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THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody. I understand that most everybody has been admitted. We waited a little bit just so we could ensure that we had most of the participants who were planning on joining. I know that we have all of our speakers. I think those new ones who have helped coordinate admitting everybody into the Zoom -- I understand that our usual suspects are taking well-deserved breaks and have handed the baton off to others who are helping in the administration of this Zoom proceeding.

So, it is nice to be here, nice to hopefully start seeing everybody soon in person, and seeing a few of you who will be turning your videos on and presenting here today.

We are here in the MDL Zantac litigation. We are here for a status conference. There was discussion that it might be nice to check in at this point, and there was discussion of another status conference, case management conference, that we are looking to have in September. I want to address that in greater detail.

The plan was, with such excitement $I$ know on all parts, to have somebody appear in person. That is still the plan, although it is a situation that $I$ think we need to continue to monitor, as we have done throughout the course of the past year and a half. All proceedings, as everyone knows, or should know, have been conducted in this litigation by Zoom. Today's proceeding, of course, is also on the Zoom platform.

This is due to the COVID pandemic.
While we are coming out of the pandemic, hopefully, and many of us are feeling freer to enjoy and to experience travel again, hopefully everybody is having a nice break this summer and able to do things perhaps that you were not able to do last summer. With some recent reports about some up tick in numbers with the Delta variant, I know that $I$ will be monitoring it closely, but as a Court, we monitor these matters very, very closely.

We have opened up the courthouses throughout the Southern District of Florida as recently as this month, in the beginning of the month, for pilot jury trials, and they have gone successfully. We have held them in each of the courthouses.

Fortunately, everything has gone well, smoothly. The trials have been taken to completion, both jury and nonjury, but we have a COVID task force that remains in full force and we continue to discuss the situation and monitor it, and would only be inviting you to come and be in our courthouses if we felt it was safe for you to do so.

For planning purposes, let's count on our September 15 th proceeding being in person, but I would want to hear from counsel, whether it is on our Zoom conference today or at some other date, when would be the latest you would want confirmation that, in fact, we are doing our proceeding in
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person so that you would know how to book -- when you needed to book your trip and make accommodations.

I would like to get you the information in a manner that allows you to efficiently and cost effectively plan for being in West Palm Beach. We look forward to hopefully being able to have you there.

So, I look forward to our agenda today. I understand, given some perhaps unexpected matters as it relates to certain travel plans with some of the speakers, as this has been provided to me through the special master, that maybe we are going to go a little bit out of order.

There was an agenda that was circulated, a sketch of an agenda, a little bit earlier, but to the extent that we are going to go a little bit out of order, I want to explain that it was because I wanted to be sure that everyone that needed to be here for purposes of speaking on the topics were here and didn't feel in any way stressed out that they might not be able to make it for the time that they were originally going to appear on the agenda.

For right now -- but again, if anything has changed in the last few minutes, you will let me know. I am not wedded to the schedule, but I understand that we will do pro se litigants first, motion practice next, talk about LDC and hear from a couple of our LDC members, hear from you as to what plans you may think would be good for the Court and for the LDC NextGen
members to be able to gather next.
We want to always hear about the registry and I know that there is a State/Federal update. I understand a PowerPoint presentation will be provided to the Court, and I thank counsel in advance for having submitted that PowerPoint and Word document to the Court so the Court was apprised of the nature of that presentation.

So, with that, let's get underway. I want to thank all of those who have helped coordinate with the Zoom instructions that were circulated. So far, so good. Almost a year and a half into our proceedings everything has gone really smoothly. Again, if anything doesn't go smoothly on Zoom for anyone, please don't ever worry about that, things happen. I could freeze in a moment and hopefully you will be patient and understanding of that.

I do hope everyone is well. I hope that you have had a chance or will have a chance to take some rest and relaxation over the summer. I know everybody has been working hard, you have other matters. Zantac is not the only case, I suspect, on most of your dockets, and I hope that you have been able to spend time with friends and family, that you have been well and healthy.

And again, I appreciate everything that everyone has done throughout the course of the litigation to make it a meaningful litigation for the Court to preside over. The
professionalism remains something that has not gone unnoticed by the Court. The efficiencies by which all of you are working also is something that the Court recognizes each and every time and at every juncture of this case, and I can't express enough how appreciative I am of the ability to preside over a case with such professionals who are willing to do their jobs in ways that reflect creative and innovative techniques that have not been used before.

But by the same token, also relying upon the expertise and experience that, through your many other cases, you have brought to bear and have educated the Court along the way, as well as those who are participating in the litigation, some for the very first time in an MDL.

With that, let me turn it over, and if I could hear from our attorneys who will be presenting on the pro se Plaintiff access to courts. It is an important issue. We do get emails from time to time, we get calls from pro se litigants wanting to know how things are happening in the litigation, how they can get access to information. They don't have Pacer, for example, they are confused, and each and every time we take note of that.

We try to be responsive if there are orders that we can enter independently. If it is something that $I$ think the leads and liaison should be handling, I reach out to our special master, Jaime Dodge, and almost immediately get
positive feedback as to what lead counsel endeavors to do to make navigating a difficult case even for those who are astute and practitioners in how to use all of the technology associated with a case like this.

You can imagine those who are unrepresented how difficult this would be, so it is a very, very important issue to the Court and I know to you as well. I want to thank you for giving it thought and I look forward to hearing what ideas you have about how we can make the process as accessible as possible to pro se litigants who do not have the benefit of counsel such as yourself to navigate them through a complex case of this nature.

So, if I could ask those counsel to turn on their video and their audio.

Good afternoon, Ms. McGlamry. How are you?
MS. MCGLAMRY: Well. How are you?
THE COURT: Good. First of all, let me congratulate you on the birth of your baby son. It is Michael James, I understand.

MS. McGLAMRY: Yes, it is. Thank you.
THE COURT: It is great to see you and to have you back so soon after giving birth. Thank you so much.

MS. MCGLAMRY: Thank you. So, for the pro se litigants, by the parties' counts there are nine pro se Plaintiffs who filed that way. There are an additional
approximately 186 cases where the lawyer has withdrawn due to some issue, mainly nonresponsiveness on behalf of the client, and they have 30 days to appear and otherwise the case would be dismissed. So, should any of those clients appear, they would be pro se and added to the list of pro se litigants.

So, obviously, the issue that came before your Honor was the access to most of the motions in the case and that are available to those of us who practice via Pacer, and although the Court's website does post the PTOs and some of the transcripts, obviously not all of the motions are available.

The parties got together and came up with a solution that we hope will be something that the Court approves of, and that is to create a Dropbox link where the parties will upload all of the motions, a file for the general MDL motions and then also folders for the individual cases should there be a motion that pertains to the specific litigant's case.

The process would be to send a letter to each of the pro se litigants informing them of this solution, asking that they provide us with their email address so that they can be provided with a link that they would then obviously need to keep up with and check the link, you know, on their own to stay apprised of motions and other filings that are loaded to the Dropbox site.

We thought that this was hopefully a good solution, particularly given the current number of pro se litigants, and
this isn't a huge group that we are talking about, and this seems to be the best way to facilitate disseminating this information to the pro se litigants at this time.

So, if that is agreeable to your Honor, the parties will submit a draft PTO next week kind of explaining the process prior to effectuating it.

THE COURT: Okay, that sounds terrific, and I think getting a draft PTO for the Court's review would be helpful because I can match what you're proposing in the PTO with the kinds of calls we get to ensure that there is a connection between what you are proposing in the PTO and at least to our knowledge the kinds of inquiries, confusion, and questions that we are getting. If I see that there is something missing, certainly $I$ will fill that in and send it back for you all to review.

Furthermore, when we do get calls, which I suspect we may still get in the future -- while I do recognize the number is small, as you mentioned, about eight or nine, it potentially could grow with the pending withdrawals, and who knows in the future. So, I think this is a good proactive preemptive measure to take.

It would also ensure that should we continue to get the phone calls when the PTO is entered, that those who answer the phone call in our chambers, because we do like to be responsive, while not giving legal advice, is to be able to
point them to a particular PTO and, quite frankly, we can even draw from the PTO to give them the kind of information that is in it.

I suspect it will work if people, one, I guess have access to a computer and an email, number one; and two, the onus would be upon them to regularly check it. They wouldn't be getting notices of filings and things of that nature, so they would have to regularly check it.

MS. MCGLAMRY: Perfect.
THE COURT: Okay. That sounds really good. I will
look to get that, you think sometime next week?
MS. MCGLAMRY: Yes.
THE COURT: Excellent. I appreciate it so much.
MS. McGLAMRY: Thank you.
THE COURT: Good to see you, and be well.
Okay. Thank you so much on that, I really appreciate it. It is something that we are always mindful of. We treat everyone the same and the standards are the same for pro se litigants and non pro se litigants, but we recognize the difficulties that the pro se litigants have in navigating litigation in general, particularly in a case like this.

So, anything we can do on your part and our part to be sure that they are aware, that they know how to get access to the information and can make informed decisions is in the best interest of the system overall. So I really appreciate that.

XX So, let's move on, then, to a discussion about potential motion practice, $I$ guess is the best way to generally refer to it. The special master has informed me of some discussions that have been going on over the course of the last couple of weeks, maybe a few weeks, resulting from the orders that the Court entered on the Motions to Dismiss, and as I understand, the potential for motion practice as it relates to certain procedural rulings, perhaps, that the parties may believe are needed, although they may not see exactly eye to eye on what is needed.

I am speaking in very vague and general terms because I have not seen anything, and as you know, I am someone who likes to kind of know what I am talking about before I embark on talking about it.

I figured the best way to learn about it, not getting into the substance because we are certainly not having motion hearings today, is simply to have those who are knowledgeable about what it is that you want, and why you want it, to tell me that, not getting into substantive argument, and let's see if we can't come up with a schedule for notifying, apprising, motioning the Court to apprise the Court that if it is a ruling that you need, or an entry of a particular order, or an entry of a judgment or something of that nature, that $I$ can accomplish that if $I$ think that that is appropriate.

So, with that, let me have those of you who are here
to tell the Court a little bit more, take the mystery maybe out of the vagueness that $I$ am referring to.

So, let's see. Let's have counsel state their appearance for the record who are appearing on the Zoom platform at this time.

MR. MCCLOUD: Good afternoon, your Honor, Luke McCloud of Williams and Connelly.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. McCloud.

MR. GILBERT: Good afternoon, your Honor, Robert Gilbert on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Gilbert. I hope both of you are doing well and have had some time to take a vacation this summer.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, Judge, trying.
MR. MCCLOUD: Same here, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Great.
So, tell me what it is that is needed in the litigation from each of your perspectives and how the court can accomplish that for you, if it is something the court can accomplish.

MR. MCCLOUD: Mr. Gilbert, you can start.
MR. GILBERT: Thank you, Mr. McCloud. Your Honor,
good to see you again and hope you and yours are well also and enjoying some down time.

