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THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Case Number 20-2924, In Re: Zantac (Ranitidine) Product Liability Litigation. We are here today for a discovery hearing on a request for additional depositions from GSK.

Let me begin by letting the parties make appearances. I will start with counsel for the Plaintiffs.

MS. FINKEN: Tracey Finken on behalf of Plaintiffs, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.
MS. FINKEN: Good afternoon.
THE COURT: On behalf of GSK.
MR. SACHE: Will Sachse on behalf of GSK, your Honor. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. I reviewed the submissions that the parties sent over, and I guess this is in some respects the equivalent of a Motion for Protective Order by GSK. Given that we are still within the discovery window -I guess I should turn my camera on -- all right.

I said, since we are in the discovery period, and presumptively the Plaintiffs still have the right to take depositions, $I$ think this is the functional equivalent, so, Mr. Sachse, I will give you the first and last word on whatever we have to deal with today.

I had one preliminary question from reviewing the parties' materials. I note that three of the proposed
deponents are former employees of GSK. Is that an issue? Does GSK take the position they can't provide these people, or does GSK not contest they can produce these people if their depositions are noticed?

MR. SACHE: So, GSK's position, our position is, frankly and candidly, we do not know because we have not talked to any of the three former employees about whether they will cooperate or not.

It has been our practice throughout this litigation to -- when a request for a former employee comes up, we do contact them, and I think with almost every -- in every instance, save one, I think the witness has agreed to cooperate and appear voluntarily.

I will say that that process, you know, takes time, obviously, getting all of that in place.

THE COURT: I guess the related question, then, is, I don't want to tread on any attorney/client situations, but do you take the position that GSK's counsel then represents the deponent for purposes of the deposition or that the deponent is not represented by counsel for GSK?

MR. SACHE: For purposes of the depositions I have been or my co-counsel have been representing both the company and the witness.

THE COURT: GSK is providing counsel to the former employee?

MR. SACHE: That is correct.

THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying that. I will let you make your arguments now. Thank you, Mr. Sachse.

MR. SACHE: Sure. Really, I think you have read the papers, this should be pretty straightforward, hopefully. Our position is, first and foremost, PTO 54, and obviously the parties have a disagreement about what it means and whether the cap, the soft cap is 28 or 35. We negotiated this a few years ago, it was a very prolonged and at times difficult negotiation.

We landed at the 28, and at that time counsel for the Plaintiffs represented that the additional seven were supposed to be reserved for class action lawyers to ask class action questions. That is the way the PTO was written. I know that my colleague on the other side will seize on the word "may", and we all remember law school, may versus shall.

I also remember law school, and I think that their interpretation not only is inconsistent with the history of the negotiations and the representations that were made, but also it would render the clause about the class action lawyers a nullity, which is another no-no.

I think our real kind of the focus, and I think you know this, Judge, by now about me, it is about getting down to brass tacks and the practical aspects, and we are at a point now -- it is December 23rd, I am wearing a red blazer in
celebration of the season, and we just don't have enough time for these witnesses, $A$; and $B$, these are all witnesses who were known to the Plaintiffs for months and months. In fact, the Plaintiffs have been asking questions related to these witnesses since the spring.

So, there is no reason why, if -- you know, Dr. Padfield, for example, is now a key witness, why they couldn't have noticed him or asked for his deposition when $I$ was in London in July, or when $I$ was in London in September, or when I was in London last month or earlier this month. They could have said, by the way, when you are going over there and dodging Omicron, why don't we also see if we can schedule Dr. Padfield.

To now ask at the kind of close of discovery and close of December for these depositions, it is not going to be possible for us to get these deposition scheduled before the close of fact discovery.

With the current employees, sort of similar logistical problems, Ms. Cochlan, Mr. Parker. GSK is closed right now, the company is closed until early January, I think January 10 is when most employees will return. And so, even making contact with these folks at this point and trying to talk to them about potentially getting a deposition, putting aside whether these witnesses are adding anything to the picture, it is just not going to be possible or practical for us.
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And then the last thing $I$ will say is, of course, the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6) \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{I}$ think we pretty conclusively show that these are duplicative of prior $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ requests and testimony. I don't think the Plaintiffs really fought too hard on that, so I think those are kind of put to the side.

As I look at this, in particular I am worried about the three formers, Dr. Padfield, who we believe he is in Oxford, Dr. Winterborn, who winters in the Caribbean, so getting in touch with him is going to be difficult, and Dr. Colborn, who is now employed by another company, and I think he might actually be on the West Coast, but $I$ am not sure. We are sort of out of time, is fundamentally kind of where we are. THE COURT: Thank you. Let me have Ms. Finken to respond.

MS. FINKEN: Thank you, your Honor. Let me address all of the points that Mr. Sachse raised.

One, obviously may means may, so the PTO says what it says, that we may take up to 35 depositions, of which seven or eight may be class depositions. We have been picking and choosing and being very judicious about how we go about scheduling those depositions because we are very conscious, and have been from day one, on the soft cap limitations that are in place in this litigation.

As your Honor is aware, we have been in front of the Court multiple times where we have discussed scheduling
depositions and the Defendants have said to us on many, many occasions, you can take liability depositions towards the end, let's focus on all the science depositions up front, and that's what we did.

We have been working well, I thought, with Mr. Sachse trying to get depositions scheduled, working to determine which witnesses make sense and which don't, and that has been an ongoing iterative process that we have been engaged in for months now that $I$ thought has been going pretty smoothly.

With that being said, these witnesses were requested on December 10. We are certainly willing to work with Mr. Sachse on the timing of the depositions, and if it is something that means that his witness isn't available until the first or second week of February, that is something, with the Court's blessing, we would work with Mr. Sachse on making sure that we can accommodate the witness on the timing.

It is not something that, from our viewpoint, we need these depositions to finish our expert report, so it would not cause a delay in that type of deadine that we have set, and it is something that we are certainly willing to work with him on.

The third point, the $30(b)(6) s$ are not being put aside. They are not duplicative, they are more of a narrowed honed in deposition on a specific location, versus a general storage and shipping, and if your Honor would like me to -- we didn't go into this in the brief, but there are certainly areas
where their original $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witness was unable to testify about certain areas that we intend to raise with these $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witnesses, and that is something that we have not had a discussion with Mr. Sachse about, the scope or anything along those lines.

This has just been a flat objection which, frankly, I thought he was kidding when he first made it. I did not think he was actually serious that he was planning on objecting to the last seven depositions that we had requested in the case, but here we are.

It is good to see you for the holidays, and I am happy to answer any questions that you might have about it, but we, as always, are willing to work with Mr. Sachse on the timing and the scope, like we always do.

THE COURT: I appreciate that.
First of all, let me rule on one thing and then we can proceed from there.

I am looking at the language of PTO 54, and you all are going to make me choose between whether I am Justice Scalia, who doesn't believe you look at the legislative history, you just look at the text, or whether I am Justice Brennan, who says you look beyond and you look at what the parties intended.

Today I am going to opt to be a textualist. As I read the provision, it says "Absent agreement of the parties or
order of the Court, Plaintiffs as a group will be limited to the following presumptive number of witnesses:
"Number one, 35 depositions for Defendant GSK, of which up to eight may be allocated for depositions limited to issues unique to the class actions."

The way I read that is, it was capping how many of the 35 could be allocated to class. It wasn't saying you can only take 27, plus you get eight more if you want them for class.

So, that will be my ruling as how I am going to interpret PTO 54, is that if the Plaintiffs want to burn their last eight depositions on what they have asked for here and they want to take none on class, that is their choice, but I think they are entitled to take up to 35 depositions by the plain terms of PTO 54. Let me start with that one.

Then I had a questions for the parties, because I have not been as deep into this as you all have recently.

I know at least one other setting in this case, and it may be with a third party, the parties got Judge Rosenberg's blessing to continue some discovery after January 24 th, so long as they swore a blood oath that they would never move for a continuance based upon that fact.

What is the parties' position as to whether Judge Rosenberg has extended that courtesy to this situation? In other words, Ms. Finken, you are saying you would be happy to agree with the Plaintiffs -- or with GSK, if they would agree
to it, to take these depositions later. I don't know that I have the authority to authorize that, but is it your position that you believe that if there is an agreement of the parties, you can do that?

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, I believe under PTO -- I might have to phone a friend, Mr. McGlamry, who has every PTO memorized in this case, but --

MR. MCGLAMRY: Your Honor, it is PTO 30.
MS. FINKEN: PTO 30, thank you. I knew he would know. PTO 30 does say that we can engage in agreements with counsel to extend discovery deadlines as long as they do not infringe upon other deadlines in the case.

So, I believe, according to PTO 30, that we could have an agreement with Mr. Sachse that if he needs some additional time to prepare his witnesses or locate them and make them available for deposition, that we can do that beyond the January 24 th date, and we are certainly willing to discuss that.

THE COURT: Let me pause you there for a second and turn to Mr. Sachse. Not trying to get you to commit that you would agree to this, do you believe, under PTO 30, that's the right interpretation, that the parties could agree to continue to take these depositions after January 24 th?

MR. SACHE: Yes. I think we do need to disaggregate what do I have authority to agree to versus what I think is
possible. I do think it is possible to go -- in this specific context if there were an agreement or a court order allowing it, and $I$ am not saying your court order necessarily, but it does seem to me that that would be allowed under the PTO.

THE COURT: So the record is very, very clear, I have not asked whether GSK agrees to do such a thing, I am just asking whether Mr. Sachse agrees as a matter of interpreting the PTOs, that Ms. Finken's interpretation, at least as to what the parties' authority is, is accurate. That's all you have agreed to, just so the record is very clear and you don't get in trouble with your client.

Okay. Let me then break these into two categories because it is somewhat easier to deal with one rather than the other.

Is it two or three current witnesses? I guess it is two current witnesses and -- Mr. Sachse, I am looking at your sulomission, and it looks like Mr. Parker gets to GSK in July of 2015, and as you point out, they are sort of winding things down, and by the time he gets there, the last batch of manufactured product at the Zebulon facility has been manufactured.

Am I reading the timeline right?
MR. SACHE: Almost. The last batch of 150-milligram has already rolled off of the assembly line. They continued to make the 300-milligram, and I think the last batch of that was
2017.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you very much. I missed the years. I got that. Okay.

Let me pause there for a second and go back to Ms. Finken.

Mr. Parker is there for roughly a two-year period when they are manufacturing. Is that really the limitation of what you want to ask about, the manufacturing processes during that two-year time period?

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, I do not know that the two years is an accurate date. I would have to be relying on Mr. Sachse's submission. I know, as of yesterday, his previous version had dates in error on the dates of employment of some of the employees. I cannot comment on whether that's the time frame.

The role is what we are interested in, and what his role was at the Zebulon manufacturing facility where they were manufacturing for the U.S. market. He was in quality assurance, I believe, and the same with Ms. Cochlan, she had a role during that time frame manufacturing Zantac in the Zebulon facility.

Mr. Watts, obviously, was supposed to be here, but he was delayed. We have not, to my knowledge, taken any depositions of anyone from the Zebulon facility at this point. We have taken some $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witnesses who have touched on some
questions about Zebulon, but we have not taken any witnesses from the Zebulon manufacturing facility. These are the first two, I believe, that we have teed up to do that.

THE COURT: Okay. Looking to those two depositions and trying to understand what you are asking for, you have taken a general $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ about general manufacturing processes, storage, transport, things of that nature.

So, your position is here, this is sort of a more narrowed geographically specific drilling down on whether those general procedures were followed at the Zebulon facility, if there were deviations from them, what were they, what records are kept at the Zebulon facility specifically, things like that?

MS. FINKEN: Yes, correct, your Honor. There were multiple manufacturing facilities globally that GSK used for Zantac that was ultimately marketed in the United States. We took a general $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ on some of these issues.

These deposition notices are specific to the Zebulon facility, that is correct.

THE COURT: You said there are other facilities. Have you done that sort of drilled down deposition for any of the other facilities?

MS. FINKEN: We haven't done specific ones to the other individual facilities. We are doing it because it is the one that is based in the United States and we wanted to nail
that down. They have been manufacturing there since 1984, so long time manufacturing the product for the United States market. And the other facilities, one is in Singapore, they are all over the place, but this is the one that we wanted to really drill on because of the long time frame that it was manufacturing for the U.S. market.

THE COURT: These are facts depositions, not $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$, so these witnesses are not required to educate themself on anything they do not already have knowledge of; is that correct?

MS. FINKEN: Correct.
THE COURT: Let me turn back to Mr. Sachse. Why is that unduly burdensome or problematic, to prepare those fact witnesses by the end of January, early February?

MR. SACHE: Two things. I will start with Mr. Parker. The reason they want his deposition, there is one document, or maybe it's a series of documents, relating to an audit of Dr . Reddy's and they have already asked several other witnesses about this document, about how to interpret it.

Mr. Parker, as somebody who is coming in in mid 2015, is kind of low man on the totem pole, and doesn't add anything to this. So, the kind of cost burden analysis here, given how much time we have before the close of discovery, it just doesn't make any sense to us that Mr. Parker should be on this list.

