9 & 35 / 17 & 36 / 3 & 37 / 2 & 37 / 3\end{array}$ |
| 32/24 36/1 56/15 57/5 57/9 | 8/9 8/9 8/10 11/24 15/25 | 37/15 41/23 42/17 43/9 44/25 |
| 57/17 58/10 | 19/10 23/23 34/2 34/20 37/11 | 45/9 54/12 58 |
| round [3] 20/19 24/6 28/5 | setbacks [1] 35/ | somebody [1] 3/5 |
| rule [1] 25/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { setting [3] } & 3 / 20 & 27 / 4 & 39 / 24 \\ \text { settings [2] } & 40 / 3 \quad 40 / 5\end{array}$ | someone [3] 15/6 48/9 57/20 something [20] 3/15 7/4 38/7 |
| rules [10] 17/5 25/14 25/15 | seven [2] 46/17 51/17 | $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { 40/6 } & 40 / 18 & 40 / 25 & 41 / 11 & 41 / 13\end{array}$ |
| 55/11 55/12 55/13 55/15 55/19 55/23 56/3 | several [2] 7/1 16/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}42 / 19 & 42 / 20 ~ 42 / 25 ~ 44 / 2 ~ & 46 / 5\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}55 / 19 & 55 / 23 & 56 / 3 \\ \text { rulings [3] } & 6 / 4 & 6 / 5 & 11 / 16\end{array}$ | shall [1] 47/14 | 46/7 47/12 $47 / 12$ 48/13 49/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { rulings [3] } & 6 / 4 & 6 / 5 & 11 / 16\end{array}$ | shared [1] 23/22 | 54/17 57/9 |
| run [1] 18/22 | sharing [2] 19/16 29/2 | sometime [1] |
| running [2] 21/16 46/12 | she [16] $7 / 15$ 7/17 $7 / 17$ 7/17 | sometimes [3] 43/2 43/20 |
| S | 8/1 11/6 11/9 12/9 15/18 | 44/1 |
| Sackett [1] 2/5 | $\begin{array}{lll} 15 / 18 & 21 / 22 & 21 / 25 \\ 29 / 14 & 39 / 2 & 51 / 11 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lll} \text { son [1] } 30 / 23 \\ \text { soon [2] } & 3 / 3 & 35 / 3 \end{array}$ |
| said [13] 11/19 11/19 13/13 | Shelby [5] 32/9 34/13 34/21 | $\text { sorry [3] } 18 / 6 \text { 41/7 } 41 / 19$ |
| 18/10 19/21 21/20 33/6 38/17 | Shelby [5] 32/9 $34 / 13$ 34/21 $34 / 22 \quad 34 / 24$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { sorry [3] } & 18 / 6 & 41 / 7 & 41 / 19 \\ \text { sort [12] } & 3 / 19 & 4 / 19 & 14 / 14 \end{array}$ |
| 45/6 46/20 50/7 57/17 58/10 | shine [1] 50/14 | $14 / 25$ $15 / 20$ $17 / 9$ $17 / 23$ <br> $15 / 14$    |
| sake [1] 8/8 | short [12] 17/11 17/14 17/19 | 46/2 46/6 46/11 58/8 |
| same [3] 9/3 22/12 43/22 | 20/8 20/10 20/11 20/20 20/24 | sought [1] 31/24 |
| Sanofi [1] 32 | 21/5 21/6 27/22 27/24 | sounds [1] 53/11 |
|  | shortly [2] 37/6 60/3 | SOUTHERN [1] 1/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} 14 / 16 & 15 / 20 & 16 / 3 & 16 / 18 & 17 / 8 \end{array}$ | should [8] 4/4 10/15 21/6 | Spalding [2] 2/1 29/16 |
| 20/17 $23 / 2 \quad 27 / 21 \quad 35 / 11 \quad 36 / 25$ | 27/24 27/25 38/8 39/7 57/18 | Spalding's [1] 30/19 |
| /77 42/21 49/25 52/14 56/13 | shouldn't [2] 26/17 45/10 | span [1] 5 |
| 57/9 58/25 59/19 | show [3] 4/3 13/16 50/15 | speak [8] 12/6 26/6 28/4 |