I am standing in for Mr. Keller who is on a plane
right now. I participated in a lengthy conversation with Mr. McCloud and Mr. Keller and Special Master Dodge yesterday. I will try to do this justice as best I can. There essentially are two issues or two concepts at play here.

First, there is an appellate deadline coming up, a hard and fast appellate deadline coming up based on your order at Docket Entry number 3750, the order granting the generic Defendants' Rule 12 Motion to Dismiss on preemption.

It is our belief that while the order itself standing on its own is clearly appealable as a final order with regard to those claims that are addressed for those parties set forth in that order, there is the need for a clarifying order that will make it clear to the Plaintiffs' Bar writ large that the ruling set forth in Docket Entry 3750 applied to those applicable short form complaints where the claims covered by your ruling are addressed.

And so, the initial conversation -- the initial idea, let's call it order number one, if you will, that Mr. Keller and Mr. McCloud and the special master were discussing yesterday was a clarifying order that the parties are working to try to reach agreement on, but have not yet been able to do so.

Absent the ability to do so, say, by the end of today or tomorrow, given the pending appellate deadline, which I believe is either August 8th or 9th, the parties have worked
out an arrangement, subject to your Honor's approval, to submit our competing orders to the Court under one filing tomorrow, by the close of business tomorrow. The orders would be attached to a simple administrative motion.

It would not really present argument in the motion itself, but simply attach the two orders, and the Court would be able to see the two orders, and by close of business Monday, both we and the Defense would file our respective submissions, no more than 15 pages each, that would address why we believe the order that we submitted is the appropriate one and why the order that the other side submitted is not the appropriate one.

We thought that by submitting both orders together with one simple non-argumentative administrative motion, it would allow the Court to have a clean entry on the docket, see what both sides have to say on Monday, and then enter one of the two orders, either with or without argument, later next week in advance of the August 8 th or August 9 th deadine.

From Plaintiffs' perspective, I would be remiss in saying, and Mr. Keller would scold me if I didn't say this, that whether the Court enters one of those two orders or not on or before August 8 th or 9 th -- and I apologize for not knowing exactly which of those two dates it is -- prior to the appellate deadline arising under Docket Entry 3750, it is our view that that is a hard and fast appellate deadline, and so notices of appeal will be filed by all that believe they are
affected by Docket Entry 3750 on or before that appelate deadline with or without this order.

This clarifying order, though, would help not only in terms of the Appellate Court, but also in terms of the Plaintiff's Bar writ large. So, that is the first issue.

The second issue -- maybe I should turn over to Mr. McCloud so he can address the first one. Then we can take the second one afterwards.

THE COURT: Before you turn it over to Mr. McCloud, you didn't really articulate what the relief sought in the order is. Can you just encapsulate that so I have kind of a -even just a terminology that $I$ can refer to it as?

What is the relief sought? When an order is issued, it is doing something. It would normally be preceded by a motion, and we can talk about that in a moment, but $I$ want to hear from Mr. McCloud. What is the relief that you envision being sought in these proposed orders?

MR. GILBERT: Put simply, your Honor, the relief sought would be an order that makes it explicit and clear that the rulings under Docket Entry 3750 apply to all short form complaints where the relief that is being sought by those individual Plaintiffs is sought on claims that are brought only against the generic Defendants, the distributor Defendants, and/or the retailer Defendants, and where they have no further litigation to pursue because they have no further claims
pending against the brand Defendants under their individual short form complaints.

Does that help answer your question?
THE COURT: Yes. And you have identified those short form complaints, or you would be in the process of doing that, or is that not necessarily relevant to the relief sought, because it would be ultimately incumbent upon the Plaintiffs to know who they are, who would qualify for falling into that category that you have just described?

MR. GILBERT: I believe the best answer would be both. Both sides have done their best to identify, using the data available through LMI, those short form complaints that appear to name -- to raise claims only against the dismissed Defendants, but we are unable to be certain, one hundred percent certain, and also, frankly, do not view it as being our exclusive responsibility to make that decision for individual Plaintiffs' lawyers around the country who have filed these short form complaints.

Therefore, while we are doing our best to identify those and apprise those lawyers, there is responsibility on the part of the individual Plaintiffs Bar at large to know what they have filed and to know what their appellate deadlines are.

Therefore, this order will help memorialize that on the CM/ECF docket, coupled with a Plaintiffs webinar that we will undertake to hold ourselves.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, Mr. McCloud.
MR. MCCLOUD: Thank you, your Honor. I think that Mr. Gilbert has accurately characterized the nature of the dispute between the parties and what the parties are seeking.

In terms of the exact procedural mechanism that would be at issue, it is Defendants' perspective that the most appropriate procedural vehicle would be the entry of $a$ judgment under Rule 54(b), and we this morning circulated to Plaintiffs' counsel a draft of a proposed order that would make clear that the category of cases that are at issue are now being dismissed, both the claims in the long form complaints and the claims in the short form complaints.

From our perspective, your Honor, it would be valuable to have a list of the short form complaints that are subject to the Rule 54(b) order and so we have proposed in our draft order to include that as an exhibit to the pleading.

I take Mr. Gilbert's point that the LMI data is not always one hundred percent accurate, and so if it was necessary, we can certainly include some language to the effect that this is not an exhaustive list and not necessarily totally binding on the parties, but is a good faith effort to come up with a list of the Plaintiffs who would be affected by the order.

So, I think, your Honor, that the end result is, there is agreement between the parties in terms of what we would like
the Court ultimately to do. There is still some disagreement, although I am hopeful we can resolve that, on the exact nature of the procedural order.

To answer your Honor's earlier question about the structure of the briefing, what we had proposed during the conversation yesterday with Mr. Keller and Special Master Dodge was a truncated briefing schedule along the lines that Mr. Gilbert described, and from our perspective there were two advantages to that.

One was it would get the issue in front of the Court for the Court's consideration more quickly. As Mr. Gilbert mentioned, from Plaintiffs' perspective, they have a deadline of August 9 th to file appeals from the Court's orders. So we thought that if it was possible to get a ruling from the Court prior to that date, that would be desirable.

The second point was that having the proposed orders together with the briefing all at the same time might make the differences between the parties' legal positions and any potential effect of the orders that would be entered more understandable to the Court.

All of that said, if the Court would prefer a more traditional briefing structure, we would absolutely go along with that. I think the goal here was just to come up with a structure that would be workable for the Court, and if that is the traditional briefing structure, we would be happy to do
that.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. McCloud, I appreciate it.
I think this may be an example of where you all have a much clearer picture of where you are than I do, understandably, because you have been talking about it, I presume, for weeks, because it is July 28th, and the last order came out on July 8th, so it is 20 days.

While $I$ referenced the special master raising it with me, that is really all she has done, is communicated, with your all authority, that there was this issue out there, and $I$ have been waiting really over the past few weeks to hear whether you wanted me to do something or not. So, I still don't have the particulars, I haven't seen anything, nor necessarily should I have seen anything until you are ready to file.

So, because I am not as comfortable with the particulars as you are, I kind of feel that a more traditional schedule would work, and I will tell you why.

What I mean by that is, to receive two proposed orders with no explanation doesn't tell me anything about why. If they are different, I will just be looking at them, and I kind of feel like, so I will be looking at them and $I$ won't be able to do anything with them, think about them, research them, give it the kind of analysis and thought that I'd like to, and so I am just sitting idly by until whenever the date was you propose that the oppositions, even Monday, and could be the end of
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Monday, so then I am looking at Tuesday.
We are getting down to the wire now. Next week is the last week, whether it is the $8 t h$ or $9 t h$.

So, I want to really understand -- so, one, it wouldn't give me the benefit of all of the things you know and have, quite frankly, had the benefit of discussing for three weeks. I am not privy to those conversations and I feel I would be disadvantaged, and I wouldn't want to jump to any conclusions erroneously about a proposed order or orders without the benefit of hearing why, why the order.

Also, you know, a proposed order doesn't usually get docketed in CM/ECF. You could, but it doesn't really carry any weight, it is just there. Normally what you would do is you would file a motion. You could consider attaching the proposed order to the motion if you wanted it as a matter of record, but then $I$ would probably also ask you to email it to me to the Zantac email, because to the extent that $I$ use one or the other, I would want it in Word format and either adopt it in full or I'd tweak it, just like I do with your PTO's. Sometimes you see them back just as you submitted them. Other times you see that they have been changed.

So, what I think would be most helpful to the Court -and again, it is speaking a little bit out of ignorance, so I have to fall back on what $I$ know and how I generally do things -- is, $I$ would want to see -- if the Plaintiffs are
seeking a certain type of relief, relief for final judgment, relief for partial judgment, relief for final orders of dismissal, relief for clarification, whatever that relief is, I'd want to see a motion, because that is how you get relief, it is from the motion. Because without a motion, I'd really kind of be acting sort of on my own, and then the Appellate Court might say, well, why is she just acting on her own.

But less so really for the Appellate Court, although I certainly like to do things right, I would want to know by what authority I am acting, why I am acting. Maybe it is something I could or should have done sua sponte, but I don't even know yet because I haven't seen what you have to present to me.

I would like to have a Plaintiffs' motion articulating the relief you seek, why you seek it, the legal basis for it, so the substantive law, any procedural, Rule 54, or any other rules that you are looking at, and a proposed order, I suppose, attached to it. So then I have the benefit of looking at your order and understanding your thinking, your brain power behind it, your rationale, your legal basis for it.

Then on Monday, I would like to see the opposition or the response, and it could be you agree in part and you oppose in part, and maybe the opposition is just very slight, and you will tell me why you agree. So that would give me further corroboration that you are in agreement, let's say, as to 70 percent of the law, or maybe all of it, but you just don't
think it should produce -- the results should be the same by way of an order.

Maybe you have a different view on the law or what procedural vehicle is invoked. I don't know, but I would learn that through an opposition memorandum, where you do all of the things you do in a memorandum, and you all do them very well and very thorough, and then you would have your proposed order by Monday.

Then, by the end of Monday, which still gives me the week, I have a fully briefed motion. Now, a fully briefed motion would involve a reply. We could have the reply due on Wednesday. The default could be the reply comes in, so it gives the Plaintiff one last opportunity to respond to the opposition.

If I look at both of them and I see I don't need one, and you want me to let you know I don't think I need one to save you the time, I can do that, but I don't know when you would be submitting the opposition on Monday, so maybe it comes in really late on Monday. I really won't know if I need a reply until later on Tuesday after $I$ look into it myself. So, maybe the default should just be there is a reply on Wednesday.

And so, this is really called like an expedited briefing schedule for motion practice under Rule 7 of the local rules.

Does the issue lend itself to that?

MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, Robert Gilbert on behalf of the Plaintiffs. First of all, of course the parties will do whatever makes more sense to the Court, and $I$ hear what you are saying. Given that you want a traditional motion, given that Mr. Keller is today on a five-hour flight, and we did not anticipate actually filing a formal motion with argument tomorrow, here is what I would propose to the court for your consideration. Unfortunately, I haven't had a chance to discuss it with Mr. McCloud, so he will have to reply to it on the fly as well.