Ms. Cochlan is somebody who -- you know, she is the site director of the Zebulon facility, but as you know, your Honor, the Zebulon facility stopped making Zantac a few years ago.

And I think also lost in the shuffle -- and I have been raising this issue for months and months and months and months with the Plaintiffs. They have spent an inordinate amount of discovery time focusing on the Zebulon facility, contrary to what Ms. Finken is saying, and what product was manufactured, where the API came from in this 2010 to 2017 time period. They have taken a lot of depositions on that, a lot it related to when GSK switched from manufacturing its own API to out sourcing that manufacture. They have got many, many depositions on this.

This is a period where vanishingly few pills are being made in the Zebulon facility and I have asked the Plaintiffs repeatedly, tell me if you have any Plaintiffs in this litigation who took Zebulon Zantac into 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017. They haven't identified anybody.

So, again, when you look at the balance here, these depositions just don't make sense from that perspective.

The last point I want to make on these is, Ms. Finken -- I saw for the first time yesterday that apparently they have an issue with our $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witness who testified in July, never said anything about that before
yesterday in a submission $I$ only saw as it was emailed to the Court. That is news to me.

The witness was asked dozens of questions about Zebulon, and answered those questions, and so, I think that for both $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ issues that we are talking about and for these specific current employees related to Zebulon, they have already got the evidence that they need, they don't need these depositions.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you keep saying the burden, the burden. Help me, what is the burden? How hard is it to sit down with the witness and prepare them and say, testify to what you remember, if you don't remember anything else, say you don't remember? These are not $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witnesses.

MR. SACHE: I hear you, but there is also collecting their custodial files, which we have begun. We have to review those, we have to produce those. We have to talk to these witnesses and prepare them to sit for these depositions.

Mr. Watts' view of the world is, just bring them in and I will ask them questions, but Mr. Watts asks very unfair, misleading, misrepresentative questions, so we have to prepare the witnesses.

That is our obligation, to defend our client, and it is not as simple as saying, well, they will be back in the office on January 10, meet with them once on January 11, and let's line them up for deposition on January 12. That is just
not the way this process works. It is going to take time for us to get those custodial files, produce them, review them, review with the witness, all of that.

THE COURT: I thought we had crossed the custodial production bridge a year ago. Help me out here. Why are we still doing this?

MR. SACHE: Because these are new custodians who they just identified.

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, the way we have been handling this is, if we have witnesses that we identify from the documents that we want to take depositions of, and we notice the depositions, we do a request for the custodial file with the notice of deposition, and that is in PTO 54.

And those are produced within a certain time frame of the deposition for those that we don't have custodial files on. So, this is nothing new that is being asked, and these witnesses -- first, I will object to Mr. Sachse's characterization of the duplicative nature of the questioning, and to Mr. Watts' actual questioning, because I obviously disagree with that.

What I can tell you, your Honor, despite there being some questioning of global witnesses about Zebulon, we have not taken any depositions of any witnesses who actually worked at Zebulon. These are it, these are the two employees that we chose from Zebulon, and they are two $30(\mathrm{~b})(6) \mathrm{s}$ that we teed up
specifically, and the API.
For what it is worth, your Honor, just for factual background for you, GSK was not manufacturing the API at Zebulon, they were manufacturing it in Singapore and then shipping it to Zebulon, and Zebulon was doing the finish dose manufacturing and packaging and whatnot.

So, we are now honing in on Zebulon and the employees there and witnesses there who have first-hand knowledge of Zebulon, and $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ notices directed towards that. It is not duplicative.

THE COURT: You made clear that is your position. How do you respond, though, to Mr. Sachse's point that you notified them on December 10 th that you want these people, they do have to then go and pull the custodial file, they have to review the custodial file, they need to review the custodial file and prep the witness, and particularly with the Christmas and New Year's holidays, that just really doesn't accord enough time to do what they need to do.

They have to get these custodial files -- refresh my memory, is it ten days ahead of the deposition, two weeks ahead? What is the deadline?

MR. SACHE: I think it's best effort is 21 days, but in no event fewer than --

MS. FINKEN: 15.

MR. SACHE: Right.
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MS. FINKEN: Just to make it complicated.
THE COURT: Assume you set the deposition for the very last day of discovery, January 24th. They have to get you the custodial file by January 10th, which is a Monday, and you notified them 30 days before that with the Christmas holiday in between. How do you respond to that, that that doesn't give them enough time to do what they, as responsible lawyers, need to do?

MS. FINKEN: I hear you, your Honor, and I understand Mr. Sachse's concerns. We have a lot to do between now and the close of discovery as well over the holiday. That is why we are willing to work with Mr. Sachse on the dates and we are willing to work with him on the production.

We have never had a problem with this in the past. We have been very flexible and Michael has dealt with Will I think very fairly and flexibly about when custodial files are produced and when depositions will take place. We have always worked out the dates mutually, we notice them up, and we reschedule them based on a date that's convenient for the witness, and we have worked together to do that.

THE COURT: I know you have, except today you haven't, and you are in front of me and you are asking me to make these decisions. I can't make these decisions on the assumption that I can extend it past January 24 th, and you all will just agree to it, because nobody has to agree to that, or that somebody
will agree to produce the custodial file outside the time limits that Judge Rosenberg has ordered. I can't work on that assumption. I have to work on the assumption that the rules that everyone has agreed to apply.

MS. FINKEN: I understand, your Honor. I would certainly be willing to go to the shorter end of the production of the custodial files, to the extent there are any.

I don't know that Mr. Sachse -- we requested these depositions December 10 th, we just received notice of the objection to them at the end of last week. I would hope at this point, with two weeks in, that they have started to at least look to see what is there and the size of those potential custodial files and what we are dealing with here before the company shut down for the Christmas holiday.

I have not heard Mr. Sachse -- whether or not they have actually done that. I would hope that they have. But we are certainly willing to work with him on the production of the custodial file, and if we had it two weeks in advance, I think that would give us enough time to get it reviewed and get the deposition done.

THE COURT: Mr. Sachse, do you have a sense of the volume -- at least for the current employee witnesses, do you have a sense of the volume of the custodial files, and are those files that, even though the company is shut down, you or your co-counsel have on some sort of litigation review
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platform so you can continue to review them while the company is shut down, or are you dependent upon the company coming back up before you can even access those files?

MR. SACHE: I don't have much in the way of detail. I can tell you that when we got these requests, even though, contrary to what Ms. Finken is saying, we got the request and I said we object -- she apparently thought that was a joke, I don't know why.

We then immediately took steps to start kind of the harvesting, as it were, the collection process. That's taking the files out of the electronic system at GSK, getting them on to the review platform. I believe that has now been done. I do not think review has started, but $I$ think the processing is underway of those files in the review platform.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
Let me put those two witnesses to the side for a second because at some level I have to make a holistic decision, we have to decide what -- at some point $I$ may ask Ms. Finken to prioritize. If $I$ can only give you a few, which ones would you take first? But I am not there yet. I am forewarning you that question may be coming.

We talked a little bit about the former employees. Okay. So, talk to me now, Mr. Sachse. What is the objection on the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ other than you think it is duplicative? If it is somewhat duplicative, but more narrowed, can the same
witness who was previously prepped to be the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witness on these topics be used again and simply just drill down on the sub universe that has to do with Zebulon or is your position you have to start from scratch?

MR. SACHE: I think to some extent we would have to start from scratch -- not from scratch, because the witness was prepared to discuss the Zebulon facility, but the witness is a scientist who is resident in Scotland. The deposition was several months ago, and if he is anything like me, you have that kind of mind wipe after you finish a big task like that.

He was somebody who did not work directly in Zebulon, but learned what he needed to know about the Zebulon supply chain because it was absolutely called for in the notice that he was put up to testify about and, as I said, he was asked those questions.

So, this is not a situation likely where we would go back to that witness in January and say, hey, you need -- we need to sit for another deposition. We would probably have to find another witness.

THE COURT: In theory -- again, you get to pick the witness you want, but in theory, couldn't you designate either Ms. Cochlan or Mr. Parker -- is it Ms. or Mr. Parker? I don't know.

MR. SACHE: Mr. Parker.

THE COURT: Mr. Parker. To the extent Ms. Finken is
telling me that the focus of the deposition is not general supply chain or general manufacture, it is going to be how were things operating at the Zebulon facility, is there an overlap there that might bring an efficiency to allow you to do both?

For example, if Ms. Cochlan was the site manager, presumably she could sit once in both her individual capacity and a partial $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$, couldn't she?

MR. SACHE: Well, I suppose she could, but it is our position the Plaintiffs have had the opportunity to and have asked these questions already about Zebulon. This is a complete do over, end of story. It is a do over.

THE COURT: To the extent it is a $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition, you are going to have the same authority $I$ always give, which is, if you think it is an improper question because it is cumulative or duplicative, you can instruct your witness not to answer it and you will take your chances with me after the fact.

Right now I don't have a transcript of the prior deposition, so I have no way to determine whether it is duplicative or not until I see the prior transcript and I see the current transcript. We have dealt that way throughout this litigation. I hear you, but I don't necessarily find that compelling at this stage.

MR. SACHE: Sure. Let me push back on that, because if the rule is we, the Plaintiffs, can serve a $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ notice,

I don't remember how many topics it was for this one, but let's say 20, and we go and we take that deposition and we make strategic decisions about the questions that we are going to ask and the questions we are not going to ask, and the witness is sitting there and prepared to answer, the rule is, it is a one-day deposition.

And they didn't at that deposition say, hey, you know, even though you just gave us a chart, and I am holding it up now, even though you gave us a chart at this deposition, or before this deposition that shows Zebulon and the fact that Zebulon was part of the supply chain for 30 years, we chose not to ask those questions and we need to reserve time, or we need more time. They didn't do that.

We finished that deposition, they asked their questions about Zebulon, and now they have served a duplicative notice asking like verbatim the same topics, but instead of saying you, meaning GSK, it says Zebulon. So they have had their chance on this.

THE COURT: Ms. Finken, let me ask you to respond to that. It seems a $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deponent is the company, it's GSK. You already got to take a storage and transport and manufacturing $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition of GSK. Why aren't you out of time?

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, just to be clear, we took a global $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition about shipping and storage. That
was not specific to Zebulon. Just because Zebulon might have been mentioned in it a couple of times does not mean the crux of the deposition was about Zebulon. There were multiple questions, and $I$ don't have references in front of me, where the witness was unable or unprepared to answer those questions, and that is fine. We are honing down here, and it is important for several reasons.

One, Zebulon manufactured up until the tail end of when this litigation -- when GSK stopped manufacturing product for the U.S. market. There was product manufactured there for the U.S. market that would have been, should have been stored up through and retained for this litigation that was destroyed in May of 2020, that we are entitled to ask about.

There are supply chain issues from different API manufacturers that go into that facility, and frankly, your Honor, we have not even had a meaningful meet and confer about this. When we asked Mr. Sachse on email what was the basis for his objection, he said, I will tell the judge. That was his response.

There was no discussion about it. We didn't even know why he was objecting to these depositions until we received his sulomission yesterday.

MR. SACHE: No. Well, Ms. Finken, that's not true.

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. Hold on.

Ms. Finken, as I said, the deponent is GSK, and the

Court authorized a storage, transport, and separate manufacturing deposition of GSK. That deposition was taken.

To the extent you are saying to me we tried to take that deposition and there were questions that we asked and the witness was not prepared to ask, I think it is fair game to come back to the Court and say we should get some additional time to get those questions answered. They were proper questions, they have not been properly objected to, and we are entitled to answers. We want to reopen that deposition to get those answers.

I think it is also fair game to come back to the Court and say, after we took that deposition they produced other materials which, had we known about it, we would have asked about, and then $I$ can evaluate that.

Mr. Sachse is not making an incorrect point when he says, look, if you knew about it at the time -- granted, you only have a limited number of hours -- but you chose not to ask about Zebulon and you could have, why should you get to reopen? Can you help me figure out where we are on this?

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, you took the words right out of my mouth actually. There have been documents produced since then that affect this issue, one hundred percent. We didn't know the product was destroyed at the time that that deposition was taken, that just came to light in October, and there is still ongoing document production that we are getting every
day. We just had a production on Monday of this past week that revealed new information that we were unaware of previously.

It is an ongoing iterative process. To the extent that there is additional information that comes to light that we want to question them about specific to the Zebulon facility, we believe that it is fair and appropriate to tee those up. Discovery is still ongoing, it is not going to be duplicative. If we need to sit down and discuss the scope with Mr. Sachse in advance so that it is not duplicative, we will. These are issues that are critical to our case, they are critical to the supply chain for the United States. These are fact witnesses and company witnesses that are specific to the U.S. market and to a specific question as to how that manufacturing facility maintained and distributed and supplied Zantac to our clients in the United States, and they did it for almost 40 years.