| saying [1] 59/ | shown [3] 8/19 15/23 58/3 | 28/21 33/9 37/16 42/11 50/ |
| schedul | shuffle [1] 13/16 | speakers [1] 3/7 |
| $34 / 5$ | side [11] 9/17 17/19 18/16 | speaking [2] 17/21 54/1 |
| scheduled [2] 33/25 34/9 | 21/19 24/17 25/18 37/6 41/9 | speaks [1] 9/10 |
| scheduling [2] 34/2 34/4 | 42/9 45/5 51/4 | special [23] 4/14 6/18 7/1 |
| Scholer [1] 1/23 | sidelines [1] 50/11 | 7/13 8/2 8/15 11/7 14/13 |
| school [4] 30/8 30/12 30/14 | sides [6] 7/10 7/24 25/19 | 14/23 15/16 $16 / 6$ 16/14 19/5 |
| $51 / 12$ [4] 30/8 30/12 30/14 | 26/16 38/10 41/4 | 20/2 20/15 21/21 25/25 51/10 |
|  | Signature [1] 60/13 | 51/11 54/11 54/25 55/8 57/6 |
| seasoned [1] 29/20 | significant [1] 13/19 | specifically [1] 30/20 |
| second [7] 13/25 15/3 | silver [3] 35/14 35/17 53/23 | specified [1] 13/22 |
| 28/5 30/9 55/7 58/6 | similar [1] 43/23 | speed [1] 48/17 |
| Secondly [4] 19/4 20/8 31 | simple [1] 57/23 | spend [3] 35/19 51/13 56/2 |
|  | simply [1] 38/10 | spent [2] 30/24 51/24 |
| secure [1] 37/19 | since [9] $4 / 18$ 9/13 13/20 | spoken [1] 33/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { see [27] } & 3 / 2 & 3 / 2 & 3 / 3 & 3 / 4\end{array}$ | $31 / 2$ 31/7 31/15 33/6 50/21 | spot [1] 47/12 |
| 5/6 8/15 9/17 9/18 9/19 9/20 | 57/10 | spring [2] 41/12 47/7 |
| 11/7 13/1 14/22 17/22 20/6 | sit [1] 50/11 | spurred [1] 13/21 |
| 20/21 22/1 27/18 27/20 41/1 | sits [1] 55/9 | staff [1] 51/17 |
| 44/4 46/21 52/5 52/9 56/9 | situation [5] 4/2 23/24 40/20 42/5 56/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stage [5] 12/24 13/1 13/10 } \\ & 39 / 1149 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |


| S | 49/16 49/19 50/3 50/10 51/8 | 50/16 53/10 53/19 53/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stages [2] 37/2 55/21 | suggestions [2] 39/7 47/4 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}54 / 14 & 54 / 14 & 56 / 9 & 56 / 11 & 56 / 14\end{array}$ |
| stand [1] 57/21 | Suite [3] 1/14 1/18 2/ | 56/23 57/3 58/12 58/14 59/ |
| standpoint [2] 24/5 28/22 | summary [2] 5/11 $16 / 1$ supplement [1] 51/20 | 60/4 <br> thanks [3] 35/5 47/23 48/5 |
| start [5] 18/10 19/13 20/10 21/6 41/21 | support [2] 8/2 8/2 | that [396] |
| starting [1] 18/22 | suppose [1] 47/2 | that's [2] 3/12 12 |
| state [52] 3/18 4/20 6/19 | sure [15] 3/11 3/16 | the discussions [1] 45 |
| 12/6 28/16 28/18 28/21 29/2 | 12/8 15/9 22/20 39/6 40/23 | the more [1] 48/12 |
| 29/5 29/21 31/5 31/7 31/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}48 / 5 & 48 / 16 & 49 / 1 & 49 / 13 & 54 / 11\end{array}$ | their [19] 3/6 7/11 |
| 32/8 36/2 36/5 36/19 36/20 | $1$ | 15/7 15/10 16/5 18/24 21/25 |
| 36/23 37/1 $37 / 9$ 37/17 $37 / 24$ | surgery [1] 30/18 | 22/12 $23 / 16$ 24/17 $26 / 4$ 35/20 |
| 38/2 38/8 38/11 38/20 38/22 | surprise | 45/1 45/2 46/13 52/2 52/13 |