Rather than submitting something tomorrow, which we may not have adequate time to prepare a full motion, what $I$ would propose is we submit our formal motion per your request with our proposed order attached by Friday evening, by midnight Friday evening. That gives us tomorrow -- the balance of today and tomorrow and Friday to get it together. We will attach our proposed order.

The Defendants, rather than having to get their response in by Monday, could file their response or opposition by Tuesday, and we'll waive the reply. We'll waive the reply. That way you will have the fully briefed motion by Tuesday night. If you feel the need to have a short oral argument on it you could do so later next week. If not, you will have the fully briefed motion when you come into court or when you turn on the computer on Wednesday morning.

But we would be willing to waive the reply under those circumstances, but it will give us enough time this week to get a formal motion filed for your Honor's consideration.

MR. MCCLOUD: Your Honor, Luke McCloud for Defendants. That is acceptable to us.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what you are saying, then, is a -- that the Court -- pursuant to agreement by all parties as a result of our discussion here at the status conference, the Court could go ahead and enter an order reflecting the agreement of the parties that a motion will be filed -- shall be filed -- to the extent that the Plaintiffs seek further relief emanating from the Motions to Dismiss as it relates to appellate related issues, that any such motion that the Plaintiffs seek to file shall be filed by no later than Friday, along with a proposed order, and a response shall be filed by the Defendant no later than Tuesday, with Plaintiffs waiving the reply to such opposition.

MR. GILBERT: That makes sense to the Plaintiffs, your Honor. Again, Robert Gilbert for the record.

I am pausing and would ask the Court to just consider one thing. This only relates to matters arising -- relating to the personal injury -- the amended master personal injury complaint, and I don't know, and would not want your order to be misconstrued to somehow negate any potential discretionary 1292 motion that may or may not be filed in the near future
with regard to your rulings under the class complaints.
We are only talking today -- Mr. McCloud and I are only discussing with you the appellate rights arising from your rulings as to the amended master personal injury complaint, and I think that that is what we are addressing through this motion, and $I$ believe that your order directing this briefing, or this motion practice should be limited to that, with respect.

THE COURT: Okay. I want to make sure I get the language right, that the parties have agreed any motion practice relating to, um-m-m, an order that it wishes to have the Court issue relating only to appellate rights arising from the Court's rulings on the amended personal injury complaint would be subject to the abbreviated expedited briefing schedule that has been set forth here.

Motion by Friday with proposed order, opposition with proposed order by Tuesday, all filed on the CME docket, but with the proposed orders in Word form also being filed in the Zantac email.

MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, Robert Gilbert for the Plaintiffs. That is acceptable.

THE COURT: And waiving the reply. Okay.
What about time, did you want until midnight on those two days? Do you want the Court to set a deadline at five o'clock, or something of that nature, close of business? What
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were you thinking?
MR. GILBERT: I would appreciate that you not set a deadline, that we simply use the 24 -hour clock for those two dates, both for ours as well as for the Defendants.

MR. MCCLOUD: I agree with that. I am hopeful we can get the submissions in before midnight, but just in case, I think that is advisable.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you want page limitations on your motion and your opposition?

MR. MCCLOUD: We had previously suggested 15 pages in our conversations with Special Master Dodge. I think that would be acceptable in this context as well, but we are also fine to rely on the default limits.

MR. GILBERT: Judge, we are okay with 15 pages. We had talked about it yesterday.

THE COURT: Okay. 15 pages for the motion and 15 pages for the opposition. Just try to be very clear what you want, why you want it, what it pertains to. If you are going to point out all the short form complaints and pursue that, then do so. If you're not, then don't and explain what the implications are of what you are asking the Court to do, what the legal authority is, whether this is something that is sort of, you know, founded in law, you know, case law, MDL case law, the rules of procedure.

Just try to be as clear -- and if there is no law you
are relying upon, but you just want it because it is cleaner and clarifying and you are trying to anticipate maybe something the Eleventh may say, and trying to get to it first, be transparent with the court about that, too, just so I am not searching for something that doesn't exist, and I know that it -- you know, it is something you are asking for, but I wouldn't necessarily find a rule that provides for it or a case that supports it.

MR. GILBERT: Robert Gilbert on behalf of the Plaintiffs. Your Honor, we, of course, will do so, and we'll endeavor to make it as clear and as concise as possible.

MR. MCCLOUD: Luke McCloud for Defendants. We will do the same, and, your Honor, just to reiterate something I said before, we are still hopeful that we can reach agreement with the Plaintiffs on this issue. If we are able to reach agreement we will keep Special Master Dodge and the Court apprised, because that would likely moot the need for briefing.

THE COURT: Yes. I guess the only thing I would say about if you reach agreement is, if agreement is reached, you'd want to get your agreed upon motion in on Friday with the agreed upon proposed order.

I still think there should be a motion, it could probably be much shorter, but $I$ would want to know why I am being asked to do some things, I'd want an explanation. I could see it being a joint agreed upon unopposed motion for
entry of $X$, here is $X$ attached, and here is why we believe it is the right thing to do.

I don't think it moots out the motion, but it does sort of change the procedural. If you are very close, but you haven't reached the agreement and it is still Friday, then I would expect the unilateral motion from the Plaintiff with the proposed order.

MR. GILBERT: We understand, your Honor, and we will do as you request.

THE COURT: Okay. I know you had a second point, so I didn't want to overlook that. That takes care of what we will call proposed motion practice, with an order that the court will set out today memorializing what we have just discussed that relates to appellate rights arising from rulings on amended personal injury complaint and the briefing schedule.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, Judge. I am going to invite Mr. McCloud to actually discuss the second issue initially and then I will respond to him.

MR. MCCLOUD: Your Honor, with the Court's permission, I am actually going to invite either Mr. Barnes or Mr. Gugerty to address that issue. They have been taking the lead on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Good afternoon, Mr. Barnes and Mr. Gugerty.

MR. BARNES: Good afternoon, your Honor. Your Honor, on behalf of generic Defendants, we have engaged in discussions
with the Plaintiffs regarding the cases involving -- the claims involving the generic Defendants, the distributors and the retailers, and cases that also involve the brands. So, what we have asked the Plaintiffs to agree to is the entry of Rule 54(b) certification of the final judgment as to all claims as to the parties that were subject to your July 8th order dismissing all claims, as well as the June 30 order as well.

Mr. Keller advised us yesterday that the Plaintiffs would not be willing to agree to the entry of a $54(\mathrm{~b})$ certification of a final judgment as to the claims that were ruled on as to the generics only and the distributors only and the retailers.

So, we have agreed, with the special master's assistance last evening, to propose a briefing schedule to your Honor where you could consider the merits of our $54(\mathrm{~b})$ arguments and rule in an orderly way pursuant to motion.

The schedule we have outlined on those claims is Monday, August 2nd, the Defendants would submit their motion in support of their request for a $54(\mathrm{~b})$ certification as to the claims I have described, the Plaintiffs would file their opposition on August 11th, and we would file our reply on August 16th.

There is no time limit for your Honor in terms of a ticking clock as to jurisdictional issues for appeal, and the appeal would run from -- the time for appeal would run from the
date of the certifying order.

So, I think that is the state of play on the claims that involve the brands and the dismissed Defendants, the claims that we would want to take up with the other claims that are going up pursuant to the Plaintiffs' Notice of Appeal per your Honor's order on January 9th -- I'm sorry, on August 9th.

THE COURT: Again, to summarize, we sort of talked about the relief sought in the first motion that was being discussed, being by the Plaintiffs, relates to relief sought for purposes of appellate rights arising from rulings on amended personal injury complaint.

How would you characterize the relief that the Defendants are seeking and which Defendants, again, would be seeking it?

MR. BARNES: I believe I am accurate in saying that the retailers and distributors will join in this motion, but it would be the generic retailers and distributors motion requesting the Court to certify certain claims by certain parties under Rule $54(\mathrm{~b})$ for final judgment, leaving behind the claims that are not dismissed against the brands to be before your Honor and continue in this MDL.

We can with work on the language, but that is my summary for your Honor's consideration.

THE COURT: The briefing schedule that you would be proposing would be Monday would be the motion. Which day would
be the --

MR. BARNES: I'll repeat them, your Honor. August 2 nd would be the Defense motion requesting the relief, August llth would be the Plaintiffs' opposition to the motion, and then the Defense would file their reply on August 16th.

THE COURT: Okay. Attached to your motion, would you envision, or could you also envision having a proposed order so I can also visualize what the relief looks like in the form of a -- not just a form order, granted or denied, but what it actually looks like, which could be attached to the motion, but also emailed to the Zantac email?

To the extent that the opposition by the Plaintiffs would feel -- the Plaintiffs would feel that it would be helpful -- the Plaintiffs may say we don't want anything at all, so we are not submitting any proposed order because you shouldn't do this, but to the extent that they agree in part with what you are asking, but they think the order should look differently, that they would include a proposed order with their response.

Is that something -- and I am going to turn to the Plaintiff in a moment to see whether you even agree with this briefing schedule and want to be heard on that as well.

Is that something Defendants would contemplate and be amenable to?

MR. BARNES: Yes, your Honor. I think we would be
submitting a proposed order setting forth the grounds for the relief as required under the Eleventh Circuit case law, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do the Plaintiffs agree -- it sounds like you don't agree with the relief being sought, but with this kind of a briefing schedule as to the issue relating to the generic distributor and retailers' request to have a certification of certain claims and parties under 54(b)?

MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, Robert Gilbert on behalf of the Plaintiffs. Before answering your question let me just say I want to make sure the record is clear with regard to something Mr. Barnes noted.

This is an issue that was, to my understanding, first raised with us the day before yesterday during a lengthy call that I participated in for almost two hours. This is not something that we have been discussing for weeks, unlike the matter that Mr. McCloud and I just covered with your Honor.

It was raised for the first time the day before yesterday, and we informed the Defendants yesterday -- I think we informed them on the call on Monday that it was not something we would agree to, but we confirmed that yesterday.

So the record is clear, this, so the Court can understand it, we view as being extraordinary relief. It would implicate all one thousand plus short form complaints that are on file in this MDL, not just the approximately one hundred complaints that I believe only implicate claims brought against
generic retailers and distributors. So, we will vigorously oppose this motion on the merits.

We had agreed yesterday to the briefing schedule that Mr. Barnes just outlined. We agreed to it in part with the understanding that our submission on the first issue would be -- would find favor with the court.

Now that we are going to be submitting a traditional motion and the Defendants are going to be submitting a response, and we have waived the reply, I do think that the landscape has changed a little bit. I have no problem with the Defendants filing their motion. They have apparently been taking about this for weeks, but shared it with us recently.

I think we should go ahead and respond to that motion within the local rules provision and let them file their reply within the period that is provided. As Mr. Barnes noted, there is no urgency to this issue. There is no appellate deadline that is implicated by it, and it will give all parties the opportunity to provide thoughtful analysis of a much more heady issue, frankly, that I think deserves the Court's consideration.