So, to the extent that it is not duplicative, we think it is an appropriate use of our deposition time. The discovery deadline has not passed. If Mr. Sachse believes it is duplicative once the deposition moves forward he can certainly object on that basis.

MR. SACHE: And we'll seek costs. Discovery has to have limits, and what we are dealing with now is, they just keep pushing and pushing, more and more discovery, putting us in a position where, how can we get this all done in the next
month? We cannot. They have had their chance on Zebulon. THE COURT: Okay. I have heard you both, I am prepared to rule on this issue. Here is my ruling.

Any deponent in a case gets deposed once and there is a time limit, that is what the rules say. In this case, there was an authorized deposition that would have allowed questioning about this topic from GSK.

Really what I hear -- the way I am interpreting the Plaintiffs' request here and the way $I$ am going to treat it, it is not that they get a new, separate, freestanding deposition because they just want to ask some more questions because they want to. It is there were either topics for which the witness could not answer at the prior deposition, or there are newly discovered materials which raise questions that could not have been asked at the prior deposition.

I think those are fair game for a renewed deposition or reopening of the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition on storage, transport, or manufacturing, whichever one they are reopening here. Okay.

I am going to order the Plaintiffs, if you are going to claim that you are addressing newly discovered information, you need to tell GSK with a fair amount of specificity exactly what it is you are pointing to, what documents do you have, what other deposition testimony, so that they can then prepare their witnesses by saying, they are going to ask you about these documents and these questions in somebody else's depo,
and they can focus in on it.
Likewise, if you are going to push back and say we need to get answers to questions that couldn't be answered at the first depo, you need to give them page and line of the question so that they can prepare their witnesses.

Within those boundaries, I will allow the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition to go forward. I will leave it to you all to decide anything beyond that as to production, time, custodial files, anything else.

Within those limited parameters, I will allow the deposition to go forward, and I will reiterate what $I$ have said previously, which is that if GSK in the live stream of the deposition believes the question is inappropriate, either cumulative, outside the bounds of what I prescribed, or otherwise, you may instruct the witness not to answer.

I will review the transcript afterwards and I will rule, and whatever remedies are available at that point, I will assess those remedies. That is how we will deal with the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witnesses.

MR. SACHE: Your Honor, I'm sorry, before we move on, because I think we have been focusing on the -- I will resist the urge to characterize it -- the Zebulon notice, there is a second $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ asking for a witness knowledgable about degradation of API, and we have previously produced witnesses, both fact and $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witnesses, on that topic.

I just want to make sure that the ruling is clear, and I didn't hear anything specifically about that notice. Are we just proceeding on the one notice, the Zebulon --

THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Finken, I will give you the chance, it is your notice, tell me what it is the other notice is asking for.

MS. FINKEN: The other notice is asking for a $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition specific to API and degradation, which has not been noticed before. It is a new $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ notice and while there may be fact witness testimony to it, there is not company testimony regarding this on a broad scale, specific to Zebulon, and that's what that deposition notice is about. It is not duplicative.

Frankly, in my view, neither of them are duplicative of the prior ones that we have served, but that is Mr. Sachse's argument that he is making. If we thought it was duplicative, we have a list -- I think this is an important point to make, we have a list of deponents that we would love to take. We are being very selective in how we are using these depositions.

So, it is not that we are, you know, trying to take duplicative testimony. There are another 20 witnesses that, if we could, we would take their depositions. Obviously Mr. Sachse would object, it would be beyond the soft cap limitations under PTO 54.

We are asking specifically to target very specific,
narrow areas of focus that we do not believe that we could -were either included in prior deposition notices or that we could have covered in other depositions. We are trying to fill in the gaps at the end of this case on where we need information. That is what we are trying to do.

THE COURT: I understand that. The question is not whether they were included in the prior deposition notices; the question is could they have been, and could they have been asked about at the prior deposition. If the answer is no, because we didn't know about it until something that happened after the deposition, $I$ think that is different from we only had ten hours, we had to make strategic decisions about what to ask about, and we, at that point, chose not to ask about Zebulon, that is a different discussion.

If that's where you are and you are asking me now to allow you to have additional time to take a deposition on new topics, that is a different question from we have newly discovered evidence, we want to take the deposition.

Look, in every case we would love to have unlimited time to question every deponent to the end of time, but the rules don't allow for it. The rules put time limits on things or the rules cap discovery. This is not a perfect process and it is not a comprehensive process. You have to make choices and you're stuck at some level with the choices you have made. That is what I am trying to understand, Ms. Finken, so
help me out.
MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, that is exactly what we have tried to do. So the deposition that was taken previously was a broad deposition covering the manufacturing facilities over 40 years. There is a lot to cover on that type of deposition over a global product that has been recalled, and trust me, it is a lot.

What we are trying to do here -- and we are not planning on doing $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition notices that are narrowed and honed in on other manufacturing facilities, we are doing it on this one. It is not duplicative of what has been done. It is narrowing the focus on to this specific facility and doing more of a deep dive into questions about that facility specifically, documents that have been obtained since then, information that has been obtained since then, and we are really trying to fill the gaps, your Honor, in where we believe we need testimony before the close of discovery.

This is something that has been a very thoughtful process that we have undertaken by Mr. Watts, by myself, by our entire team. We have looked at the deposition testimony that has been taken, we are trying to figure out where we still need to cover items before the close of discovery, and like I said, we have been very selective.

If I had my Christmas wish list here, there are at least another 25 or so witnesses that I would love to take
depositions of, but $I$ understand that we are not going to be able to do that.

That is why I am shocked that Mr. Sachse is making these types of objections at the 11th hour when we are trying to finish up this case and close it out before discovery ends. That is what we are trying to do.

THE COURT: I understand. I am going to apply the same ruling, because I think I have to balance a number of factors.

One is that we have a limited amount of time. Whether I wanted to let you take an expansive deposition or not, there is a limited amount of time. I have to give GSK a fair amount of time to prepare the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witnesses and all that. I am going to apply the same standard to the request -- I am just going to call it the API $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition -- is if the Plaintiffs can identify evidence that came to their attention after the prior deposition such that they could not have inquired about those topics at the prior deposition, I will allow that.

If there were prior questions asked at the prior deposition that were not answered, and the witness was not prepared to answer, the Plaintiffs can explore those areas as well.

Beyond that, I am not going to let the Plaintiffs to either go back over something that they could have fairly asked
about at the prior deposition, or that was asked about at the prior deposition, even if it was at a higher level.

That will be my ruling as to that, and again, I would require the Plaintiffs to give GSK a fair amount of specificity as to what questions you are going to drill down on and what newly discovered evidence you are going to rely on.

That will be my ruling as to the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$.
MR. SACHE: Your Honor, sorry, one other point. What I heard Ms. Finken say is that this is about API degradation as it relates to the Zebulon facility, and she says that she was not able to get that discovery before.

I am not going to re-argue it, but $I$ want to make sure the record is clear that that is what they are asking for here with respect to this API degradation.

THE COURT: To be clear, let's be fair and clear, I haven't seen the deposition notice. I am not limiting the scope of anything that may be in that deposition notice. I am going to leave it to Ms. Finken in the first instance to say these are the things that are in the notice that we think are fairly within the rulings the Judge just made.

You all can talk about it, fight about it, talk about it with the special master, but come to some resolution, and whatever resolution that is, Ms. Finken has to give eye level specificity to the Defense. Then, if you think she is being overly broad, Mr. Sachse, at the deposition, you can object.

But I am not going to today try to limit what I have rule on because $I$ haven't seen the deposition notice. I appreciate your attempt to clarify or narrow it, but I am going to overrule that clarification.

MR. SACHE: Okay.
THE COURT: Thank you. That is as to those.
As to the current witnesses, Ms. Cochlan and Mr. Parker, I would allow those depositions to go forward, but I want -- but they will be secondary to the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ depositions that I just authorized.

If in good faith GSK simply cannot get it done, cannot produce the custodial records, cannot prepare their witnesses and this can't be done, then it can't be done. I will allow Plaintiffs to come back -- if they get notice from the Defense that we are pulling the plug, we are not going to agree to extend, which they don't have to agree to, and we are not going to be ready, if Plaintiffs think they are game playing or not acting in good faith, $I$ will revisit that, but conceptually $I$ would allow those depositions to go forward.

As to the former employees, I don't know that $I$ am in a position to rule on that until somebody reaches out to them, somebody serves them, and we get a sense of whether they are going to fight it or not. They have every right to hire their own lawyers and file an objection in wherever they may be, Canada, California, the Caribbean, wherever.

I think it is premature for me to rule as to whether those depositions can go forward other than to say, follow whatever procedures you have used in the past, either have GSK serve them -- serve as in get it to them, I don't mean formally serve -- or the Plaintiffs can formally serve the deposition notices and we will let that process play out.

Ms. Finken, $I$ will throw it to you, but that is my inclination. I don't know how I can rule on that until $I$ know what their position is.

MS. FINKEN: We appreciate that, your Honor, and I don't know that Mr. Sachse knows what the witnesses' positions are because he never reached out to them, because they are just objecting to the depositions for the sake of objecting. So, I think that that is fair.

I am sure if the witness is unavailable, or even deceased, we don't know -- sometimes we have been requesting them and it turns out that they are deceased -- we will work with Mr. Sachse to figure that out. If we can't, we will come back to you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Listen, the two of you work very well together, and have worked with me for over a year and a half now. He is not objecting just for the sake of objecting, and Ms. Finken is not making gratuitous remarks. Let's keep the level of dialogue at a civilized level here.

Mr. Sachse, for whatever reason, has a principled
objection. You may not agree that he has a principled objection. Ms. Finken is in good faith asking for materials that she thinks she is entitled to. You may not agree she is entitled to them. Let's all try to keep the dialogue at the level that we have kept it at up until now.

I am going to defer any ruling on -- I will deny -- I am going to defer any ruling on the request to compel the depositions of the former employees, pending either side getting further information. As soon as you get that further information, $I$ will get you right back in front of me.

We have an open-ended date on January 5th for open discovery questions, so if you want to throw that on the agenda on January 5th, I will rule on it at that time. If you are able to obtain that information between now and then and you want to see me next week, I will be working next week.

I hope you all are taking next week off, and I am not suggesting you have to work, but if you want me next week, I am here next week and I will make myself available.

MS. FINKEN: I am working as well.
THE COURT: It could have been worse, the discovery cutoff could still be next Thursday.

So, all right, those will be my rulings today.
Ms. Finken, without waiving any objection you may have to the rulings I made, any other topics you want to raise or any issues that you wanted to raise that I haven't addressed?

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

MS. FINKEN: No, your Honor, I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Sachse, without waiving any objections you may have, any other issues you wanted to raise today?

MR. SACHE: No, your Honor, other than to hope that you get some time off, even though you will be working next week. The rest of us will be working, but $I$ hope you get some time.

THE COURT: Thank you, I appreciate that. I always volunteer to take criminal intake duty the week between Christmas and New Year because I don't celebrate Christmas and my colleagues do, so I think that is just the collegial thing to do.

So I will be here next week dealing with some warrants and arrest and things of that nature, but $I$ always have time for you. The MDL is always high on my priority list.

MS. FINKEN: I hope you have a happy New Year, your Honor, and we will see you January 5th.

THE COURT: To everybody on the call and to all of your colleagues, please, on behalf of Judge Rosenberg and me and the entire court staff, $I$ want to wish everyone who celebrates Christmas a Merry Christmas, wish everyone a happy and safe New Year. Hopefully we will all be able to see each other in person sometime in January, and that Omicron blows by before then.

With the Court's best wishes, we will be in recess.

Thank you, everybody.
MS. FINKEN: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. MCGLAMRY: Thank you, your Honor.
(Thereupon, the hearing was concluded.)