| 38/23 39/3 39/20 39/20 40/1 | survive [1] 34/2 | them [19] 6/8 6/21 8/11 $13 / 4$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}40 / 1 & 40 / 1 & 40 / 2 & 40 / 3 \\ 43 / 23 / 9\end{array}$ | suspect [1] 44/10 | $13 / 20$ $14 / 25$ $14 / 25$ $21 / 4$ <br> $1 / 25$    |
| $\begin{array}{llll}43 / 22 & 43 / 24 & 44 / 3 & 44 / 6 \\ 44 / 12\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 17 & 24 / 18 & 25 / 2 & 38 / 15 & 38 / 16\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 44 / 25 & 45 / 1 & 45 / 4 & 46 / 1 & 46 / 10 \\ 46 / 11 & 47 / 4 & 47 / 14 & 48 / 21 \end{array}$ | systems [1] 16/6 | 45/7 48/25 48/25 54/24 59/17 |
| State/Federal [4] 28/16 | T | themes [1] 11/18 |
| 28/18 28/21 38/8 | T's [1] 46/7 | $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 18 & 13 / 12 & 13 / 15 & 15 / 13 & 16 / 1\end{array}$ |
| stated [3] 18/19 37/8 41/16 | TaCARA [2] 2/1 29/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 8 & 20 / 21 & 23 / 14 & 27 / 5 & 28 / 19\end{array}$ |
| states [6] 1/1 1/10 1/11 | tagged [1] 17/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 9 & 30 / 11 & 30 / 17 & 34 / 6 & 34 / 13\end{array}$ |
| status [8] 1/9 6/16 31 | take [14] 4/22 5/22 6/20 | 36/22 37/16 40/10 45/25 |
| 33/11 33/18 35/10 51/21 60/2 | 8/23 10/2 10/15 19/17 39/18 | 53/13 55/6 60/1 |
| Statute [1] 23/17 | 42/20 48/1 53/13 57/25 58/18 | there [67] |
| stay [7] 11/17 14/20 19/21 | take-away [1] 57 | therefore [1] 32/3 <br> these [13] 7/18 10/22 11/17 |
| 19/23 26/17 26/17 47/15 | taken [2] 10/6 59/24 | 20/3 27/7 27/8 31/1 40/14 |
| stayed [1] 22/10 | taking [3] 5/3 9/22 26/20 | 45/11 53/7 57/9 58/19 59/3 |
| $\begin{array}{\|lcc} \text { step [2] } & 39 / 8 & 45 / 6 \\ \text { stickler } & \text { [1] } & 16 / 14 \end{array}$ | talk [5] 40/25 42/2 47/6 | they [62] |
| still [10] 3/12 15/15 21/12 | 55/4 55/18 | they are [1] 41/18 |
| 22/8 24/18 25/7 29/10 51/16 | talked [4] 17/5 36/7 37/5 | thing [15] 3/8 11/2 14/1 |
| 52/14 54/21 | 21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 3 & 15 / 13 & 17 / 8 & 26 / 12 & 26 / 12\end{array}$ |
| stint [1] 30/4 | /10 17/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 3 & 40 / 13 & 43 / 18 & 43 / 25 & 48 / 19\end{array}$ |
| Stipes [3] 2/7 12/7 60/12 | 41/8 41/21 | 57/8 58/9 |
| stipulate [1] 28/9 | talks [1] 46/18 | things [23] 5/13 6/5 7/6 |
| Stokes [2] 34/17 35/9 | [1] | $\begin{array}{lllll}7 / 19 & 12 / 18 & 14 / 8 & 29 / 12 & 43 / 11\end{array}$ |
| Stokes' [1] 37/14 | tasks [1] 51/22 | 43/15 43/20 $44 / 5$ 44/8 $44 / 1$ |
| stone [1] 3/24 | taught [1] 51/11 | 44/19 45/5 46/2 $46 / 2147 / 5$ |
| stop [1] 58/8 | team [3] 30/9 48/1 | 54/12 57/13 57/15 57/25 |
| stories [2] 35/17 52/2 | technical [2] 15/4 15/8 | 59/21 |
| storms [1] 56/17 | technology [1] | think [74] |