If the Court wants to shorten our response time by a few days and have us stick with ten days after they file their motion being -- not being any earlier than August 11, we, of course, will abide by the Court's ruling. But given the change in how we are doing the first one, it does implicate the second
one as well.
So, can we do it in ten days, our opposition? Yes. Would I prefer to have the 14 days? Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. If there is no time urgency, can that one be briefed out under the local rules by both page limit and timing, or at least by timing? Then $I$ will hear from you on page limit.

MR. BARNES: By the local rules is fine with us, your Honor. We would like it expedited, but I'd like to comment on Mr. Gilbert's comment.

THE COURT: Before you do that, just so I heard you, you are okay with the local rule?

MR. BARNES: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So. we will do that by the local rule deadline. Before you respond, are you all -- should you do the page limit by local rules as well?

MR. BARNES: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Gilbert?
MR. GILBERT: Yes, that works for us, Judge.
THE COURT: Okay. We will do an order on that as well. I will hear from you, Mr. Barnes, but two orders will go out today simply setting briefing schedules for two motions that $I$ will be getting along the lines of what we have just discussed here today. Mr. Barnes.

MR. BARNES: Briefly, Mr. Gilbert was not involved in

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter
this conversation, but the entire Defense team met with Mr. Keller and the special master well before Monday to discuss briefing issues and appellate issues, and on that call, while we didn't get into the specifics, he was aware that we intended to have all claims before the Eleventh Circuit by the generics.

It wasn't sprung on them in any sense, and we went over in detail the Plaintiffs' proposal as to how -- the appeals, and we worked with Mr. Keller before that. So, his statement isn't entirely accurate.

THE COURT: All right. I know you have a lot going on, and a lot of people are on some calls, some people are on other calls, so I am going to assume that everyone is trying to keep apprised, but it is hard for any one person, maybe other than Special Master Dodge, to have all of the knowledge of all of the issues, and maybe she doesn't even have that, but she may be the closest person.

So, not a problem at all, and it's not affecting my thinking. I want to give you the time you need, and with the other motion, I will just reiterate the same things. Please be very clear in what you are seeking, on whose behalf you are seeking, what the relief is, what the basis is for it in the law, whether there is case law, is this a MDL kind of relief, is it -- if so, are there other MDLs that have done this, what are the rules that you are relying upon.

Just try to be very, very clear and very much based in
the law, if the law exists. If you believe this is sort of a discretionary thing, let me know so $I$ am not -- if you don't cite law, I am not chasing law that doesn't exist. Just try to lay it all out there for me, and the same for the response.

MR. BARNES: Thank you, your Honor, of course. THE COURT: Okay. Does that cover motion practice? MR. BARNES: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Post Motion to Dismiss motion practice. MR. GILBERT: From the Plaintiffs' perspective, it covers the post MTD motion practice, relating to the MTDs, yes, Judge.

THE COURT: I can't shut it down because it is not on the case management schedule, I have to allow this to go forward? It didn't make it on to the schedule.

MR. GILBERT: We can always redo the schedule if the Court --

THE COURT: No, no, no. Let's not open that can of worms, not today at least. It sounds like everybody will be heard, will be heard in the fashion and in the time that you want to be heard. I understand that the first motion is the one that is more time sensitive, the second one not so much, although things are always treated as time sensitive in our chambers.

What I mean by time sensitive, by a date, and I suppose it probably would behoove the Plaintiffs to let the

Court know that date, whether it is the 8 th or 9 th, in your motion papers. We will look forward to getting those by both motion and also the proposed orders in Word format to the Zantac email address.

Is that everything from everybody?
MR. BARNES: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.
MR. GILBERT: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thanks so much, appreciate it.
Okay. So, now we will talk about something lighter and of a different ilk. I guess we will call Mr. McCloud back on and Mr. Lear.

It is actually always nice when the LDC and NextGen lawyers are not only appearing just to tell me what should we do with the LDC and NextGen lawyers, but they're actually there on the screen because they are doing the heavy lifting and doing the work, which $I$ know you are doing. It's not that if $I$ don't see you on the screen $I$ don't think you're doing it. I know you are doing it.

I just think it is always nice for the judge to be able to see the lawyers, and that goes for everyone, even, let's say, PSC members who are doing work, but are not necessarily having the interaction with the court. I guess I should let the leads know that, that it is helpful. It is helpful for judges to know what lawyers are doing.

I think I mentioned this before, but, you know, when I
went through the leadership selection process, among the many things that I did, I called other judges about the applicants whom I had received in the application process when those applicants had listed the cases they had worked on and the judges with whom they had performed work in those cases to ask what the judge's experiences were with those lawyers.

If the judge doesn't see the lawyer, and the judge doesn't know the lawyer worked on a particular matter, and the lawyer's name isn't on the submissions, and often it is just the leads, it is hard for the judge to know, and I think it is important that you apprise the judge, particularly in this business of MDL where you may be seeking leadership appointments in the future and will be using me or other judges as references, so to speak.

I don't mean in the traditional sense, but someone may call and say, oh, Lear, I saw he was on the Zantac case, or McCloud, how did he do, or what did he do. I don't know, I never saw McCloud, I have no idea, or, oh, yeah, McCloud, he appeared several times, and this was my experience with him. So keep that in mind. I don't really do this just for like showcasing. I want you, Mr. McCloud, and Mr. Lear to know that, and everyone else, this is real. How you conduct yourself, even if it is a small matter -- I have always said how you handle the small matters is equally important as how you handle the big matters. Our talking about whether we are
going to have a breakfast on September 15, while it may seem small, how you handle it is going to be noted by the Court and that is sort of why I do it.

Also, it kind of takes the fear away a little bit, right. The more you do something, the less intimidated you are, the less mysterious it is. I just want you to know there is substance behind why I like to see you, even though I like to see you anyway, and $I$ think it is good for you and it's good for the other lawyers on the case so that they are really mentoring you and helping you in this case and also the career that you follow after this case with future MDLs, if you are going to stick with the MDL business, and also it is good for me to know and hear what you are doing.

With that really awesome introduction, let's hear what you have on the agenda for this part of what we are discussing today.

MR. MCCLOUD: Thank you, your Honor. For the record, Luke McCloud of Williams and Connelly for the Defendants.

Your Honor, we completely agree and we really appreciate the opportunity to be seen and heard by the court. It is a very meaningful opportunity, as your Honor said, and I think I speak for all of the LDC members and the NextGen lawyers on that point, which actually brings me to the subject that we wanted to raise with the Court today.

I know from speaking to my colleagues, the LDC members
greatly enjoyed the opportunity to meet the Court during the earlier Zoom brown bag lunch session the Court hosted. If the Court is amenable to it, we would be interested in another LDC event, perhaps one scheduled around the September 15 th case management conference.

We thought that since that conference is currently scheduled to be in person, we could also have a small in-person LDC event, perhaps, as your Honor suggested, a breakfast before the conference or a coffee after the conference.

Of course, as your Honor noted at the outset of the hearing today, the situation with COVID-19 is evolving, sometimes day to day, and we recognize that it may not be feasible to have an in-person event in September, but we do think that there would be real value in another LDC meeting with the Court in whatever format the Court is comfortable with.

Unless the Court has questions for me, I believe Mr. Lear would also like the opportunity to say a few words on behalf of Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. McCloud. Mr. Lear.
MR. LEAR: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, Mr. McCloud. I don't have much to say other than ditto in the sense that, for the Plaintiffs' side, we agree that having another LDC and NextGen event for us -- the NextGen piece of that has helped. Our Leadership Development Committee is, of
course, aware there is a smaller set, but there are a lot of up and coming counsel also on the Plaintiffs' side that can get benefit from these events, so we appreciate your Honor having expanded the scope somewhat to afford that.

I suppose $I$ would put in a word for in person. I totally agree heartfeltly at the notion that safety is a prerequisite, but when it comes time for the Court to have an in-person case management conference, for example, having an LDC NextGen component to that would be very valuable.

For some of the reasons at the very beginning of this case management conference you already articulated, I know I would just be preaching to the choir, but I guess I'd also make the point, too, that there is a benefit to the litigation itself, having an opportunity for the lawyers both within our sides, given an opportunity to be together, because we are all by Zoom ourselves, across the aisle with our colleagues on the other side, and with the Court, all of that is sort of grease to the wheels of the litigation.

It makes for a more impactful event in the moment, but it also pays dividends down the line, so that is very beneficial.

That is the only thing $I$ would add to the excellent presentation that Mr. McCloud has already made. With that, if you have any questions I'm sure either or both of us are happy to field those.

THE COURT: Excellent. I appreciate that. I take it, since both of you were the ones designated to speak on the issue, that $I$ will conclude for purposes of this topic and this proposed event that you all are taking the lead on behalf of your respective sides. To that end, I guess what I would say is, why don't you -- I am fully on board, so why don't you take the lead and put it together.

I guess we should have plan A and plan B. Plan A would be in person because, as of now, it is in person with our case management conference. I would say be sensitive to both the need to be inclusive and to have those participate in person whom you think and they think and everyone thinks should be present.

Be mindful also of whatever cost and logistical issues there are. I want to be sensitive to that. I don't want anyone to be heard saying, well, $I$ had to go, and it is costing us this. So, I am going to leave that up to you to balance those. I would understand if somebody didn't come or if someone's leadership didn't want someone to come because that is costing someone X amount of money. Everything is always a balance.

You can tell me whether, if we do it in person, should it be fully in person, should it be hybrid, some in person, some on Zoom for cost saving measures. I don't have a point of view, I am just saying these are the kinds of things $I$ would be
thinking about if $I$ were leading this effort, but you are.
Also, what do you want to talk about. It doesn't have to be scripted, so it could be that you don't have anything scripted and it is open, or if there are particular topics that you think you really want to hear the Court talk about, or you want to talk about, $I$ would say take that into account.

The other thing is, always think in terms of, like, how can we do something that will not only benefit all of us in this case, but might be able to be replicated in other cases. The things that work well, of course, we hope we can share with other judges. There is a vast array of communication channels that go on within the MDL world. There is the Rules Committee, there are conferences around the rules, there are conferences around best practices.

You know that LDC has gotten a lot of coverage, you know that diversity in all aspects of what we are doing, including an MDL litigation, is a really big topic, so what can we contribute to that conversation. What can we, as members of the Zantac team, if you will, not only contribute to this litigation, but how we might express that to others.

Just keep all of those things in mind and I will look to Special Master Dodge to get updates about what you are thinking and what it looks like, and I am just going to take your lead on it. So thank you.

MR. MCCLOUD: Thank you, your Honor.
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MR. LEAR: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Great. Take care and I appreciate your presentation.

I think we will go to registry next. I know Mr. Pulaski is hanging on by a thread with connectivity issues. I am getting texts that he is on, he is off, so let's see.