*     *         * 
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| available [4] 7/13 10/16 | BRUCE [1] 1/8 | clause [1] 4/ |
| 29/17 37/18 | burden [4] 14/22 16/9 16/10 | clear [8] 11/5 11/10 18/1 |
| aware [1] 6/24 | 16/10 | 24/24 30/1 34/13 34/15 34/15 |
| B | burn [1] 9/10 | clients [1] 27/15 |
| back [13] 12/4 14/12 16/23 | C | close [8] 5/14 5/14 5/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 21 / 2 & 22 / 17 & 23 / 24 & 26 / 6 & 26 / 11 \\ 29 / 2 & 33 / 25 & 35 / 14 & 36 / 19 & 37 / 10 \end{array}$ | California [1] 35/25 | closed [2] 5/19 5/20 |
| 33/25 35/14 36/19 37/1 | call [2] 33/15 38/19 | co [2] 3/22 20/25 |
| balance [2] 15/20 33/8 | called [1] 22/13 | co-counsel [2] 3/22 20/25 |
| based [3] 9/21 13/25 19/19 | came [3] 15/10 26/24 33/16 | Coast [1] 6/11 |
| basis [2] 25/17 27/21 | camera [1] 2/18 | Cochlan [6] 5/19 12/19 15/1 |
| batch [3] 11/19 11/23 11/25 | can [32] 3/3 5/12 7/2 7/16 | 22/22 23/5 35/7 |
| be [48] | 8/16 9/7 10/4 10/10 10/16 | Colborn [1] 6/10 |
| BEACH [3] 1/2 | 17/21 19/24 21/1 21/3 21/5 | colleague [1] 4/ |
| because [24] $3 / 6$ 6/21 $9 / 15$ | 21/19 21/25 23/15 23/25 | colleagues [2] 38/12 38/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 13 & 13 / 24 & 14 / 5 & 17 / 7 & 17 / 19\end{array}$ | 26/14 26/19 27/20 27/25 | collecting [1] 16/14 |
| 19/25 21/17 22/6 22/13 23/14 | 28/23 29/1 $29 / 5$ 33/16 $33 / 22$ | collection [1] 21/10 |
| 23/24 25/1 $28 / 11$ 28/11 29/21 | 34/21 34/25 36/2 36/5 36/8 | collegial [1] 38/12 |
| 31/10 33/8 35/2 36/12 36/12 | can't [6] 3/2 19/23 20/2 | come [5] 26/6 26/11 34/22 |
| 38/11 | 35/13 35/13 36/18 | 35/14 36/18 |
| been [38] 3/9 3/22 $3 / 22$ 5/4 | Canada [1] 35/25 candidly [1] 3/6 | comes [2] 3/10 27/4 <br> coming [3] 14/20 21/2 21/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}6 / 19 & 6 / 22 & 6 / 24 & 7 / 5 \\ 7 / 9 & 7 / 7 & 7 / 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { candidly [1] } & 3 / 6 & & \\ \text { cannot [5] } & 12 / 14 & 28 / 1 & 35 / 11\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { coming [3] } & 14 / 20 & 21 / 2 & 21 / 21 \\ \text { comment [1] } & 12 / 14\end{array}$ |
| 7/9 8/6 9/16 11/20 14/1 15/6 | $35 / 11 \quad 35 / 12$ | commit [1] 10/20 |
|  | cap [5] 4/8 4/8 6/22 $30 / 23$ | company [10] 3/22 5/20 6/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 11 & 26 / 8 & 26 / 21 & 28 / 15 & 29 / 21\end{array}$ | 31/22 | 20/14 20/24 21/1 21/2 24/20 |
| $30 / 8 \quad 31 / 8 \quad 31 / 8 \quad 32 / 6 \quad 32 / 11$ | cap limitations [1] 6/22 | 27/12 30/10 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}32 / 14 & 32 / 15 & 32 / 18 & 32 / 21 \\ 32 / 23 & 36 / 16 & 37 / 20 & \end{array}$ | capacity [1] 23/6 | compel [1] 37/7 |
| $32 / 23$ $36 / 16$ $37 / 20$  <br> before $[15]$ $1 / 8$ $5 / 16$ | capping [1] 9/6 | compelling [1] 23/23 |
| before [15] 1/8 5/16 $14 / 23$ <br> 15/25 19/5 20/13 21/3 24/10 | Caribbean [2] $6 / 8 \quad 35 / 25$ | complete [1] 23/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 15 / 25 & 19 / 5 & 20 / 13 & 21 / 3 & 24 / 10 \\ 29 / 20 & 30 / 9 & 32 / 17 & 32 / 22 & 33 / 5 \end{array}$ | case [12] 1/3 2/1 8/9 9/17 | complicated [1] 19/1 |
| 34/11 38/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 7 & 10 / 12 & 27 / 10 & 28 / 4 & 28 / 5\end{array}$ | comprehensive [1] 31/23 |
| begin [1] $2 / 5$ | categories [1] 11/12 | conceptually [1] 35/18 concerns [1] 19/10 |


| C | deceased [2] 36/16 36/17 | 26/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| concluded [1] 39/5 | December [7] 1/5 4/25 5/15 | documents [6] 14/17 17/11 |
| conclusively [1] 6/2 | December 10 [1] 7/11 | dodging <br> [1] 5/12 |
| confer [1] 25/16 conscious [1] 6/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { December 10th [2] 18/13 } & \text { 20/9 }\end{array}$ | does [5] 3/1 3/2 10/10 11/4 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { conscious } \\ \text { contact [2] } & 3 / 11 \\ \text { col }\end{array}$ | December 23rd [1] Dechert [1] 1/18 | $\qquad$ |
| contest [1] 3/3 | $\text { decide [2] } 21 / 18 \quad 29 / 7$ | $\begin{array}{\|ccccc} \text { doesn't [5] } \\ 18 / 17 & 8 / 20 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| context [1] 11/2 | decision [1] 21/18 | doing [6] 13/24 17/6 $18 / 5$ |
| ntinue [3] 9/19 10/22 21/1 | decisions [4] 19/23 19/23 | 32/9 32/10 32/12 |
| continued [1] 11/24 | 24/3 31/12 | don't [29] 3/17 5/1 5/12 6/3 |
| contrary [2] 15/9 21/6 | deep [2] 9 | $7 / 7$ 10/1 11/10 15/21 |
| convenient [1] 19/19 | defend [1] 16/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 12 & 16 / 13 & 17 / 15 & 20 / 8 & 21\end{array}$ |
| cooperate [2] 3/8 3/12 | Defendant [1] 9/3 | 21/8 $22 / 22$ 23/18 $23 / 22$ |
| correct [6] 4/1 13 | DEFENDANTS [2] 1/17 7/1 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}25 / 4 & 31 / 21 & 35 / 16 & 35 / 20 & 36 / 4\end{array}$ |
| 14/10 14/11 39/7 | Defense [2] 34/24 35/1 | $36 / 8 \quad 36 / 11$ 36/16 38/1 38/11 |
| cost [1] 14/22 | defer [2] 37/6 37/7 | done [10] 13/21 13/23 20/16 |
| costs [1] | degradation [4] 29/24 30 | 20/20 21/12 $27 / 25$ 32/11 |
| could [18] 5/10 9/7 10/13 | 34/9 34/14 | 35/11 $35 / 13 \quad 35 / 13$ |
| 10/22 23/6 23/8 26/18 28/13 | delay [1] 7/1 | dose [1] 18/5 |
| 28/14 30/22 31/1 31/3 31/8 | delayed [1] 12/23 | down [13] 4/23 11/19 13/9 |
| 31/8 33/17 33/25 37/20 37/21 | deny [1] 37/6 | 13/21 14/1 16/11 20/14 20/2 |
| couldn't [4] 5/7 22/21 23/7 | dependent [1] 21 | 21/2 22/2 25/6 27/8 34/5 |
| 29/3 | depo [2] 28/25 29 | dozens [1] 16/3 |
| counsel [8] 2/6 3/18 3/20 | deponent [6] 3/19 3/19 24/20 | Dr [6] 5/6 5/12 6/7 6/8 6/9 |
| 3/22 3/24 4/11 10/11 20/25 | 25/25 28/4 31/20 <br> deponent to [1] 31/20 | $\begin{array}{\|llll} 14 / 17 \\ \text { drill [3] } & 14 / 5 & 22 / 2 & 34 / 5 \end{array}$ |
| couple [1] 25/2 | deponents [2] 3/1 30/1 | drilled <br> [1] <br> 13/21 |
| course [1] 6/1 | deposed [1] 28/4 | drilling [1] 13/9 |
| court [11] 1/1 1/21 6/25 | deposition [72] | duplicative [18] 6/3 7/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 2 & 11 / 3 & 16 / 2 & 26 / 1 & 26 / 6 \\ 26 / 11 & 38 / 21 & 39 / 12\end{array}$ | depositions [45] | $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 18 & 18 / 10 & 21 / 24 & 21 / 25\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{cc}\text { 26/11 38/21 } & 39 / 12 \\ \text { Court's [2] 7/14 }\end{array}$ | designate [1] 22/21 | 23/15 23/20 24/15 27/8 $27 / 9$ |
| Court's [2] 7/ | despite [1] 17/21 | 27/17 27/20 $30 / 13$ 30/14 |
| Court, [1] 9/1 | destroyed [2] 25/12 26/ | 30/16 30/21 32 |
| Court, Plaintiffs [1] 9/1 courtesy [1] 9/23 | detail [1] 21/4 | during [2] 12/8 12/20 |
| cover [2] 32/5 32/22 | determine [2] 7/6 23/1 | duty [1] 38 |
| covered [1] 31/3 | dialogue [2] 36 | E |
| covering [1] 32/4 | did [4] 7/4 8/7 $22 / 11$ 27/15 | each [1] 38/ |
| Criminal [1] 38/10 | didn't [7] 7/25 24/7 24/13 | earlier [1] 5/10 |
| critical [2] 27/10 27/11 | 25/20 26/22 30/2 31/10 | early [2] 5/20 14/1 |
| crossed [1] 17 | different [4] 25/14 31/11 | easier [1] 11/13 |
| crux [1] 25/2 | 31/14 31/17 | educate [1] 14/8 |
| cumulative [2] 23/15 29/14 | difficult [2] 4/9 6/9 | efficiency [1] 23/4 |
| current [7] 5/18 11/15 11/16 | directed [1] 18/9 | efficiency [1] 23/4 effort [1] 18/22 |
| 16/6 20/22 23/21 35/7 | directly [1] 22/11 | effort [1] 18/22 <br> eight [4] 6/19 9/4 9 |
| custodial [18] 16/15 17/2 | director [1] 15/2 | either [7] 22/21 28/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 4 & 17 / 12 & 17 / 15 & 18 / 14 & 18 / 15\end{array}$ | disaggregate [1] 10/24 | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 31 / 2 & 33 / 25 & 36 / 3 & 37 / 8\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 15 & 18 / 19 & 19 / 4 & 19 / 16 & 20 / 1\end{array}$ | disagree [1] 17/20 | electronic [1] 21/11 |
| 20/7 20/13 20/18 20/23 29/8 | disagreement [1] 4/7 | else [2] 16/12 29/9 |
| 35/12 | discovered [4] 28/14 28/20 | else's [1] 28/25 |
| custodians [1] 17 cutoff [1] 37/21 | 31/18 34/6 | email [1] 25/17 |
| D | 2/19 5/14 5/17 9/19 10/11 | employed [1] 6/10 |
|  | 14/23 15/8 19/3 19/11 27/7 | employee [3] 3/10 3/25 20 |
| date [5] 10/17 12/11 19/19 37/11 39/10 | 27/18 $27 / 22 \quad 27 / 24 \quad 31 / 22$ | employees [11] 3/1 3/7 5/18 |
| dates [4] 12/13 12/13 19/12 | 32/17 32/22 33/5 34/11 37/12 | 5/21 12/14 16/6 17/24 18/7 |
| 19/18 | 37/20 | 21/22 35/20 37/8 |
| day [4] | discuss [3] 10/17 22/7 27/8 | employment [1] 12/13 |
| days [3] 18/20 18/22 $19 / 5$ | discussed [1] 6/25 | end [8] 7/2 14/14 20/6 20/10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { deadline [3] 7/19 18/21 } \\ & 27 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { discussion [3] } 3 / 4 \text { 25/20 } \\ & 31 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 23 / 11 & 25 / 8 & 31 / 4 & 31 / 20 \\ \text { ended [1] } & 37 / 11 \end{array}$ |
| deadlines | distributed [1] 27/14 | ends [1] 33/5 |
| al [3] 2/23 11/13 | DISTRICT [2] 1/1 1/1 | engage [1] 10/10 |
| dealing [3] 20/13 27 | dive [1] 32/13 | engaged [1] 7/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} 38 / 14 \\ \text { dealt [2] } & 19 / 15 & 23 / 21 \end{array}$ | DIVISION [1] 1/2 <br> do [42] <br> document [3] 14/16 14/19 | $\left.\begin{array}{rllll} \text { enough } & {[4]} & 5 / 1 & 18 / 17 & 19 / 7 \\ 20 / 19 \end{array}\right]$ |