| story [1] 27/6 | telephone [3] 33/5 33/8 $33 / 8$ | thinking [4] 17/20 21/3 52/8 |
| strategize [2] 5/16 5/1 | [4] 17/20 27/6 | 57/4 |
| strategy [2] 31/4 49/4 | 56/25 | is [97] |
| streamline [1] 17/16 | telling [1] | rough [1] |
| street [5] 1/21 1/24 2/2 $2 / 5$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ten [5] } 19 / 6 \\ 22 / 2337 / 15 \end{gathered}$ | le [65] $3 / 7$ 52/1 |
| 50/22 | tends [1] 5/6 | ought [4] 3/24 29/ |
| stress [1] 10/10 | Tennessee [7] 30/15 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { thought } \\ & 55 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { strikes [1] } & \text { 25/9 }\end{array}$ | 31/9 32/7 33/22 33/23 36/9 | thoughts [2] 46/25 56/19 |
| strongly [1] 59/7 struck [1] 23/7 | term [1] 20/7 | thousand [2] 37/9 37/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { struck [1] } & 23 / 7 \\ \text { structure [1] } & 47 / 9\end{array}$ | terminal <br> [1] $52 / 4$ | thousands [2] 51/24 59/10 |
| structure [1] $47 / 9$ Stuff [1] 57/13 | terms [4] 8/3 $13 / 8$ 26/9 $46 / 6$ | three [6] 14/8 16/1 $32 / 10$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Stuff [1] 57/13 } \\ \text { subcommittee [3] } & & 25 / 14 & 26 / 7\end{array}$ | terrible [1] 16/9 | $34 / 1534 / 19 \quad 51 / 17$ |
| subcommittee [3] 25/14 26/7 | terrific [1] 16/2 | through [23] 1/9 6/10 8/5 |
| bcommittees [1] 55/23 | Texas [5] 3/18 36/12 36/17 | 8/7 8/14 8/14 9/25 19/10 |
| submit [2] 18/24 43/2 | 37/17 56/16 | 19/12 19/15 21/20 24/6 24/12 |
| submitted [3] 15/7 15/11 | than [5] 4/4 5/6 21/23 37/13 | 26/25 30/7 37/10 39/23 49/5 |
| sequent [1] | thank [45] 10/24 12/22 18/3 | 57/14 |
| stantial [2] | 18/4 27/12 27/12 27/16 27/16 | throughout [5] 36/5 36/18 |
| substantive [3] 6/5 | 27/18 $28 / 12$ 28/13 28/14 $29 / 8$ | 36/20 43/21 51/1 |
|  | 32/25 33/14 33/14 35/7 35/10 | time [35] 3/11 4/7 5/20 5/20 |
| $\text { succinct [1] } 44 /$ | 35/23 35/24 44/20 46/15 | 6/22 6/23 9/3 11/19 11/20 |
| such [8] 35/17 41/2 48/11 | 46/16 46/23 47/16 47/17 | 15/7 15/11 19/24 20/1 22/12 |
| such [8] 35/17 41/2 48/11 | 47/18 47/24 49/22 49/23 | 24/15 25/6 26/6 28/17 33/6 |



| W | 13/10 14/2 16/23 17/10 19/12 | $30 / 2 \quad 36 / 18 \quad 37 / 24 \quad 55 / 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| way... [10] 18/22 23/9 24/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 6 & 23 / 15 & 23 / 23 & 29 / 4 & 32 / 13\end{array}$ | yes [14] 23/5 39/13 42/13 |
| 25/25 26/6 38/20 39/5 58/21 | $33 / 19$ 37/12 45/10 49/5 49/14 49/24 51/25 59/11 59/25 | $\begin{array}{llll} 42 / 13 & 42 / 21 & 44 / 22 & 45 / 15 \\ 45 / 21 & 46 / 21 & 47 / 6 & 47 / 24 \\ 50 / 18 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc}58 / 22 & 59 / 20 \\ \text { ways } & {[5]} & 4 / 15 & 4 / 15 & 10 / 19\end{array}$ | while [10] 6/25 7/2 9/24 | 54/3 56/7 |