Hi, Mr. Petrosinelli. Let me see if Mr. Pulaski is with us or not. I don't see your video. Are you there by audio? He is back off. If he gets on, anyone can let him know he is welcome to butt in and join.

Mr. Petrosinelli, do we have anyone else -- I had in my notes Ms. Johnston. Are you going to address first and then Ms. Johnston should come on? All right, it's all yours.

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

Actually I have a pretty short report on the registry this afternoon. I thought I would take advantage, since Mr. Pulaski is not here to rebut anything I say, but he and I actually spoke yesterday, and so we agreed on what we would cover with the Court.

I think there are three things. One is, the registry continues to grow. We continue to get claims submitted to the registry, albeit at a slower pace than had been, which is to be expected, but that, of course, as your Honor knows, under the various pretrial orders, once a claim gets filed, that triggers
a new set of deadlines that are applicable to such claim, namely the filing of a Census Plus form within 60 days, and then we check to see if there are deficiencies. There might be a deficiency process if there are, and then potentially an exit notice process if the deficiencies can't be corrected.

So that machinery of the registry, I think it continues to work well and is up and running and LMI is doing a great job assisting us with that. So that is report number one.

Number two is, we have made substantial progress, probably even more so since the last conference, on the collection of proof of use and proof of injury records, which is a core function of the registry in connection with the vendor Lexitas, the collection vendor for the registry. We have many thousands of -- these would be claims in the registry this are -- where the forms are not deficient, so people who have filled out a complete form and have alleged one of the ten cancers that the Plaintiffs' leadership has designated at the moment that they are going to pursue.

Those are the ones we are focused on, I think for obvious reasons, and we are making good progress on collecting proof of use and proof of injury records as to those claimants.

That leads me to my third point, which is the next step is to use those records to what I call -- Mr. Pulaski and I have called true up the forms, meaning we have now
non-deficient forms where claimants have filled out their allegations about use or injury, and now we have to look at the records and see whether those match.

I think it is undoubtedly true that some of them aren't going to match, and Mr. Pulaski and I are discussing a process for and a timetable for doing that true up where -because, as the Court knows, we want the data to be reliable in the registry, because if it is not reliable, it is not very useful, particularly as we head into discussions about, for example, bellwether -- a process or bellwether selection, so that is probably our next step.

It leads to perhaps the discussion with -- I know Ms. Johnston wants to have with the Court about, because a piece of that is getting records from the retailers, to -- that is perhaps one of the more reliable proofs of use, is if retailer records show that a certain claimant had purchased a certain product.

So, I know Ms. Johnston is going to address the Court as to that subject, but those are the main things that we are dealing with in the registry now, and I guess, unless the court has any questions about that, I'd turn it to Ms. Johnston to describe what the status is as to the retailer records.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Petrosinelli.
Ms. Johnston, I will hear from you first.
I can't hear you. I am not seeing a mute button on
your computer, so it might be a computer setting. It doesn't look like a Zoom setting, you are not muted.

MR. PULASKI: Judge Rosenberg, can you hear me?

THE COURT: Mr. Pulaski is on, and I can hear and see you. I won't ask where you are, what kind of a room that is, but $I$ do know you are traveling and I think to a very nice place. I won't disclose the whereabouts.

MR. PULASKI: Yes, your Honor. I apologize, I have had a bit of a planes, trains, and automobiles day, and it seems to just be getting worse, but we are all here and ready to go.

I agree with everything Mr. Petrosinelli said, and we are continuing to get additional CPS filed into the registry daily. Everything is going well with the exit notices and notifications to Plaintiffs' attorneys --

THE COURT: I think you froze, Mr. Pulaski. I heard you up to a point.

MR. PULASKI: (inaudible) barely, and that is really -- everything that Mr. Petrosinelli said I agree with.

THE COURT: Just so you know, there was a momentary pause, so $I$ know that the transcript -- don't worry, Pauline, it will be okay. We will acknowledge there was an interruption and we got the essence, Mr. Pulaski, of what you said, which is things are going as anticipated and you agree with Mr. Petrosinelli and his report. Is that accurate?

MR. PULASKI: That is accurate, your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's hear what Ms. Johnston has to say. Do we have your audio on? No. I think that has happened before. I don't remember how you fixed it. Do you have IT support there? No.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Your Honor, might we skip to the next item and then maybe we could circle back to Ms. Johnston?

MS. JOHNSTON: Your Honor, is this working?
THE COURT: Yes, now I can hear you.
MS. JOHNSTON: I dialed in with my phone, I needed to be admitted from the waiting room, so my apologies to you. Apologies for the technical interruption.

THE COURT: No worries. Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: So, good afternoon, and I understand, your Honor, that you have requested, and we wanted to provide an update on records collection on behalf of the retailer and pharmacy Defendants.

As your Honor knows, we established a retailer portal that would permit claimants in the registry to submit certain information depending on the retailer they are requesting records from. That process had a bit of a slow start, I think, as the portal was being set up, but $I$ think that we are caught up now and are continuing to collect both prescription and loyalty card records on behalf of the retailers and those who have elected to continue to go through the registry process
versus a subpoena or other process following the recent Motion to Dismiss order.

Currently, we are on the third wave of those records collection, working with LMI, and it is my understanding, at least as of this morning and not having spoken to each individual retailer, but that the third wave is to be submitted to LMI so that they can be dropped into the individual claimant portals on their website, or through their database, towards the end of this week and early next week as those continue to come in from the various retailers.

I have spoken to LMI again this morning, and they have collected a pretty substantial number of additional claims that will present the fourth wave that they are going to roll out shortly.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I know there was this window of a 60 to 90 -day period. Are you going to get the records in full delivered within that time period?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, your Honor, we are on track to do that.

THE COURT: What is that date? By when?
MS. JOHNSTON: I believe that -- it's somewhere in the first of June, so 90 days would be the first week of August.

THE COURT: So, you are saying by the first week of August the -- would it be rolling -- is it rolling now or would it be rolling as of the first week of August, or would all
records be in by the first week of August?

MS. JOHNSTON: The goal is to have all of the records that are currently out for collection produced by next week. I believe that there have been rolling productions made. Certain retailers are getting significantly more records request, and those are the ones that have taken longer. For those that have fewer requests, I believe LMI already has those records in their database, but they have been rolling as the process has continued.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you are kind of remaining as the point person and overseeing all of those record productions and keeping in touch with counsel who remain in the case about the status of that?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, your Honor. I am continuing to be the point person there and also speaking with the special master on these issues. To date, I have not heard from any of the retailers that they are having any difficulty meeting the 60 to 90-day window. We will certainly apprise the special master and the other parties if there is an issue there.

THE COURT: Okay. As I understand it, different requests come out from LMI, so maybe there are different and new requests that are going to be coming out shortly, and so the ongoing requests would then need to be responded to by the retailers.

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, your Honor, that is correct, and I
think that what they have been doing is getting the requests that come in through the retailer portal and waiting until they have a sizable bucket to then send out to the other retailers via a spreadsheet that goes to each of the retailers' counsel.

So, I think they have gotten that fourth wave of sizable buckets and they are going to be getting those out shortly.

THE COURT: Okay. As I understand, they may be trying to do it monthly or so.

Mr. Petrosinelli, does that all sound right? Is there anything that you wanted to respond to in terms of that timeframe and Ms. Johnston's ongoing role? For which I am thankful for your ongoing participation in this, Ms. Johnston.

MR. PETROSINELLI: This is Joe Petrosinelli. No, your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate it, and again, I would ask that you continue to remain on top of it, diligent, responsive, and to the extent that you perceive problems before they occur, let Special Master Dodge know so that nobody is unfairly surprised or unfairly prejudiced.

But based on your presentation today, everybody is going to be working on the assumption that the records will be timely produced within the first week of August so that, as Mr. Petrosinelli says, among others things, the registry can work as it always intended to operate.

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, your Honor, and thank you. THE COURT: Okay, thank you so much.

Mr. Petrosinelli, with respect to the registry in general, any administrative matters, vendor expenses, any other costs, bills, things of that nature that $I$ can be helpful to in terms of communicating what needs to be done? I'd hate for anything to be shut down because entities aren't being paid. MR. PETROSINELLI: Yes, your Honor, Joe Petrosinelli again. In terms of vendor bills, there have been invoices sent out to the Defense groups.

I should let the Court know, I guess, that -- I am sure the Court probably assumes this, but with the dismissal of the other groups of Defendants -- we had had a cost sharing agreement per PTO 15 among the Defendants, and what we have agreed as a Defense group is that that cost sharing agreement would be in effect through -- for work done through June 30th, and the timing of your Honor's orders is convenient because it sort of lends itself to that cutoff for work that starts -starting in July that the brand Defendants, as the only Defendants remaining in the case, would be solely responsible for the registry costs and invoices.

In terms of the outstanding invoices, to your Honor's question, some of them have been paid and some have not. It depends on the vendor and it depends on the Defense group.

I think that, you know, we should probably get the
vendors -- the older invoices paid, and I know we are trying to do that. There is a little administratively challenge on our side given the number of groups and number of Defendants, but I know we are all trying to do that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I appreciate that, and I know that in operating all of the things that are going on between LMI, Lexitas, the special master, and maybe there are other vendors and bills and invoices, and certainly it is not my intent to get in the middle of those kind of administrative details, but $I$ do want -- to the extent that it implicates the operations of the institutions and structures that the court has put in place, $I$ feel obligated to at least address it.

So, to the larger audience, those of you who are responsible for your portion of payments to the entities that I have named and persons I have named, or any others, I would just really, you know, implore you to focus on that during this window that we have now to get the invoices paid. Maybe if we can set a deadline of August 15 th, if that seems fair and reasonable -- do you think that is fair and reasonable, Mr. Petrosinelli?

MR. PETROSINELLI: Your Honor, I think certainly for the older invoices that would be fair and reasonable.

THE COURT: Okay. For whichever ones have been out there for some period of time, if everyone can look to -- you know, focus on that and have the discussions you need to have,
the questions that need to be asked if things need to be clarified, and get that all cleaned up as of August 15th, that would be great, and so we kind of have a clean slate moving forward.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Thank you, your Honor. I will communicate with the groups and look to clean things up by that date.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I think that sounds great. Was there anything else that you wanted to go over with respect to the registry?

MR. PETROSINELLI: No, your Honor, not for me. I don't know where Mr. Pulaski is, but I will send the hostage rescue exculpation team as soon as the conference is over.

THE COURT: I couldn't quite tell if he was in a train, a plane, a contraption, but he may need some help. MR. PETROSINELLI: One never knows with Mr. Pulaski. I will try to help him. Thank you, your Honor, good to see you.

THE COURT: You, too. Be well.
Last, but certainly not least, the Federal/State presentation with Mr. Agneshwar and maybe Mr. McGlamry may join. Whoever would like to join, welcome.

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, Adam Pulaski for the Plaintiffs again. I am going to let Mr. McGlamry take over for me just because the quality is poor with the audio and the
video here and I don't want to interrupt the Court. Mr.
McGlamry and I have been working hand in hand for the last 48 hours on this, and he is prepared and ready to go.