| H | interpret [2] 9/10 14/19 | $9 / 11 \text { 11/19 11/23 11/25 15/22 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| here... [11] 20/13 25/6 28/3 | interpretation [3] 4/18 | 19/3 20/10 |
| 28/9 28/18 $32 / 8 \quad 32 / 24 \quad 34 / 13$ | interpreting [2] 11/7 28/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { later [1] } 10 / 1 \\ & \text { law [2] } 4 / 16 \text { 4/17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $36 / 24$ hey | is [206] | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { lawyers [4] } & 4 / 13 & 4 / 20 & 19 / 7\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { hey [2] } & 22 / 17 & 24 / 7 \\ \text { high [1] } & 38 / 16 \end{array}$ | isn't [1] 7/13 | 35/24 |
| higher [1] $34 / 2$ | issue [5] 3/1 15/6 15/24 | learned [1] 22/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { him [5] } & 5 / 8 & 6 / 9 & 7 / 20 & 19 / 13\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rllll} 26 / 22 & 28 / 3 \\ \text { issues [7] } & 9 / 5 & 13 / 17 & 16 / 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { least [5] } 9 / 17 \text { 11/8 } 20 / 12 \\ & 20 / 2232 / 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20/17 hire [1] $35 / 23$ | $25 / 14 \quad 27 / 10 \quad 37 / 25 \quad 38 / 3$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { leave [2] } & 29 / 7 & 34 / 18\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { hire [1] } & 35 / 23 & & \\ \text { his [9] } & 5 / 8 & 7 / 13 & 10 / 15 & 12 / 12\end{array}$ | it [126] | legislative [1] 8/20 |
| $\begin{array}{crlll} \text { his [9] } & 5 / 8 & 7 / 13 & 10 / 15 & 12 / 12 \\ 12 / 16 & 14 / 16 & 25 / 18 & 25 / 18 \end{array}$ | it's [3] 14/17 18/22 24/20 | let [16] $2 / 5$ 4/2 6/13 6/15 |
| $25 / 21$ | items [1] 32/22 | 8/16 9/14 10/19 11/12 12/4 |
| history [2] 4/18 8/21 | iterative [2] 7/8 27/3 | $\begin{array}{llll}14 / 12 & 21 / 16 & 23 / 24 & 24 / 19\end{array}$ |
| Hold [3] 25/24 25/24 25/24 | its [1] 15/12 | $33 / 11$ 33/24 36/6 |
| holding [1] 24/8 | $J$ | $536 / 23 \quad 37 / 4$ |
| holiday [3] 19/5 19/11 20/14 | January [17] 5/20 5/20 9/19 | letting [1] 2/5 |
| holidays [2] $8 / 1118 / 17$ holistic [1] 21/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 10/17 } & 10 / 23 & 14 / 14 & 16 / 24\end{array}$ | level [7] 21/17 31/24 34/2 |
| holistic [1] 21/17 HON [1] 1/22 | 16/24 16/25 $19 / 319 / 4 \quad 19 / 24$ | 34/23 36/24 36/24 37/5 |
| honed [2] 7/23 | 22/17 37/11 37/13 38/18 | liability [3] 1/5 2/2 7/2 |
| honing [2] 18/7 25/6 | /24 | light [2] 26/24 27/4 |
| Honor [29] 2/8 $2 / 12$ 6/15 | January 10 [2] 5/20 16/24 | like [8] 7/24 8/14 11/17 |
| 6/24 7/24 10/5 10/8 12/10 | January 10th [1] 19/4 | $\begin{array}{llll}13 / 12 & 22 / 9 & 22 / 10 & 24 / 16 \\ 32 / 22\end{array}$ |
| 13/14 15/3 17/9 17/21 18/2 | January 11 [1] 16/24 | likely [1] 22/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}19 / 9 & 20 / 5 & 24 / 24 & 25 / 16 \\ 26 / 20\end{array}$ | January 12 [1] 16/25 | Likewise [1] 29/2 |
| 29/20 $32 / 2 \quad 32 / 16$ 34/8 $36 / 10$ | January 24th [4] 9/19 10/17 | limit [2] 28/5 35/1 |
| 36/19 38/1 38/5 38/18 39/3 | 10/23 19/24 | limitation [1] 12/7 |
| 39/4 | January 5th [2] 37/11 37/13 | limitations [2] 6/22 30/24 |
| HONORABLE [1] 1/8 | joke [1] 21/7 | limited [6] 9/1 9/4 26/17 |
| hope [6] 20/10 20/16 37/16 | judge [8] 1/9 4/23 9/18 9/22 | 29/10 33/10 33/12 |
| 38/5 38/7 38/17 | $18$ | limiting [1] 34/16 limits [3] 20/2 |
| hopefully [2] 4/5 38/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { July [3] } & 5 / 9 & 11 / 17 & 15 / 25\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { line [3] } & 11 / 24 & 16 / 25 & 29 /\end{array}$ |
| hour [1] 33/4 | just [32] 5/1 5/25 8/6 8/21 | lines [1] 8/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { hours [2] } & 26 / 17 & 31 / 12 & \\ \text { how [15] } & 6 / 20 & 9 / 6 & 9 / 9 & 14 / 19\end{array}$ | 11/6 11/10 14/23 15/21 16/18 | list [5] 14/25 30/17 30/18 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccr}\text { how [15] } & 6 / 20 & 9 / 6 & 9 / 9 & 14 / 19 \\ 14 / 22 & 16 / 10 & 18 / 11 & 19 / 6 & 23 / 2\end{array}$ | 16/25 17/8 18/2 18/17 19/1 | 32/24 38/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 22 & 16 / 10 & 18 / 11 & 19 / 6 & 23 / 2 \\ 24 / 1 & 27 / 13 & 27 / 25 & 29 / 18 & 30 / 19\end{array}$ | 19/24 20/9 22/2 24/8 24/24 | Listen [1] 36/20 |
| 24/1 27/13 27/25 29/18 30/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 25 / 1 & 26 / 24 & 27 / 1 & 27 / 23 & 28 / 11\end{array}$ | litigation [9] $1 / 5 \quad 2 / 3 \quad 3 / 9$ |
|  | 30/1 30/3 33/14 34/20 35/10 | 6/23 15/18 20/25 23/22 25/9 |
| hundred [1] 26/22 | 36/12 36/22 38/12 | 25/12 |
| I | Justice [2] 8/19 8/21 | little [1] 21/2 |
| I'm [1] 29/ | K | live [1] |
| identify [2] 17/10 33/16 | $\left.\begin{array}{llll} \operatorname{keep} \\ 37 / 4 \end{array}\right][4] \quad 16 / 927 / 24 \quad 36 / 23$ | $\begin{array}{\|lr} \text { locate [1] } & \text { 10/15 } \\ \text { location [1] } & 7 / 23 \end{array}$ |
| immediately [1] 21/9 | kept [2] 13/12 37/5 | Logan [1] 1/11 |
| important [2] 25/6 | key [1] 5/7 | logistical [1] 5/18 |
| coper [1] 23/14 | kidding [1] 8/7 | London [3] 5/9 5/9 5/10 |
| inappropriate [1] 29 | kind [8] 4/22 5/14 6/5 6/12 | long [4] 9/19 10/11 14/2 |
| inclination [1] 36/8 | 14/21 14/22 21/9 22/10 | 14/5 |
| included [2] 31/2 31/7 | knew [2] 10/9 26/16 | look [9] 6/6 8/20 8/21 8/22 |
| inconsistent [1] 4/18 incorrect [1] $26 / 15$ | know [27] 3/6 3/14 $4 / 14$ 4/23 | 8/22 15/20 20/12 26/16 31/19 |
| individual [2] 13/24 23/6 | 5/6 9/17 10/1 10/9 12/10 | looked [1] 32/20 |
| information [8] 27/2 27/4 | 12/12 15/1 15/2 19/21 20/8 | looking [3] 8/18 11/16 $13 / 4$ |
| 28/20 31/5 32/15 37/9 37/10 | 21/8 22/12 $22 / 23$ 24/7 25/20 | looks [1] 11/17 |
| 37/14 | 26/23 30/20 31/10 35/20 36/8 | lost [1] 15/5 |
| infringe [1] 10/12 | $36 / 8 \quad 36 / 11 \quad 36 / 16$ | lot [5] 15/11 15/11 19/10 |
| inordinate [1] 15/7 | knowledgable [1] 29/23 <br> knowledge [3] 12/23 14/9 | 32/5 32/7 <br> love [3] 30/18 $31 / 19 \quad 32 / 25$ |
| inquired [1] 33/18 | $18 / 8$ | $\text { low [1] } 14 / 21$ |
| $\begin{array}{lr}\text { instance [2] } & 3 / 12 \\ \text { instead [1] } & 24 / 16\end{array}$ | known [2] 5/3 26/13 <br> knows [1] 36/11 | M |
| instruct [2] 23/15 29/15 |  |  |
| intake [1] 38/10 | L | 18/11 31/24 34/20 37/24 |
| intend [1] 8/2 <br> intended [1] 8/23 <br> interested [1] 12/16 | landed [1] 4/11 <br> language [1] 8/18 <br> last [11] 2/22 5/10 6/1 8/9 | MAGISTRATE [1] 1/9 <br> maintained [1] 27/14 <br> make [20] $2 / 5$ 4/3 $7 / 7$ 8/19 |


| M | months [8] 5/3 5/3 7/9 15/6 | 38/1 38/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| make... [16] 10/15 11/25 | more [9] 7/22 9/8 13/8 21 | [1] [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 24 & 15 / 21 & 15 / 22 & 19 / 1 & 19 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { 24/13 } & 27 / 24 \\ \text { mol/24 } & 28 / 11\end{array}$ | none [1] 9/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 19 / 23 & 21 / 17 & 24 / 2 & 30 / 1 & 30 / 17 \\ 31 / 12 & 31 / 23 & 34 / 12 & 37 / 18 \end{array}$ | $32 / 13$ 21/21 | not [90] |
| making [7] 5/21 7/15 15/3 | most [1] 5/21 | note [1] 2/2 |
| 26/15 30/16 33/3 36/23 | Motion [1] 2/ | nothing [1] |
| $\operatorname{man}[1] 14 / 21$ | mouth [1] 26/21 | notice [20] 17/11 |
| manager [1] 23/5 | move [2] 9/20 29/20 | 19/18 20/9 22/13 23/25 2 |
| manufacture [2] 15/13 23/2 | moves [1] $27 / 20$ Mr [49] | $\begin{array}{lllll} 29 / 22 & 30 / 2 & 30 / 3 & 30 / 5 & 30 / 5 \\ 30 / 7 & 30 / 9 & 30 / 12 & 34 / 16 & 34 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| manufactured [5] $\begin{array}{llll} 15 / 10 & 25 / 8 & 25 / 10 \end{array}$ | Mr. [2] 22/22 36/25 | 34/19 35/2 35/14 |
| manufacturers [1] 25/15 | Mr. Parker [1] 22/22 | noticed [3] 3/4 5/8 30/9 |
| manufacturing [22] 12/7 12/8 | Mr. Sachse [1] 36/25 | notices [6] 13/18 18/9 31 |
| 12/17 12/18 12/20 13/2 13/6 | Ms [8] 6/13 $11 / 8$ 12/19 $22 / 22$ | 31/7 32/9 36/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 15 & 14 / 1 & 14 / 2 & 14 / 6 & 15 / 12\end{array}$ | 22/25 25/23 31/25 37/2 | notified [2] 18/12 19/5 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 3 & 18 / 4 & 18 / 6 & 24 / 22 & 25 / 9\end{array}$ | Ms. [20] 5/19 9/24 12/5 $15 /$ | now [20] 4/3 4/23 4/25 5/7 |
| 26/2 27/14 28/18 32/4 32/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 9 & 15 / 23 & 21 / 6 & 21 / 19 & 22 / 22\end{array}$ | 5/14 5/19 6/10 7/9 18/7 |
| manufacturing facilities [1] | $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 5 & 24 / 19 & 25 / 25 & 30 / 4 & 34 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 10 & 21 / 12 & 21 / 23 & 23 / 18 & 24 / 9\end{array}$ |
| 13/15 | 34/18 34/23 35/7 36/7 36/23 | 24/15 27/23 31/15 36/22 37/5 |
| many [6] $7 / 1$ 7/1 $9 / 6$ 15/13 |  | 37/14 |
| 15/13 24/1 | $22 / 22 \quad 23 / 5 \quad 35 / 7$ | $\text { number [5] } 2 / 2 \text { 9/2 } 9 / 3 \quad 26 / 17$ |
| market [6] 12/18 14/3 14/6 | Ms. Finken [15] 9/24 12/5 | 33/8 |
| marketed [1] 13/16 | $15 / 9$ $15 / 23$ $21 / 6$ $21 / 19$ <br> $25 / 25$ $30 / 4$ $34 / 9$ $34 / 18$ | 0 |
| master [1] 34/22 | $36 / 7 \text { 36/23 37/23 }$ | oath [1] 9/20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { materials [4] } 2 / 25 \quad 26 / 13 \\ 28 / 1437 / 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { much [3] } & 12 / 2 & 14 / 23 & 21 / 4\end{array}$ | object [5] 17/17 21/7 27/21 |
| matter [2] | multiple [3] 6/25 13/15 25/3 | 30/23 34/25 |
| may [19] $4 / 15$ 4/16 6/17 6/17 | mutually [1] 19/18 | objected [1] 26 |
| 6/18 6/19 9/4 9/18 21/18 | my [16] $2 / 18$ 3/22 $4 / 15$ 9/9 | objecting [6] 8/8 25/21 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 21 & 25 / 13 & 29 / 15 & 30 / 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}12 / 23 & 18 / 19 & 26 / 21 ~ 28 / 3 & 30 / 14\end{array}$ | 36/13 36/13 36/22 36/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}34 / 17 & 35 / 24 & 37 / 1 & 37 / 3 & 37 / 23\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 24 & 34 / 3 & 34 / 7 & 36 / 7 & 37 / 22\end{array}$ | objection [8] 8/6 20/10 |
| 38/3 | 38/12 38/16 | 21/23 25/18 35/24 37/1 371 |
| maybe [1] 14/17 | myself [2] 32/19 37/18 | 37/23 |
| McGLAMRY [3] $1 / 141 / 1410 / 6$ | N | objections [2] 33/4 |
| md [1] 1/3 | nail [1] 13/25 | obtain [1] 37 |
| MDL [1] 38/16 | narrow [2] 31/1 35/3 | obtained [2] 32/14 32/15 |
| me [39] 2/5 4/23 6/13 6/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { narrowed [4] 7/22 } & 13 / 9 & 21\end{array}$ | obviously [6] 3/15 4/6 6/ |
| 7/24 8/16 8/19 9/14 10/19 | $32 / 9$ | $12 / 22 \quad 17 / 19 \quad 30 / 22$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}11 / 4 & 11 / 12 & 12 / 4 & 14 / 12 \\ 1 / 5 / 17\end{array}$ | narrowing [1] 32/12 | occasions [1] 7/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 2 & 16 / 10 & 17 / 5 & 19 / 22 & 19 / 22\end{array}$ | nature [3] 13/7 17/18 38/15 | October [1] 26/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 21/16 } & 21 / 23 & 22 / 9 & 23 / 1 & 23 / 16\end{array}$ | NE [1] 1/15 | $\text { off [3] } 11 / 24 \quad 37 / 16 \quad 38 / 6$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}23 / 24 & 24 / 19 & 25 / 4 & 26 / 3 & 26 / 19\end{array}$ | $\text { necessarily [2] } 11 / 3 \quad 23 / 2$ | office [1] 16/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 5 & 31 / 15 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 6 & 36 / 1 \\ 36 / 21 & 37 / 10 & 37 / 15 & 37 / 17\end{array}$ |  | Official [2] 1/21 39/11 |
|  | 16/7 18/15 18/18 19/7 22/17 | Okay [12] $11 / 12$ 12/2 $12 / 3$ |
| mean [2] | 22/18 24/12 24/12 27/8 28/21 | 13/4 16/9 21/15 21/23 28/2 |
|  | 29/3 29/4 31/4 32/17 32/21 | 28/18 30/4 35/5 36/20 |
| meaning [1] 24/17 | needed [1] 22/12 | Omicron [2] 5/12 38/24 |
| meaningful [1] 25/16 | needs [1] 10/14 | on the [1] 29/21 |
| means [3] 4/7 6/17 7 | negotiated [1] | once [4] 16/24 23/6 27/20 |
| meet [2] 16/24 25/16 | negotiation [1] 4/10 | 28/4 |
| memorized [1] 10/7 | negotiations [1] 4/19 | one [23] $1 / 11 \quad 2 / 24 \quad 3 / 12 \quad 6 / 17$ |
| memory [1] 18/20 | neither [1] 30/14 | $\begin{array}{ccccl} \\ 6 / 22 & 8 / 16 & 9 / 3 & 9 / 14 & 9 / 17\end{array}$ |
| mentioned [1] 25/2 | never [4] 9/20 15/25 19/1 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 11 / 13 / 25 & 14 / 3 & 14 / 4 & 14 / 16\end{array}$ |
| Merry [1] 38/22 | 36/12 | $\begin{array}{llll}14 / 1 & 24 / 6 ~ 25 / 8 ~ 26 / 22 ~ 28 / 18 ~\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { MICHAEL [2] } & 1 / 14 & 19 / 15\end{array}$ | new [10] 17/7 17/16 18/16 | 30/3 32/11 33/10 34/8 |
| mid [1] 14/20 | 27/2 28/10 30/9 31/16 38/11 | one-day [1] 24/6 |
| might [5] 23/4 25/1 | 38/17 38/23 | ones [3] 13/23 21/20 30/15 |
| igram | newly [4] 28/13 28/20 31/17 | ongoing [4] 7/8 26/25 27/3 |
| mind [1] 22/10 | 34/6 | 27/7 |
| sleading [1] | news [1] 16/2 | only [6] 4/18 9/7 16/1 21/19 |
| representative | next [9] 27/25 37/15 37/15 | 26/17 31/11 |
| [1] $12 / 2$ | 37/16 37/17 37/18 37/21 38/6 | open [2] 37/11 37/11 |
|  | 38/14 | open-ended [1] 37/11 |
| month [3] 5/10 5/ | no [11] $1 / 3$ 4/21 4/21 5/6 | operating [1] 23/3 |