| ways [5] 4/15 $4 / 15$ 10/19 28/4 33/15 | 14/20 22/12 $44 / 23$ 45/2 45/3 | yet [9] 20/14 24/4 24/5 |
| we [216] | 50/23 58/24 | 31/15 32/1 34/20 35/9 44/9 |
| we'll [1] 13/16 | who [43] 3/23 8/23 12/1 $12 / 5$ | 55/9 |
| weary [1] 10/16 | $14 / 18$ $16 / 8$ $16 / 21$ $17 / 12$ <br> $1 / 4$    | York [3] 1/24 36/17 48/21 |
| weather [3] $16 / 4 \quad 16 / 9$ 56/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 23 & 22 / 22 & 23 / 3 & 23 / 15 & 24 / 2 \\ 24 / 3 & 24 / 24 & 25 / 6 & 25 / 22 & 25 / 23\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { you [280] } \\ & \text { you'd [1] } 48 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| website [1] 27/3 |  | you've [1] 35/23 |
| Wednesday [1] 56/5 <br> week [6] 3/17 16/1 17/21 | 29/2 30/24 38/18 45/17 46/13 | younger [2] 54/19 54/21 |
| $34 / 12 \quad 34 / 25 \quad 54 / 16$ | 48/9 48/24 50/6 52/11 54/23 | your [79] |
| weeks [3] 9/25 37/12 57/1 | 55/1 55/6 55/9 55/10 56/16 | yours [1] 35/1 |
| welcome [3] 3/1 28/20 53/11 | 56/17 56/25 59/4 59/24 | yourself [1] 8/10 |
| well [24] 3/2 3/25 5/2 6/9 | who may [1] 50/6 | yourselves [2] 41/12 47/6 |
| 11/7 16/13 17/23 18/22 21/17 | whole [4] 35/15 44/2 5 | Z |
| $\begin{array}{llll}25 / 21 & 30 / 12 & 30 / 17 & 33 / 21\end{array}$ | whom [2] 12/7 48/25 | ZANTAC [5] 1/4 4/20 5/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 15 & 35 / 9 & 36 / 9 & 36 / 10 & 36 / 11\end{array}$ | why [9] 5/1 20/17 26/18 | 13/14 51/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37 / 23 \text { 49/21 49/23 50/1 58/15 } \\ & 60 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { 42/14 } & 43 / 4 & 43 / 5 & 52 / 21 & 53 / 2\end{array}$ | Zoom [4] $1 / 9$ 3/8 $3 / 15$ 3/23 |
| Wells [1] 36/12 | 55/16 |  |
| went [5] 3/11 15/25 16/3 | will [90] |  |
| 45/25 57/11 |  |  |
| were [20] 3/22 10/3 10/4 |  |  |
| 10/4 10/5 12/20 13/14 15/11 | within [1] 25/14 |  |
| 18/10 18/11 21/24 28/16 | without [4] 15/19 19/1 $30 /$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 12 & 32 / 11 & 32 / 14 & 34 / 15\end{array}$ | $37 / 1$ |  |
| 45/17 52/11 54/2 57/3 | won't [2] 42/3 52/5 |  |
| weren't [3] 15/9 41/25 45/24 | wonderful [4] 50/15 |  |
| WEST [4] 1/2 1/5 1/24 $2 / 8$ | $54 / 12 \quad 55 / 6$ |  |
| what [60] 3/16 4/1 5/4 8/4 | wondering [1] 52/8 |  |
| 8/4 10/15 10/20 11/10 11/21 | word [1] 49/24 |  |
| 13/8 14/6 14/12 14/20 15/13 | words [1] 23/9 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 20 & 20 / 21 & 23 / 7 & 23 / 11 & 23 / 22\end{array}$ | work [34] 5/17 6, |  |
| 24/3 25/20 25/21 26/13 27/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 8/15 } & 9 / 25 & 10 / 24 & 11 / 9 & 11 / 14\end{array}$ |  |
| 28/25 29/1 $29 / 2 \begin{array}{llll} & 35 / 13 & 35 / 22\end{array}$ | 20/13 21/7 21/8 21/19 21/21 |  |