MR. McGLAMRY: Yes, your Honor, Mike McGlamry. I
guess I am going to play Steve Martin to Adam's John Candy in the movie, so I am prepared to go forward, although I
understand that Anand will lead this off.
THE COURT: Okay. Terrific.
MR. AGNESHWAR: Your Honor, I am used to being double teamed. I think on my last document it was me against four of them, so two is nothing.

THE COURT: Take it as a badge of honor.
MR. AGNESHWAR: On this one, your Honor, though, we have talked -- at least $I$ talked to Adam in advance, and I think this presentation will be relatively uncontroversial and factual.

We provided the Court ahead of time with a chart that I think is hopefully responsive to what you are looking for, which is a listing of all of the State Court Zantac cases and what kind of orders have been entered in those cases, how many Plaintiffs are pending, and that sort of thing.

I do have a little PowerPoint that I wanted to focus on, just a couple of the jurisdictions where there has been more activity just to advise the Court as to what is going on.

So, let me try to -- I actually haven't shared my
screen since the very first CMC that we had here, so hopefully this will work.

THE COURT: We did a trial run today and it went well. MR. AGNESHWAR: We did, yes.

THE COURT: Hopefully it will go as it had. There you go.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Okay. So, your Honor, as with every large-scale nationwide litigation, there is an MDL, but there is also various State Court cases pending around the country at varying levels of activity.

In this litigation, the vast majority of cases, particularly when you take the registry into account, are in the MDL. I think we are up to nearly 2,000 cases filed and over 100,000 cases in the registry. And after that, we have -there is the California litigation, there's a JCCP in California, and I have a slide about that.

There is litigation in Tennessee, in two different counties in Tennessee, and those cases have been proceeding, and they have also been coordinating between single judges in Chattanooga and in Memphis.

And then there is a handful of one off cases, one in New York, one in Illinois, one in Texas, and a couple of State AG cases in Baltimore and in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

So, with that, $I$ will go to the first slide and talk a little bit about California.

So, the California cases have generally been filed against the brand Defendants and local retailers. By local, I mean local to California. And there was -- there is a mechanism in California to coordinate those cases to a particular county, and those cases have been assigned to Judge Winifred Smith in Alameda County. Alameda is where Oakland is. But Judge Smith is retiring, I believe she is retiring this coming month, in August, so we are expecting a new judge to be assigned any day now.

We have had two case management conferences before Judge Smith, and at the last one she told us that a new judge would be assigned by the time of the August case management conference. California is a jurisdiction that is very sophisticated and far along in is management of these types of cases, and has their own rules and processes and the like that the parties have to take into account when you litigate there.

With that in mind, the parties basically sat down and negotiated a whole series of agreements, and some of these were waiting for the judge to sign off on them, but we think that is going to happen, we just haven't seen them yet.

Basically, what we have in California is that we are going to have a trial in October of 2022, and leading up to that is, we are going through a bellwether selection process right now, that is going to be narrowed down, and ultimately there will be Sargon, that is California's version of Daubert,
briefing and presumably argument and hearing in the summer of 2022, as well as dispositive motions and the trial on October 10, 2022.

Now, in Alameda County there are 1135 Plaintiffs, but actually there is only 720 California residents, and it is our position -- the Defendant's position is that there is not jurisdiction over the non-California residents. One of the orders deals with the process to adjudicate those issues. But the bellwether selections are from these 720 California residents.

THE COURT: So, the briefing on Daubert, or Sargon, is that akin to what we have when we have our briefing on general causation Daubert motions where we have it fully ripe by July of 2022? Would I be comparing apples to apples if I looked at our July 18, 2022 date and that September 7, 2022 date?

MR. AGNESHWAR: That is right, your Honor. Sargon is California's version of Daubert. So, the scheduling order has a briefing that ends up, in California, closing on September 7, 2022, and I believe our case has briefing that closes in July of 2022 .

So it is kind of very similar timeframes, maybe the MDL is a month or two in advance of that.

THE COURT: And in your experience -- I have been privy to certain judges talking about sitting together, hearing arguments together, coordinating. Before we leave the

California slide, and $I$ don't want to put you on the spot and if you are not comfortable responding at this point, it can be for another day, but would there be something that would make sense for this Court and that Court to be discussing, coordinating on any issues, including, but not limited to, Sargon, Daubert, given the close proximity in timing it appears?

Are these dates, by the way, that have been set in place or you are hoping or expecting that they will be?

MR. AGNESHWAR: I have not seen the final order. I believe the docket says that it has been entered, but I haven't received a copy of it. At the last hearing that we had before Judge Smith there was nothing to indicate that the judge had any disagreement with this order.

Obviously, everything is subject to change, and a new judge is going to be assigned to the case that may have different views, but $I$ expect that something close to this will remain in effect, especially since this was all part of a, you know, very, very detailed, lengthy, roll up your sleeves negotiation on a whole bunch of issues related to case management that this was just a part of that.

So, I am optimistic that it will ultimately be approved.

But in response to your question, I think the opportunities for collaboration are absolutely there, and in
two recent litigations that $I$ have done, one with Judge Rogers in the Northern District in the Abilify gambling litigation, and one Judge Wilson did in New Jersey in the Plavix litigation, even though the Courts had their own rules and their own process and their own case law, the judges in the other State Court litigations were invited by the Federal judges to sit in on the Daubert hearings and they did so in both of those cases.

So, I think that is definitely something that we see on our side as something that would be useful, I mean as long as the judges believe it is useful to them.

THE COURT: So you will keep the Court apprised if a new judge is assigned and maybe the contact information for that judge?

MR. AGNESHWAR: Yes, absolutely. With the chart that we provided, your Honor, we included the contact information for all the judges assigned to these cases right now, and we will update it when we learn of the new judge in the California cases.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
MR. AGNESHWAR: Of course. Moving on to Tennessee, it is one state, but there is not a mechanism for statewide coordination, so it is done on a county-wide basis.

THE COURT: I am sorry, Mr. Agneshwar, can you go back? Could I just ask another question?

MR. AGNESHWAR: Sure.
THE COURT: I asked about Daubert, and just noting the date kind of close to our date, assuming that their date remains as is -- it is true we are a little ahead because ours is fully briefed in July. Then they have jury selection for first bellwether trial.

I am presuming that the -- that would contemplate that the motions are fully ripe on Sargon, as well as any other dispositive motions, argument, rulings, and then going right into a bellwether trial? I mean, is it contemplated that there might not be rulings, but there would still be a bellwether trial, or is it contingent upon whether rulings will come out?

MR. AGNESHWAR: I don't think those kind of details have been fleshed out, especially since we don't have a new judge. I think right now, it is contemplated that things will move pretty quickly between the close of briefing and the trial.

Obviously, if the judge feels that they need more time or something else happens, or they want to push something back a little bit, or push something forward, that all can be discussed with the new judge, but right now, this is what has been agreed to by the parties and proposed by the court.

THE COURT: So the selection of that bellwether trial would be exclusively among and between the attorneys who are litigating in that case, and whatever points of interest there
may or may not be from that trial and that case selected as it relates to the MDL, it will be what it will be.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Yes. So, in California there is not -- as your Honor knows full well, this was the subject of a large section of the argument that we did on the schedule. We have a structure in the MDL where general causation is going to be decided first, and then depending what, if anything, is left after that, we get into case specific discovery.

That structure is not there in California. General causation will be adjudicated as part of the initial bellwether cases, and basically they will be -- basically, the way the cases will be tried, there is an agreement they will be several months apart, but the first one will be, after a lot of winnowing down and strikes and things, will be a single Plaintiff case selected by the Plaintiff, and then it will be the Defense selection, then it will be the Plaintiff, and then it will be the Defense again, so that is the way that is going to work.

But because in our case we have the structure where the Plaintiffs have taken basically everything that has been filed and narrowed it down so far to ten cancers, and then these are going to be litigated in general causation, then whatever is left, if anything, is left, it is a different structure all together.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. AGNESHWAR: So, that brings us to Tennessee. I believe the Court has already reached out -- I don't recall if you have actually spoken to Judge Bennett or not, but I think at one of the prior conferences your Honor mentioned that you reached out, at least emailed back and forth with him.

THE COURT: Yes, I did.
MR. AGNESHWAR: There are 43 Plaintiffs in Hamilton County, and there is a case management order in that case, and Judge Bennett had motions to -- we filed Motions to Dismiss very much similar to the ones we filed in the MDL. Judge Bennett ruled on those motions and pretty much aligned with how this Court ruled in the MDL.

The Plaintiffs then amended their complaints and now there is briefing on the second round of Motions to Dismiss underway.

There is a limited case management order in place that has the workup of these cases through responses to expert interrogatories, and essentially the key dates here are, by October we have deadline for depositions of Plaintiffs; December, deadine for depositions of Defendants; February, the deadline for Plaintiffs' expert interrogatory responses; and April 2022, deadline for Defendants' expert interrogatory responses.

THE COURT: So they have only gone that far, in other
words.
MR. AGNESHWAR: Exactly. Exactly. But it is another situation where $I$ believe in our case, that the Plaintiffs' expert reports are due in December of 2021, and then -- I wrote this down actually. January 31st for ours, and then February 21, 2012 for rebuttal, so again pretty similar time frames.

THE COURT: Yes, that is correct.
MR. AGNESHWAR: That brings us to the other
jurisdiction, Shelby County in Tennessee, and this case has been assigned to Judge Stokes, and again we had a round of briefing on Motions to Dismiss and the judge entered orders on those motions that, again, pretty much tracked this Court's rulings, and $I$ believe that the Plaintiffs are going to amend after that. Amended complaints are due in September of 2021, and we haven't gotten to the point in these cases of agreeing to, or the Court entering a scheduling order.

There are about half the number of cases in Shelby County as in Hamilton County, there are 20 Plaintiffs there. THE COURT: Okay. MR. AGNESHWAR: And finally, just to give the Court a sense of what else is out there, there is a single Plaintiff in New York County, and that case is going through Motions to Dismiss. I think the briefing is going to be -- it has either been completed or shortly will be completed.

There is a single Plaintiff case against the brands in Cook County, Illinois. That is going through Motions to Dismiss briefing.

There are two AG cases, which are kind of consumer fraud, nuisance, that type of case, one in City of Baltimore and one in New Mexico. Your Honor has ruled on motions to remand in those cases. Now they are back and they're going through Motions to Dismiss. I think Baltimore, the briefing has not yet started yet, but will commence pretty soon.

Then there is a Texas case in Nueces County, which is Corpus Christi, Texas, and that case was a single Plaintiff case and it was filed close to a year ago, i believe, and it was filed against a local retailer, a third party, and named the brands. In that case, there is a scheduling order and I expect motions will be filed shortly.