| 0 | pick [1] 22 | lem [1] 19/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| opt [1] 8/2 | picking [1] 6/19 | problematic |
| order [5] 2/16 9/1 $11 / 2$ 11/3 | picture [1] 5/2 <br> Pierce [1] 1/22 | problems [1] 5/19 <br> procedures [2] 13/10 36/3 |
| $28 / 19$ ordered [1] 20/2 | Pierce/West [1] 1/22 | proceed [1] 8/17 |
| ordered [1] 20/2 original [1] 8/1 | pills [1] 15/15 | proceeding [1] 30/3 |
| other [23] $4 / 15$ 9/17 9/24 | place [4] 3/15 6/23 14/4 | proceedings [1] 39/8 |
| 10/12 11/14 13/20 13/22 | $\text { plain [1] } 9 / 14$ | process $[9]$ $3 / 14$ $7 / 8$ $17 / 1$ <br> $21 / 10$ $27 / 3$ $31 / 22$ $31 / 23$ $32 / 19$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 24 & 14 / 3 & 14 / 18 & 21 / 24 & 26 / 12\end{array}$ | PLAINTIFFS [24] 1/10 $2 / 6$ 2/7 | $36 / 6$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 28 / 23 & 30 / 5 & 30 / 7 & 31 / 3 & 32 / 1 \\ 34 / 8 & 36 / 2 & 37 / 24 & 38 / 3 & 38 / 5 \end{array}$ | 2/20 4/12 $5 / 3$ 5/4 6/4 9/1 | processes [2] 12/8 13/6 |
| $38 / 24$ | 9/10 9/25 15/7 15/16 15/17 | processing [1] 21/13 |
| otherwise [1] 29/15 | $\begin{array}{llll}23 / 9 & 23 / 25 & 28 / 19 & 33 / 16 \\ 33 / 22\end{array}$ | produce [5] 3/3 16/16 17/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}\text { our [14] } & 3 / 5 & 3 / 9 & 4 / 5 & 4 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rllll}33 / 24 & 34 / 4 & 35 / 14 & 35 / 17 & 36 / 5 \\ \text { Plaintiffs' } & {[1]} & 28 / 9 & \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{llll} 20 / 1 & 35 / 12 \\ \text { produced [5] } & 17 / 14 & 19 / 17 \end{array}\right.$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}7 / 17 & 7 / 18 & 15 / 24 & 16 / 22 & 16 / 22\end{array}$ | planning [2] 8/8 32/9 | $26 / 12 \quad 26 / 21 \quad 29 / 24$ |
| out [17] 6/12 11/18 15 | platform [3] 21/1 21/12 | product [8] 2/2 11/20 14/2 |
| 17/5 19/18 21/11 $24 / 22$ | 21/14 | 15/9 25/9 25/10 26/23 32/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}1 / 26 / 20 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 21 & 33 / 5 & 35 / 21\end{array}$ | platform so [1] 21/1 | production [7] 17/5 19/13 |
| 36/6 36/12 36/17 36/18 | play [1] 36/6 | 20/6 20/17 26/25 27/1 29/8 |
| outside [2] 20/1 29/14 | playing [1] 35/17 | PRODUCTS [1] 1/5 |
| over [10] $2 / 15$ 5/11 14/4 | please [1] 38/20 | prolonged [1] 4/9 |
| 19/11 23/11 23/11 32/4 32/5 | plug [1] 35/15 | proper [1] 26/ |
| $33 / 25$ 36/21 | plus [1] 9/8 | properly [1] 26/8 |
| overlap [1] | point [14] 4/24 5/22 7/2 | proposed [1] 2/25 |
| overly [1] 34/25 | 11/18 $12 / 2415 / 22$ 18/12 | Protective [1] 2/16 |
| overrule [1] 3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 11 & 21 / 18 & 26 / 15 & 29 / 17\end{array}$ | provide [1] 3/2 |
| own [2] 15/12 35/24 | 34/8 | providing [1] 3/24 |
| Oxford [1] 6/8 | ] $28 / 22$ | provision [1] 8/25 |
| P | pole [1] 14/21 | 9/10 9/14 10/5 10/6 10/8 |
| P.C [1] 1/1 | Pope [1] 1/14 | 10/9 10/10 10/13 10/21 11/ |
| PA [2] 1/12 1/19 | position [14] 3/2 3/5 3/5 | 17/13 30/24 |
| packaging [1] 18/6 | 3/18 4/6 9/22 10/2 13/8 | PTOs [1] 11/8 |
| Padfield [3] 5/7 5/13 6/7 | 18/11 $22 / 3$ 23/9 $27 / 25$ 35/21 | pull [1] 18/14 |
| page [1] 29/4 |  | pulling [1] 35/15 |
| PALM [3] 1/2 $1 / 5$ 1/22 | positions [1] 36/11 | purposes [2] 3/19 3/21 |
| papers [1] $4 / 5$ | possible [4] 5/16 5/25 11/ $11 / 1$ | push [2] 23/24 29/2 <br> pushing [2] 27/24 27/24 |
| parameters [1] 29/10 | potential [1] 20 | put [5] 6/5 7/21 21/16 $22 / 14$ |
| $\begin{array}{clllll}\text { Parker } & {[11]} & 5 / 19 & 11 / 17 & 12 / 6 \\ 14 / 15 & 14 / 20 & 14 / 24 & 22 / 22\end{array}$ | potentially [1] 5/23 | 31/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}14 / 15 & 14 / 20 & 14 / 24 & 22 / 22 \\ 22 / 22 & 22 / 24 & 22 / 25 & 35 / 8\end{array}$ | practical [2] 4/24 5/25 | putting [2] 5/23 27/24 |
| rt | practice [1] 3/9 |  |
|  | preliminary [1] 2/24 | $Q$ |
| particular <br> [1] | premature [1] 36/1 | quality [1] 12/18 |
| particularly [1] 18/ | prep [1] 18/15 | question [12] 2/24 |
| parties [9] $2 / 5$ 2/15 $4 / 7$ | prepare [9] 10/15 14/13 | 21/21 $23 / 14$ 27/5 27/13 $29 / 5$ |
| 8/23 8/25 9/15 9/18 10/3 | 16/11 16/17 16/20 28/23 29/5 | 29/13 31/6 31/8 31/17 31/20 |
| / 22 | 33/13 35/12 | questioning [4] 17/18 17/19 |
| parties' [3] 2/25 9/22 11/9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { prepared [5] } 22 / 7 \text { 24/5 } 26 / 5 \\ 28 / 333 / 22 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lllll} \text { 17/22 } 28 / 7 \\ \text { questions [28] } & 4 / 14 & 5 / 4 & 8 / 12 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { party [1] } & \text { 9/18 } \\ \text { passed [1] } & 27 / 19\end{array}$ | prepped [1] 22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 15 & 13 / 1 & 16 / 3 & 16 / 4 & 16 / 19\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { passed [1] 27/19 } \\ \text { past [4] 19/14 19/24 } & \end{array}$ | prescribed [1] 29/14 | 16/20 22/15 23/10 24/3 24/4 |
| $\underset{36 / 3}{\text { past }[4] \quad 19 / 14} 19 / 24 \text { 27/1 }$ | presumably [1] 23/6 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}24 / 12 & 24 / 15 & 25 / 4 & 25 / 5 & 26 / 4\end{array}$ |
|  | presumptive [1] 9/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}26 / 7 & 26 / 8 & 28 / 11 & 28 / 14 & 28 / 25\end{array}$ |
| pause [2] 10/19 12/4 | presumptively [1] 2/20 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 29 / 3 & 32 / 13 & 33 / 20 & 34 / 5 & 37 / 12\end{array}$ |
| Peachtree [1] 1/15 | pretty [3] 4/5 6/2 7/9 previous [1] 12/12 | R |
| pending [1] 37/8 | previously [5] 22/1 27/2 | raise [5] 8/2 28/14 37/2 |
| people [3] 3/2 3/3 18/13 | $29 / 12 \quad 29 / 24 \quad 32 / 3$ | $37 / 25 \quad 38 / 4$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { percent [1] } & 26 / 22 \\ \text { perfect [1] } & 31 / 22\end{array}$ | principled [2] 36/25 37/1 | raised [1] 6/16 |
|  | prior [15] 6/3 23/18 23/20 | raising [1] 15/6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { period [5] } 2 / 19 \text { 12/6 } 12 / 9 \\ & 15 / 11 \quad 15 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 28/13 28/15 30/15 31/2 31/7 | RANITIDINE [2] 1/4 2/2 |
| person [1] 38/24 | 31/9 33/17 33/18 33/20 33/20 | rather [1] 11/13 |
| perspective [1] 15/21 | $34 / 1$ 34/2 | re [3] 1/4 2/2 34/12 |
| Philadelphia [2] 1/12 1/19 | prioritize [1] 21/1 | re-argue [1] 34/12 |
| phone [1] 10/6 | priority [1] 38/16 | reached [1] 36/12 |
|  | probably [1] 22/18 | reaches [1] 35/21 |