| $36 / 7$ 37/25 38/4 38/5 38/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 7 / 12 & 31 / 2 & 38 / 18 & 48 / 18\end{array}$ |  |
| 38/11 38/12 38/21 39/7 40/7 | $27 / 12$ 31/2 38/18 48/18 |  |
| 41/17 $42 / 3$ 42/5 $42 / 21$ 42/23 |  |  |
| 43/5 43/5 43/6 43/19 46/13 | $52 / 25 \quad 53 / 2 \quad 53 / 8 \quad 53 / 12 \quad 53 / 1$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}46 / 14 & 46 / 20 & 47 / 2 & 47 / 3 & 53 / 15\end{array}$ | $54 / 10 \quad 58 / 18$ |  |
| 55/13 55/14 55/15 56/18 58/9 |  |  |
| 59/8 | worked [3] 11/14 $21 / 20$ 55/20 |  |
| whatever [1] 15/16 | working [15] 4/13 $4 / 13$ 11/2 |  |
| whatnot [1] 56/4 | 11/12 11/22 14/23 20/6 21/22 |  |
| when [26] 3/17 4/7 7/6 7/10 | $51 / 8 \quad 55 / 1$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 13 & 12 / 4 & 18 / 25 & 24 / 18 & 26 / 4\end{array}$ | works [1] 55/14 |  |
| 26/23 27/8 27/24 35/15 38/6 | world [1] 52/15 |  |
| 38/6 43/12 44/1 44/11 44/17 | worn [1] 50/6 |  |
| 46/12 $50 / 13$ 50/14 52/2 55/22 | worry <br> [2] 3/14 24/1 |  |
| 56/18 57/25 | would [25] 5/11 10/12 12/4 |  |
| where [39] 5/5 5/5 7/18 8/16 | $13 / 10$ $14 / 14$ $15 / 23$ $16 / 18$ <br> 17    |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & \text { /7 } & \text { 9/23 } & 10 / 3 & 11 / 1 & 11 / 2 & 11 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 20 / 11 & 20 / 22 & 20 / 25 & 27 / 1 & 29 / 22\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}11 / 3 & 12 / 25 & 13 / 12 & 13 / 17 \\ 1 / 4 / 11\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 6 & 35 / 11 & 40 / 5 & 40 / 18 & 40 / 20\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}15 / 21 & 16 / 5 & 16 / 17 & 19 / 15 & 23 / 24\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}40 / 20 & 41 / 13 & 42 / 2 & 42 / 8 & 53 / 20\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 10 & 30 / 10 & 30 / 15 & 31 / 9 & 32 / 7\end{array}$ | 55/22 59/20 |  |
| 33/5 35/18 37/8 39/19 39/21 |  |  |
| 40/3 40/4 40/23 43/12 43/15 | Y |  |
| 44/4 44/18 45/8 45/9 | yeah [1] 53/25 |  |
| whether [14] 5/9 6/5 7/8 | year [22] 3/8 4/7 4/10 4/1 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}11 / 8 & 24 / 10 & 25 / 16 & 26 / 1 & 26 / 4\end{array}$ | $4 / 184 / 194 / 204 / 224 / 22$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}26 / 5 & 27 / 24 & 28 / 4 & 41 / 1 & 54 / 20\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} 4 / 22 & 4 / 23 & 8 / 22 & 9 / 4 & 9 / 8 & 9 / 17 \end{array}$ |  |
| 55/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 9 / 18 & 9 / 18 & 10 / 12 & 30 / 4 & 30 / 22\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{cllll}\text { which } & {[27]} & 7 / 13 & 8 / 25 & 9 / 9 \\ 9 / 11 & 10 / 21 & 11 / 11 & 12 / 25 & 13 / 9\end{array}$ | 50/7 51/25 |  |
| 9/11 10/21 11/11 12/25 13/9 | years [7] 4/17 4/17 4/17 |  |