In that case, there is a scheduling order that has the Plaintiffs' expert reports due on February 1st; the Defendants' expert reports due on March 3rd, this is 2022; an April 4, 2022, discovery deadline, that is my wife's birthday; an April 11th deadline for Daubert and dispositive motions; and a trial date right now of May 2, 2022.

THE COURT: Okay. Do we get all of the scheduling orders as attachments to what you submitted to the Court?

MR. AGNESHWAR: It was our intent to attach them all. If one was inadvertently left off, I apologize.

THE COURT: They may be here. Those would be things I would want to look at more carefully.

Which was the case that you said there was going to be a trial, and what did you say the trial date was, May?

MR. AGNESHWAR: The trial date is May 2, 2022. This trial date was entered, $I$ believe, in January of this year, and that was when the schedule in the MDL was what it was before it was pushed back.

THE COURT: You said that was New York, the May 22? MR. AGNESHWAR: No, that was Texas, a Nueces County, Texas case.

THE COURT: Yes, I see that. I have that docket control order with the judge's signature there.

Okay. And again, your experience with state trials that may be going to trial, do they actually go to trial -State cases that actually go to trial in advance of any trial in the MDL is --

MR. AGNESHWAR: Honestly, your Honor, it happens sometimes and it doesn't happen other times, it just depends on a lot of factors, the jurisdiction, the docket in the jurisdiction, how fast the Court wants to move it, the Plaintiffs' lawyers and whether they want to go ahead of the MDL or with the MDL. There is just no rule, but in nationwide MDL litigation this just happens from time to time.

THE COURT: They have their Daubert motions to be
filed by $4 / 11$ in the Texas case.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Exactly.
THE COURT: Okay. All right.
MR. AGNESHWAR: I think that is the end of my
presentation. I just want to reiterate that -- I want to reiterate that this Court has, you know, obviously presided over this case the longest and has delved into the science, has delved into like key issues of the case, has heard multiple rounds of briefing, and there is a lot of opportunities, I believe, for collaboration with these various Courts.

I think it has already been happening, as the Court has pointed out, with the judges in Tennessee. At many of these conferences we go to everyone is, obviously -- whether or not they are ultimately going to -- whatever they are going to do vis a vis the MDL, there have definitely been questions at each case management conference as to what is going on in the MDL, so I think there is definitely interest there.

In my own experience, that kind of collaboration most of the time is helpful and desired.

THE COURT: Okay. I do see the chart that you attached that has the -- all of the contact information for those judges who are involved in these various cases, with the exception of Judge Smith who may be replaced, and that will be updated.

Mr. McGlamry, do you agree or disagree with anything
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that has been presented or said with respect, or have any views about -- and Mr. Pulaski, about collaboration that can and should look like from your experience?

MR. McGLAMRY: Your Honor, Mike McGlamry for Plaintiffs. Let me kind of respond to that in this way, because $I$ think it is sort of one of those longer answers than a yes or no.

Let me begin by saying, as you know this, and $I$ know the special master knows this, from the beginning of this litigation, the PSC, Plaintiffs Steering Committee, and the coleads, and even before we were officially in those positions, we were committed to this MDL, and we have remained that way from that point, and we have worked to make it the focus of all of this litigation. I think if you look at the numbers that Mr. Agneshwar referenced, that is clearly the case.

I also will say, though, that we do not speak for the Plaintiffs' counsel in those State Court litigations so that, you know, they don't have a voice here, and my guess is, although I --

THE COURT: May I ask you in that regard, are there some Plaintiffs' attorneys who are litigating in the MDL and also litigating in these State cases?

MR. MCGLAMRY: Yes, I am sure there are in some combinations, yes, your Honor.

What I would say is that most likely, if you ask those

Plaintiffs' counsel -- you talked about an interest in collaboration and coordination with us. I am not sure exactly what their position would be. Your Honor asked about this issue of the Sargon and the Daubert, which $I$ will get to in a minute, about whether or not they would be interested and so forth.

From our perspective as coleads in this MDL, I will use California, the JCCP, as sort of an example, number one, because it is the largest piece of litigation other than the MDL. Mr. Agneshwar referenced what has been called -- or what has been submitted jointly by the parties as PTO 4, which deals with bellwether selection schedule and preference motions, as we understand it, although it is secondhand, that the Court has entered it, but it just has not made its way to counsel. As I understand the JCCP rules out there, they don't necessarily have to have an electronic system set up for that coordination.

But the point being is, for example, that PTO 4, we were not consulted. In fact, until maybe yesterday, we were not even informed that that was negotiated by the brand counsel and counsel for the retailers in California, with Plaintiffs' counsel, under a confidentiality agreement to where we would not be engaged, consulted, informed.

And so, again, I say that for the purpose of -- I cannot speak for Plaintiffs' counsel there, and I would expect, just like the Court might wonder, why were we not consulted if
there is really an interest in coordination and collaboration.
I would say also, for example, with the California scenario, as I understand the PTOs that have been gathered and are part of the submission here today, PTO 1 I understand is sort of a leadership order in that proceeding which was entered, I believe, the 1st or 2 nd of June of this year, and then PTO 4, obviously, was submitted before PTO 5, which has been entered.

That order was negotiated and submitted to the Court in less than a month or so. We did not participate, were not consulted or informed about these decisions, proposals, or even that there was an agreement from either Plaintiffs' counsel or from Defense counsel, the brands and the retailers.

For example, as to the bellwether process, we understand, as Mr. Agneshwar referenced, there are about 720 cases that are California cases that are subject to that selection. There are no designations of cancers in that litigation that $I$ am aware of, so there are no limitations on type of cancers.

And there is no, as far as $I$ can tell from the orders and what we have heard, any, you know, limitations or parameters of usage, dosage, formulation of Zantac in terms of usage, and under that PTO, as I believe, the date was July 2 nd, and $I$ don't know how this plays out in terms of time, that Plaintiffs would provide what $I$ consider rudimentary
information about each of those 720. It is an attachment to that order, $I$ think it is 18 data fields, name, address, Social Security number, it is very limited. That then the Defendants would reduce that bellwether pool from 720 to 100 within two weeks without any more information, and that within that point in time, the Plaintiffs would provide what $I$ think they call a PPF form, which here we have a CPF. I am not sure if they are exactly the same, comparable, smaller, larger, but whatever that is, that order contemplates that that will be provided to the Defendants.

And that within 60 days, the Defendants, without anything else, will pick ten out of those hundred, so that by October of this year, the Defendants and the Plaintiffs would each have selected ten cases for bellwether.

So, you know, I say that in the sense that $I$ know your Honor has PTO 65 outstanding here for us, that we will be discussing with the special master that process as well. And I say that also in the sense that, again, we have not been consulted or had any discussions with the Defense about this in the context of putting those things together.

And just like in Texas, I know Mr. Agneshwar mentioned Texas, we were not consulted by Plaintiffs or Defendants as it related to their scheduling order, and same with Tennessee.

So, although we are obviously committed to this MDL and we want to push this as expeditiously as possible, we
cannot speak for those counsel in those cases, and they are different at some level, as I mentioned about the California scenario. Mr. Agneshwar did reference the Texas case as being one against the retailer, a then third party, the brands and others, which $I$ think is correct, but I don't know that -- we are not looking at sort of the scope of that case, that is one case, just like the other litigations.

I did not even know until sort of -- we were provided this information that there was a case filed in New York, and so we don't know sort of the context of it. Obviously, I assume that is something that has just come on board in terms of a filing.

So, as you know, your Honor, we are here, we are working as hard as we can go on what we have, and what is before us, and what we agreed to do, and what we negotiated with the Defendants and with the special master and the Court, and because we were not invited to any of the others, you know, we can only sort of respond to what we have going on, which we think is where we want to be, and what we want to do.

So, we don't want anything to sort of mess up our process either that we have in place, that we can put together to make this happen as expeditiously as possible here.

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, if I may, Adam Pulaski. Am I coming in clear okay now?

THE COURT: You are, you are in a new location.
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MR. PULASKI: I apologize for that. I just wanted to say that, in addition to everything that Mr. McGlamry so eloquently spelled out for you with respect to the agreements that have happened with the other state courts that we were not made a part of, we are committed to the MDL being the focal point of this litigation. Over 95 percent of the claims are in this litigation. We continue to push forward, as Mr. McGlamry stated, pursuant to your scheduling order that you have put out, and we will continue to do that and move forward.

As it relates to the scheduling orders and trial dates in Texas, in California, and elsewhere, we are okay with that. We don't believe it takes away from the MDL being the focal point of this litigation. Obviously it was agreed to in California by Defendants' and Plaintiffs' counsel. They agreed to the date November of 2022. They did that without our knowledge, and we are okay with taking a verdict in California before we get to trial here, but we will continue down the path that we have, and we will pursue it as long as we can and as far as we can.

And with respect to everything else, we -- including Texas, we just want to make sure the Court understands that we do consider this the focal point of the litigation, and the states -- the State Court attorneys that I have spoken with a number of times over the last several days, we have talked about loosely coordinating, which we have, so that there is not
duplicative discovery, that they will have access, pursuant to the common benefit orders, to the discovery that has been propounded to us in our litigation, and they will have their additional discovery that they have either agreements -private agreements with Defense counsel already to get additional discovery in State courts pursuant to their rules and state laws, and additional discovery that they are going to get on their own through their State Courts without agreement.

THE COURT: You said we have access to the common benefit materials. Is that because they signed an agreement under the common benefit order here? Are they participating attorneys?

MR. PULASKI: Correct.

THE COURT: Do they have cases in the MDL?
MR. PULASKI: I can tell you the attorneys in California have cases in the MDL that $I$ am aware of, and the attorneys in Texas have cases in the MDL that $I$ am aware of, as I believe the Court is as well.

THE COURT: Do you have any attorneys who are not -who do not have cases in the MDL, but have cases in these other states and are signing participating agreements -- I hope I am referring to it correctly -- from the common benefit order? I think that's what they were called, weren't they?

MR. PULASKI: Yes, your Honor. There are attorneys that don't have cases in the MDL that are signing participation
agreements with the MDL as a coordination effort, so that there is not duplicative discovery, and so that the Defense does not have to provide the same discovery that they have already provided in the MDL.

They may have to provide additional discovery to the State Courts, but that is how we are loosely coordinating with them, and it is going splendidly well, as can be seen through the scheduling orders, trial dates, and everything else that seems to be moving forward expeditiously and efficiently in State Courts, and we are moving at our own pace, which is fine.

We are happy with where we are at here. We are happy with where the State Courts are, where they are at, and as far as co-counsel with me, leadership, Mr. Gilbert, Ms. Finken, and Mr. McGlamry, we couldn't be more pleased with the way that everything is being coordinated as is.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Your Honor, could I respond to -- I'm sorry, if Mr. Pulaski is not done, $I$ will let him finish.

MR. PULASKI: I am finished.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. AGNESHWAR: I don't want to belabor this, but $I$ do want to respond to a couple things.