| R | revealed [1] 27/ | Scotland [1] 22/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| read [3] 4/4 8/24 9/6 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { review [11] } & 16 / 15 & 17 / 2 & 17 / 3\end{array}$ | scratch [3] 22/4 22/6 22/6 |
| reading [1] 11/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 18 / 14 & 18 / 15 & 20 / 25 & 21 / 1 & 21 / 12 \\ 21 / 13 & 21 / 14 & 29 / 16 & & \end{array}$ | season [1] $5 / 1$   <br> second [5] $7 / 14$ $10 / 19$ $12 / 4$ |
| ready [1] 35/17 | reviewed [2] 2/14 20/19 | 21/17 29/23 |
| $\text { really [7] } 4 / 4 \quad 6 / 4 \quad 12 / 7 \quad 14 / 5$ | reviewing [1] 2/24 | secondary [1] 35/9 |
| $18 / 17 \text { 28/8 } 32 / 16$ | revisit [1] 35/18 | see [8] 5/12 8/11 20 |
| reason [3] 5/6 14/16 $36 / 25$ | right [12] 2/18 2/20 5/ | 23/20 23/20 37/15 38/18 |
| reasons [1] 25/7 | 10/22 11/22 18/25 21/15 | 38/23 |
| recalled [1] 32/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 18 & 26 / 20 & 35 / 23 & 37 / 10\end{array}$ | seek [1] |
| received [2] 20/9 25/21 | 37/22 | seem [1] 11 |
| recently [1] 9/16 | Road [1] 1/15 | seems [1] 24/20 |
| recess [1] 39/1 | ROBIN [1] $1 / 22$ |  |
| $\underset{39 / 8}{\text { record }}[4] \quad 11 / 5 \quad 11 / 10 \quad 34 / 13$ | rolled [1] 11/24 | selective [2] selectill |
| records [2] | ROSENBERG [5] 1/3 1/22 9/23 | sense [6] 7/7 14/24 15/21 |
| $\text { red [1] } 4 / 25$ | 0/2 38/20 | 20/21 20/23 35/22 |
| Reddy's [1] 14/18 | Rosenberg's [1] 9/18 roughly [1] 12/6 | sent [1] 2/15 separate [2] |
| references [1] 2 | $\text { rule [10] } 8 / 16 \quad 23 / 25 \quad 24 / 5$ | September [1] 5/9 |
| refresh [1] 18/19 | 28/3 29/17 35/2 35/21 36/1 | series [1] 14/17 |
| regarding [1] 30/11 | 36/8 37/13 | serious [1] 8/8 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { REINHART [1] } & 1 / 8 \\ \text { reiterate [1] } & \\ \text { 29/11 }\end{array}$ | rules [5] 20/3 28/5 31/21 | serve [5] 23/25 36/4 36/ |
|  | 31/21 31/22 | 36/5 36/5 |
| $16 / 6$ | ruling [8] 9/9 28/3 30/1 | served [2] 24/15 30/15 |
| relates [1] | 33/8 34/3 34/7 37/6 | serves [1] 35/22 |
| relating [1] 14/17 | ruling on [1] 37/6 | set [2] 7/19 19/2 |
| rely [1] 34/6 | rulings [3] | setting [1] |
| relying [1] 12/11 |  | [3] 4/12 6/18 8/9 |
| remarks [1] 36/23 | S | shall [1] |
| remedies [2] 29/17 29/18 | SACHSE [31] 1/17 2/12 2/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { she [12] } & 12 / 19 & 15 / 1 & 21 / 7\end{array}$ |
| remember [6] | 4/3 6/16 7/5 7/12 7/15 8/4 | 23/6 23/7 23/8 34/10 34/10 |
| render | 8/13 10/14 10/20 11/7 11/16 | 34/24 37/3 37/3 37/3 |
| render [1] | $\begin{array}{lllllllll}14 / 12 & 19 / 12 & 20 / 8 & 20 / 15 & 20 / 21\end{array}$ | shipping [3] 7/24 18/5 24/25 |
| pen [2] | 21/23 25/17 26/15 27/9 27/19 | shocked [1] 33/3 |
| reopening [2] | $30 / 23$ 33/3 34/25 36/11 36/18 | shorter [1] 20/6 |
| repeatedly [1] 15/17 | 36/25 38/2 | should [6] 2/18 4/5 14/24 |
| report [1] 7/18 | Sachse's [5] 12/12 17/1 | 25/11 26/6 26/18 |
| Reporter [3] 1/21 39/11 | 18/12 19/10 30/15 | show [1] 6/2 |
| 39/12 [3] 1/21 | safe [1] 38/23 | shows [1] 24 |
| representations | said [12] 2/19 5/11 7/1 7/10 | shuffle [1] 15/5 |
| represented [2] 3/20 | 13/20 15/25 21/7 22/14 25/18 | shut [3] 20/14 20/24 21/2 |
| representing [1] 3/22 | 25/25 29/11 32/22 | side [4] 4/15 6/5 21/16 37/8 |
| represents [1] 3/18 | sake [2] 36/13 36/22 | Signature [1] 39/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { request [7] } & 2 / 4 & 3 / 10 & 17 / 12\end{array}$ | same [6] 12/19 21/25 23/13 | similar [1] 5/18 |
| 21/6 28/9 33/14 37/7 | 24/16 33/8 33/14 | simple [1] 16/23 |
| requested [3] 7/10 8/9 | save [1] 3/12 | simply [2] 22/2 35/11 |
| requesting [1] 36/16 | saw [2] 15/23 16/1 | since [6] 2/19 5/5 14/1 |
| requests [2] 6/3 21/ | say [15] 3/14 6/1 10/10 | 26/21 32/14 32/15 |
| require [1] 34/4 | 16/11 16/12 22/17 24/2 24/7 | Singapore [2] 14/3 18/ |
| required [1] 14/8 | 26/6 26/12 28/5 29/2 34/9 | sit [5] 16/11 16/17 22/1 |
| required [1] | 34/18 36/2 | 23/6 27/8 |
| reschedule [1] 19 reserve [1] $24 / 12$ | saying [10] 9/7 9/24 11/3 | site [2] 15/2 23/5 |
| reserve [1] 24/12 | 15/9 16/9 16/23 21/6 24/17 | sitting [1] 24/5 |
| reserved [1] 4/13 | 26/3 28/24 | situation [2] 9/23 22/16 |
| resident [1] 22/8 | says [7] 6/17 6/18 8/22 8/25 | situations [1] 3/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { resist [1] } & 29 / 21 \\ \text { resolution [2] } & 34 / 22 & 34 / 23\end{array}$ | 24/17 26/16 34/10 | size [1] 20/12 |
| resolution [2] $34 / 22$ 34/23 respect [1] 34/14 | scale [1] 30/11 | smoothly [1] 7/9 |
| respect [1] 34/14 | Scalia [1] 8/20 | so [42] |
| respects [1] 2/16 | schedule [1] 5/12 | soft [3] 4/8 6/22 30/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { respond [4] 6/14 18/12 } \\ & \text { 24/19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { scheduled [2] } & 5 / 16 & 7 / 6\end{array}$ | some [19] $2 / 16$ 9/19 10/14 |
| response [1] | scheduling [2] 6/21 6/25 | 12/13 12/25 12/25 13/17 |
| responsible [1] 19/ | school [2] 4/16 4/17 | 7/22 20/25 21/17 21/18 22/5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { responsible [1] } \\ & \text { rest [1] } 38 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | science [1] 7/3 | 26/6 28/11 31/24 34/22 38/6 |
| retained [1] 25/12 | scientist [1] 22/8 | 38/7 38/14 |
| return [1] 5/21 | scope [4] 8/4 8/14 27/8 | somebody [7] 14/20 15/1 |


| S | tail [1] 25 | $14 / 15 \text { 23/3 } 31 / 21 \quad 34 / 19 \quad 38 / 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| somebody... [1] 35/22 | take $\begin{array}{lllll}{[26]} & 2 / 20 & 3 / 2 & 3 / 18 & 6 / 18 \\ 7 / 2 & 9 / 8 & 9 / 12 & 9 / 13 & 10 / 1 \\ 10 / 23\end{array}$ | think [42] thinks [1] |
| something [8] 7/12 7/14 7/17 |  | third [2] 7/21 9/18 |
| 7/20 8/3 31/10 32/18 33/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 / 24 / 2 & 24 / 21 & 26 / 3 & 30 / 18 & 30 / 20\end{array}$ | this [65] |
| sometimes [1] 36/16 | $30 / 22$ 31/16 31/18 $32 / 25$ | those [34] 6/5 6/21 8/5 $13 / 4$ |
| somewhat [2] 11/13 21/25 | $33 / 11$ 38/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 9 & 14 / 13 & 16 / 4 & 16 / 16 & 16 / 16\end{array}$ |
| soon [1] 37/9 | taken [10] 12/23 $12 / 25$ 13/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 2 & 17 / 14 & 17 / 15 & 20 / 12 & 20 / 24\end{array}$ |
| sorry [2] 29/20 34/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 6 & 15 / 11 & 17 / 23 & 26 / 2 & 26 / 24\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 21 / 3 & 21 / 14 & 21 / 16 & 22 / 15 & 24 / 12\end{array}$ |
| sort [6] 5/18 6/12 11/18 | $32 / 3$ 32/21 | 25/5 26/7 26/10 27/7 28/16 |
| 13/8 13/21 20/25 | es [1] 3/ | 29/6 29/10 $29 / 18$ 33/18 $33 / 22$ |
| sourcing [1] 15/13 | taking [2] 21/10 37/16 | 35/6 35/8 35/19 36/2 37/22 |
| SOUTHERN [1] 1/1 | t | though [6] 18/12 20/24 21/5 |
| special [1] 34/22 | talked [2] 3/6 21/ | thought [6] 7/5 7/9 8/7 17/4 |
| specific [14] 7/23 11/1 13/9 | talking <br> [1] <br> 16/5 | $21 / 730 / 16$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 13 / 18 & 13 / 23 & 16 / 6 & 25 / 1 & 27 / 5 \\ 27 / 12 & 27 / 13 & 30 / 8 & 30 / 11 & 30 / 25 \end{array}$ | target [1] 30/25 | thoughtful [1] 32/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 27 / 12 \text { 27/13 } 30 / 8 \text { 30/11 } 30 / 25 \\ & 32 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | task [1] 22/10 | three [4] 2/25 3/7 6/7 11/15 |
| specifically [5] $13 / 12$ 18/1 | team [1] 32/20 | through [2] 1/8 25/1 |
| 30/2 30/25 32/14 | tee [1] 27/6 | throughout [2] 3/9 23/21 |
| specificity [3] 28/21 34/4 | teed [2] 13/3 17/25 | throw [2] 36/7 |
| 34/24 | tell [6] 15/17 17/21 21 | Thursday [1] |
| spent [1] 15/7 | 25/18 28/21 | time [41] |
| spring [1] 5/5 | telling [1] 23/ | timeline [1] |
| Square [1] 1/11 | ten [2] 18/20 31/12 | times [3] $4 / 9$ 6/25 $25 / 2$ |
| staff [1] 38/21 | terms [1] 9/14 $\text { testified [1] } 1$ | timing [3] 7/12 7/16 8/13 today [7] 2/3 2/23 8/24 |
| stage [1] 23/23 | testify [3] $8 / 116 / 11 \quad 22 / 1$ | 19/21 35/1 37/22 38/4 |
| standard [1] 33/14 <br> start [6] 2/6 9/14 14/15 | testimony [7] 6/3 28/23 | together [2] 19/20 36/21 |
| start [6] 2/6 9/14 14/15 $21 / 9 \quad 22 / 4 \quad 22 / 6$ | 30/10 30/11 30/21 32/17 | too [1] 6/4 |
| started [2] 20/11 21/13 | 32/20 | took [6] 13/17 15/18 21/9 |
| STATES [7] 1/1 1/9 13/16 | text [1] | 24/24 26/12 26/20 |
| 13/25 14/2 27/11 27/15 | textualist [1] | topic [2] 28/7 29 |
| steps [1] 21/9 | than [5] 11/13 18/23 21/24 | topics [7] 22/2 24/1 24/16 |
| still [7] 2/17 2/20 17/6 | 36/2 3 | 28/12 31/17 33/18 37/24 |
| 26/25 27/7 32/21 37/21 | thank [13] 4/2 $4 / 3$ 6/13 6/15 $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 9 & 12 / 2 & 21 / 15 & 35 / 6 & 38 / 2\end{array}$ | totem [1] |
| Stipes [2] 1/21 39/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 38 / 9 & 39 / 2 & 39 / 3 & 39 / 4 \end{array}$ | touched [1] 12/25 |
| stopped [2] 15/3 25/9 | that [286] | towards [2] 7/2 18/9 |
| storage [6] 7/24 13/7 24/21 | that's [9] 7/3 10/21 11/9 | Tracey [1] 2/7 |
|  | 12/14 19/19 21/10 25/23 | TRACY [1] 1/10 |
| tored [1] <br> tory [1] | 30/12 31/15 | transcript [5] 23/18 23/20 |
| raightforward [1] | their [16] 3/3 4/17 8/1 9/10 | 23/21 29/16 39/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { strategic [2] } & 24 / 3 & 31 / 12\end{array}$ | 9/12 $16 / 15$ 24/14 $24 / 18$ 28/1 | transport [4] 13/7 24/21 |
| stream [1] 29/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll}28 / 24 & 29 / 5 & 30 / 22 & 33 / 16 & 35 / 12\end{array}$ | 26/1 28/ |
| Street [2] 1/12 1/19 | 35/23 36/9 | tread [1] 3/17 |
| stuck [1] 31/24 | them [32] 3/11 5/23 9/8 | treat [1] 28/9 |
| sub [1] $22 / 3$ | 10/15 10/15 13/11 16/11 | tried [2] 26/3 32/3 |
| submission [4] 11/17 $12 / 12$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 17 & 16 / 18 & 16 / 19 & 16 / 24\end{array}$ | trouble [1] 11/11 |
| 16/1 25/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 25 & 17 / 2 & 17 / 2 & 18 / 13 & 19 / 5\end{array}$ | true [1] 25/23 |
| submissions [1] | 19/7 19/18 19/19 20/10 21/1 | trust [1] 32/6 |
| such [2] 11/6 33/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}21 / 11 & 27 / 5 & 29 / 4 & 30 / 14 & 35 / 21\end{array}$ | try [2] 35/1 37/4 |
| suggesting [1] 37/17 | $35 / 22$ 36/4 36/4 36/12 36/17 | trying [13] 5/22 7/6 10/20 |
| suggesting you [1] 37/17 | 37/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 5 & 30 / 20 & 31 / 3 & 31 / 5 & 31 / 25\end{array}$ |
| Suite [2] 1/12 1/15 | themself [1] 14/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 8 & 32 / 16 & 32 / 21 & 33 / 4 & 33 / 6\end{array}$ |
| supplied [1] 27/14 | then [18] 3/16 3/18 6/1 $8 / 16$ | turn [3] 2/18 10/20 14/12 |
| supply [5] 22/12 23/2 24/11 <br> 25/14 27/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 9 / 15 & 11 / 12 & 18 / 4 & 18 / 14 & 21 . \\ 26 / 14 & 26 / 22 & 28 / 23 & 32 / 14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { turns [1] } & 36 / 17 & \\ \text { two [16] } & 11 / 12 & 11 / 15 & 11 / 16\end{array}$ |
| suppose [1] 23/8 | 32/15 34/24 35/13 37/14 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}12 / 6 & 12 / 9 & 12 / 10 & 13 / 3 & 13 / 4\end{array}$ |
| suppose [1] <br> supposed [2] | 38/25 | 14/15 17/24 17/25 18/20 |
| $\text { sure [7] } 4 / 46 / 11$ | theory [2] 22/20 22/21 | 20/11 20/18 21/16 36/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 30 / 1 & 34 / 12 & 36 / 15\end{array}$ | there [46] | two-year [2] 12/6 12/9 |
| switched [1] 15/12 | Thereupon [1] 39/5 <br> these [48] | type [2] 7/19 32/5 <br> types [1] 33/4 |
| system [1] 21/11 | they [81] <br> thing [4] | U |
| T | /12 | U.S [5] 12/18 14/6 25/10 |
| tacks [1] 4/24 | things [8] 11/18 13/7 13/12 | 25/11 27/ |


| U | we [202] | 5/24 7/7 7/10 8/3 9/2 10/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ly [1] 13/16 | we'll [1] 27/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 15 & 11 / 16 & 12 / 25 & 13 / 1 & 14 / 8\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { ultimately } \\ \text { unable [2] } & 8 / 1 & 25 / 5\end{array}$ | wearing [1] 4/25 | 14/14 14/18 16/13 16/17 |
| unavailable [1] 36/15 | week [11] 7/14 20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 21 & 17 / 10 & 17 / 17 & 17 / 22\end{array}$ |
| unaware [1] 27/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 15 & 37 / 15 & 37 / 16 & 37 / 17\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 23 & 18 / 8 & 20 / 22 & 21 / 16 & 27 / 12\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { under [4] } & 10 / 5 & 10 / 21 & 11 / 4\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{llllll} 27 / 12 & 28 / 24 & 29 / 5 & 29 / 19 & 29 / 24 \\ 29 / 25 & 30 / 21 & 32 / 25 & 33 / 13 & 35 / 7 \end{array}$ |
| 30/24 | Weiss [1] 1/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 25 & 30 / 21 & 32 / 25 & 33 / 13 & 35 / 7\end{array}$ 35/12 |
| understand [7] 13/5 19/9 | well [9] $7 / 5$ 16/9 $16 / 23$ | witnesses' [1] 36/11 |
| 20/5 31/6 31/25 33/1 33/7 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 19/11 } & 23 / 8 & 25 / 23 & 33 / 23 & 36 / 21\end{array}$ | word [2] 2/22 4/15 |
| undertaken [1] 32/19 | $37 / 19$ le | words [2] 9/24 26/20 |
| underway [1] 21/14 | were [22] $4 / 12$ 4/19 $5 / 2 \quad 7 / 10$ | work [13] 7/11 7/15 7/20 |
| unduly [1] 14/13 | 11/2 12/17 13/10 13/11 13/11 | 8/13 19/12 19/13 20/2 20/3 |
| unfair [1] 16/19 | 13/14 18/4 21/10 23/2 25/3 | 20/17 22/11 36/17 36/20 |
| unique [1] 9/5 | 26/4 26/7 27/2 28/12 31/2 | 37/17 |
| UNITED [7] 1/1 1/9 13/16 | $31 / 7$ 33/20 33/21 | worked [4] 17/23 19/18 19/20 |
| universe [1] 22/3 | WEST [4] 1/2 $1 / 5$ 1/22 $6 / 11$ | 36/21 |
|  | what [55] | working [6] 7/5 7/6 37/15 |
|  | whatever [5] 2/22 29/17 | $37 / 19$ 38/6 38/7 |
|  | 34/23 36/3 36/25 | works [1] 17/1 |
| $25 / 8 \quad 25 / 21 \quad 31 / 10 \quad 35 / 21 \quad 36 / 8$ | whatnot [1] 18/6 | world [1] 16/18 |
| $37 / 5$ | when [18] 3/10 5/8 5/9 5/9 | worried [1] 6/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { up [17] } & 3 / 10 & 6 / 18 & 7 / 3 & 9 / 4\end{array}$ | 5/11 5/21 8/7 12/6 15/12 | worse [1] 37/20 |
| 9/13 13/3 16/25 17/25 19/18 | 15/20 19/16 19/17 21/5 25/9 | worth [1] 18/2 |
| 21/3 22/14 24/8 25/8 25/12 | 25/9 25/17 26/15 33/4 | would [31] 4/20 7/15 7/18 |
| 27/7 33/5 37/5 | where [14] 6/12 6/25 8/1 | 7/24 9/20 9/24 9/25 10/9 |
| upon [3] 9/21 10/12 21/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 17 & 15 / 10 & 15 / 15 & 22 / 16 & 25 / 4\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 21 & 11 / 4 & 12 / 11 & 20 / 5 & 20 / 10\end{array}$ |
|  | 26/19 27/25 31/4 31/15 32/16 | 20/16 20/19 21/20 22/5 22/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { urge [1] } \\ \text { us [10] } & 5 / 16 & 5 / 25 \quad 7 / 1\end{array}$ | 32/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 22 / 18 & 25 / 11 & 26 / 13 & 28 / 6 & 30 / 18\end{array}$ |
| us [10] 5/16 5/25 7/1 14/24 | wherever [2] 35/24 35/25 | $30 / 22$ 30/23 30/23 31/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 2 & 20 / 19 & 24 / 8 & 24 / 9 \\ 38 / 7 & 27 / 24\end{array}$ | whether [16] 3/7 4/7 5/24 | 32/25 34/3 35/8 35/19 |
| 38/7 | 8/19 8/21 9/22 11/6 11/7 | written [1] 4/14 |
| used [3] 13/15 22/2 36/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 12 / 14 & 13 / 9 & 20 / 15 & 23 / 19 & 31 / 7 \\ 33 / 10 & 35 / 22 & 36 / 1 & & \end{array}$ | Y |
| using [1] 30/19 | which [16] 4/21 6/18 7/6 7/7 | year [7] 12/6 12/9 17/5 |
| V | 8/6 9/4 16/15 19/4 21/19 | 36/21 38/11 38/17 38/23 |
| vanishingly [1] 15/15 | $\begin{array}{llll} 23 / 13 & 26 / 13 & 28 / 12 & 28 / 14 \\ 29 / 12 & 30 / 8 & 35 / 16 & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { Year's [1] } & 18 / 16 \\ \text { years [7] } & 4 / 8 & 12 / 3 & 12 / 11 \end{array}$ |
| verbatim [1] 24/16 | whichever [1] 28/18 | 15/3 24/11 27/16 32/5 |
|  | while [2] 21/1 30/9 | Yes [2] 10/24 13/14 |
| $\text { very [16] } 4 / 96 / 20 \quad 6 / 21 \quad 11 / 5$ | who [19] 5/2 6/7 6/8 6/10 | yesterday [4] 12/12 15/23 |
| $11 / 5 \quad 11 / 10 \quad 12 / 2 \quad 16 / 19 \quad 19 / 2$ | 8/20 8/22 10/6 12/25 14/20 | 16/1 25/22 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 15 & 19 / 16 & 30 / 19 & 30 / 25\end{array}$ | 15/1 15/18 15/24 17/7 17/23 | yet [1] 21/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}1 / 18 / 18 & 32 / 23 ~ 36 / 20 ~\end{array}$ | 18/8 22/1 22/8 22/11 38/21 | you [162] |
| view [2] 16/18 30/14 | why [11] 5/6 5/7 5/12 14/12 | you're [1] 31/24 |
| viewpoint [1] 7/17 | 17/5 19/11 21/8 24/22 25/21 | your [43] |
| volume [2] 20/22 20/23 |  | Z |
| voluntarily [1] 3/13 | willing [8] 7/11 7/20 8/13 | ZANTAC [7] $1 / 4$ 2/2 $12 / 20$ |
| volunteer [1] 38/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 10/17 } & 19 / 12 & 19 / 13 & 20 / 6 & 20 / 17\end{array}$ | 13/16 15/3 15/18 27/15 |
| W | winding [1] 11/18 | Zebulon [46] |
| waiving [2] 37/23 38/2 | window [1] 2/17 | Zoom [1] 1/8 |
| want [23] 3/17 9/8 9/10 9/12 | Winterborn [1] 6/8 winters [1] 6/8 |  |
| 12/8 14/16 15/22 17/11 18/13 | wipe <br> [1] 22/10 |  |
| 22/21 26/9 27/5 28/11 28/12 | wish [3] 32/24 38/21 38/2 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 1 & 31 / 18 & 34 / 12 & 35 / 9 & 37 / 12\end{array}$ |  |  |
| 37/15 37/17 37/24 38/21 | within [5] 2/17 17/14 29/6 |  |
| wanted [5] 13/25 14/4 33/11 | $\begin{array}{lllllllll}\text { within [5] } & 2 / 17 & 17 / 14 & 29 / 6\end{array}$ |  |
| 37/25 38/3 | without [2] 37/23 38/2 |  |
| warrants [1] 38/14 | witness [29] $3 / 12$ 3/23 5/7 |  |
| was [55] | $7 / 13 \quad 7 / 16 \quad 8 / 1 \quad 15 / 24 \quad 16 / 3$ |  |
| wasn't [1] 9/7 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} 16 / 11 & 17 / 3 & 18 / 16 & 22 \end{array}$ |  |
| Watts [3] 12/22 16/19 32/19 | $22 / 1 \quad 22 / 6 \quad 22 / 7 \quad 22 / 17 \quad 22 / 19$ |  |
| Watts' [2] 16/18 17/19 | $22 / 21 \quad 23 / 15 \quad 24 / 4 \quad 25 / 5 \quad 26 / 5$ |  |
| way [10] $4 / 14$ 5/11 $9 / 6 \quad 17 / 1$ | $28 / 12 \quad 29 / 15 \quad 29 / 23 \quad 30 / 10$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 9 & 21 / 4 & 23 / 19 & 23 / 21 & 28 / 8\end{array}$ | $33 / 21 \quad 36 / 15$ |  |
| 28/9 | witnesses [38] 5/2 5/2 5/5 |  |