I don't know what Mr. McGlamry is talking about when he says there was some confidentiality agreement that the parties could not tell the MDL lawyers about negotiations in California. My understanding is Grant Wisner was negotiating
there and he has cases in the MDL, too, and I think he is even on this hearing right now.

So, I'm not sure what he is talking about. I know from our standpoint, we have to deal with the hand that is dealt us. We have cases filed against our clients in various jurisdictions, and no matter what we believe is the ideal way a case should be litigated, we have to negotiate what we think is the best agreement for our clients in light of what the particular procedures and rules and processes are in every particular jurisdiction.

That does not in the slightest mean that we are suggesting anything -- anything less about the leadership in the MDL. From day one in this litigation, when I presented the opening, basically, of this litigation on behalf of the Defendants, $I$ mentioned that the MDL is not just the coordinating center for the Federal litigation, but the MDL plays a leadership role in coordinating among State Court litigations.

In my career, we have had so many instances where State Court judges are not threatened by an MDL or trying to get to something different, but work collaboratively with the MDL. The MDL tends to have cases from all over the country with lawyers from all over the country, and nothing that we have done in what we have negotiated in State Courts has in any way lessened our view of the significance of this MDL.

In fact, you know, our eye is on the long game and this is where most of the cases are. Yes, this is where we are going to get to Daubert by the middle of next year. It has been our consistent position since the beginning of this litigation that this -- the elephant in the room is the lack of scientific evidence connecting real world use of Zantac to cancer, and that is the result that we believe should happen here, and that is the process and procedure that we believe should happen here.

The Court, you know, has heard already one day of science, where there was a science presentation. It has come up in various Motions to Dismiss. The Court is contemplating a science day that the parties are talking about. Maybe that is an opportunity to invite state court judges to listen in as well.

That is still -- whether we can accomplish that in every jurisdiction, you know, having general causation Daubert first, does not in any way lessen the fact that that is what we believe is the right thing for this litigation.

So, I just want to be clear that the fact that we are negotiating in various state Courts and reaching agreements that may not be what we have done in the MDL, there are -- they are different jurisdictions, and we do the best we can, but we are still complete believers in the structure and process and the leadership role of this MDL.

MR. MCGLAMRY: Your Honor, this is Mike McGlamry. Can
I very quickly respond?
I kind of want to calm myself down a little bit, particularly after what Mr. Agneshwar said about he didn't know that the conversations were confidential in California when he knows that Mr. Wisner sent him an email, and others, yesterday confirming that and asking him not to convey those beyond that.

So, I take offense at what he would say to that, knowing that they sent an email to him calling him out on that.

Secondly, I am offended by him bringing up that this is a science issue, and there is no science. That is not true, that will not be the case. We will pass Daubert and we will prevail in these cases.

If we are going to argue science, we will argue when we need to, but coming up and saying there is no science is not true.

Look, it is not our fault that they did this negotiation behind our back confidentially, or however they did it. That is what they did. We are not focused on that, we are focused on here.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I guess -- I don't want to turn this into any kind of a dispute between the parties. This was intended as an update on what was happening in Federal and State. I am sure there are many lawyers to what is going on and how cases arrived at where they have arrived. I was a

State Court judge once, I understand that.
I think it is important for me, at a minimum, to know what is going on, so in that regard it was helpful. And I just want to confirm that $I$ have an understanding as to what, if anything, either the Plaintiffs or the Defendants would suggest to this Court, independent of what the Court may decide in her own judgment to do, to further adequate and productive coordination.

So, looking at it from a positive, proactive, productive standpoint, I am hearing from Defense coordination is good. So, it is true I have reached out to judges in the past. I have not spoken with the California judge.

So, let me hear kind of in a summary form what, if anything, if you are prepared to say, you believe this Court should do in the interest of State/Federal coordination. And it won't be the last time you can be heard, and if you need to confer with colleagues and elaborate at a later point, but in light of what you have said, in light of what you have presented.

Let me go back to Mr. Agneshwar and then Mr. McGlamry or Mr. Pulaski. What, if anything, do you think this Court should do in the interests of productive, coordinated, collaborative efforts, if anything? I am not suggesting that anything could or should be done, but I would like you to be heard on that.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Exactly what I said earlier, your Honor, I think -- and what I have asked earlier, which is why we provided the contact information. I believe the Court should reach out to the various State Court judges and offer, you know, your perspective based on your two years of presiding over this case, listening to the parties argue various things, brief various things, conduct -- do presentations on various issues, and offer avenues of collaboration wherever possible.

I think your Honor raised one very particular area, which is in the hearings on scientific evidence, and I think you know our perspective. That, to us, is the big issue in the case, so that would absolutely be a point of collaboration, also perhaps inviting them to listen in to the science day whenever it is that your Honor holds that, and there might be other points along the way where -- I think the most important thing is communication and coordination.

THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. McGlamry or Mr. Pulaski.
MR. McGLAMRY: Yes, your Honor, Mike McGlamry for the Plaintiffs.

Your Honor, at some level I consider this coordination issue somewhat disingenuous when they are talking about communication because, again, until right now there has been no such communication.

Your Honor, I think that with the numbers of cases and claims here and most of this litigation focused here we should
just push forward.
What I would say, if there is going to be any consideration of coordination, that the Plaintiffs' counsel be included in that discussion or be, you know, allowed to have some involvement. It is -- from our perspective, we weren't consulted. So, as far as we were concerned and as far as what the Plaintiffs' counsel in those places told us, it was their case, they were proceeding with their courts under their process, schedule, what they negotiated, what they worked on, and as Adam indicated, we would otherwise loosely coordinate particularly with discovery so there wouldn't be inefficiencies, but that otherwise it is their case and they're proceeding with their court.

We just think that they need to be engaged in this if that is going to be an issue.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Your Honor, I would just say I might have one view, the other side might have another view. Ultimately, it is really up to the judges on how they want to communicate and collaborate, if at all.

MR. PULASKI: Your Honor, Adam Pulaski for the Plaintiffs.

Quickly, in my conversations with all Plaintiffs' counsel for Illinois, for Tennessee, for California, for Texas, they have all informed me that they are not in need of any further coordination with us at this point other than our loose
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coordination that we have now, which working very well.
Again, it is your Honor's prerogative as to what you would like to do in this situation, but as far as Plaintiffs leadership is concerned and as far as Plaintiffs leadership in every State Court that I have spoken to is concerned, is that everything is going so smoothly and so efficiently and so well for them right now that they are very happy with where they are at and everything is going, and they don't think it could be going better with us coordinating any more than we are.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you for the presentation. Has everybody been heard on the State/Federal? Coordination?

MR. MCGLAMRY: Yes, your Honor, thank you. MR. PULASKI: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are we coordinated on this screen?
MR. PULASKI: Always.
MR. MCGLAMRY: Yes.
THE COURT: We can't coordinate with others if we are not coordinated amongst ourselves, so thank you.

MR. AGNESHWAR: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All righty. Well, that does conclude the conference for the day, for the afternoon, so I want to thank everyone. I think that we have covered a lot of really important issues. It has been helpful to the Court. We, I think, had our heads down for quite some while,
at least the Court did I should say, with your MTDs and hearings and rulings that the Court tried to issue in a prompt fashion, and so, it was important for me to be able to check back in with you and see how things are going.

I recognize that you are doing a zillion things a day on the case, and so this is really maybe is only the tip of the iceberg, but you should be assured that it is an important one for the Court. So, I thank you for taking the time. I know they go longer than probably you would like and I guesstimate, so we are at two hours and 17 minutes, but it was important for me to hear how we were doing with pro se.

It was important for me to understand what you have been discussing with respect to post Motion to Dismiss motion practice that you feel is necessary, always important to hear from our LDC members, the registry remains critically important, and then to get an idea of where we stand with the State/Federal.

I appreciate there may be differences in how that process works, and I know that it works differently with every case and with every judge. There is no one size fits all, I get that.

There was a conference recently at GW, I was on one part of it with respect to vetting and initial census, but I took the time to listen to all of the other sessions, and there was a session that was devoted to State/Federal and even the
judges on that session had different ideas and different views about everything from sitting with other judges in Daubert hearings, to phone calling, to anything in between.

So, I just wanted to get the benefit of your thinking. It was not intended to bring up any issues that relate to differences that you may have, and it is fine. It is okay to have those differences, to be professional about them, and to continue to operate in good faith and cordially and transparently with colleagues here in this case.

The Court certainly doesn't have any concerns about State Court cases and State Court orders. That is just the way things work. Litigants are free to file in whatever forum they choose to, and some have filed in state Court, and many have filed here, and I have done the best I can, with your input, to issue scheduling orders that make sense for this case, and I am sure the State Court judges have done exactly the same thing.

So, we all try to do our best, and I will continue to ask you about it, and continue to think about ways that coordination makes sense from an efficiency standpoint for the benefit of the litigants, the people who have a stake in this case, the parties themselves who want to see the case move along as expeditiously as possible, where resources are spent in a conservative and efficient way.

I think we all have an obligation to explore avenues all the time as to how that can be done. So, when I use the
word "coordination" that is really what $I$ mean, what is efficient, what makes sense. It's not taking rights away from anyone. It's not trying to get in the way of anybody. It's not trying to get ahead of anybody. It's not trying to be first. It's not trying to be last.

It is just trying to do the right thing, but being aware and educated about what is going on around you will inevitably, I think, inform you, that is me, the Court, and hopefully other judges about how they can best do their job, as I hope to always be informed about how best I can do my job.

I continue to believe it is a joint effort and we have to do this as a team. That is everybody from the support that each of you get every day from people in your office who are helping you, to the attorneys who appear, the ones who are working behind the scenes, to myself and the staff that works with me. We couldn't do what we do if we didn't do it together in an open and transparent and collaborative way.

That is how I intend to continue presiding over this case. I hope it continues to be the theme that motivates all of you to do the work that you would expect of yourselves and the Court would expect of you.

With that, great to see those who $I$ was able to see, great to know that a hundred plus of you were here and interested in knowing what was going on.

I do look forward to seeing many of you in person in

September. I would ask that you apprise Special Master Dodge over the next week or so what your preferred deadline is for knowing, and $I$ will just have to make a judgment call, just like I did back in March of 2020, weeks before we were planning our first in person, when $I$ had to sort of make the decision -it was still early, we didn't know, but I had to make the decision that we couldn't go forward in person, and it turned out to be the right decision, as we saw from the many, many months that ensued.

I will attempt to do the right thing with our September hearing, and inviting you if it seems the right thing to do, if it is safe and manageable. If I have reason to believe it is not, we will set it for the next month in person and continue to meet in the Zoom platform.

With that, I wish everyone well, stay healthy, please enjoy your summer. It is important to relax, to take time off to clear your head and be with family and loved ones, and I look forward to seeing you again at our next opportunity.

Thank you.
(Thereupon, the proceedings concluded.)
I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
from the record of proceedings in the above matter.
Date: July 30, 2021
Sighature of Court Reporter
Sine A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

|  | 2 | 713-664-4555 [1] 1/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. AGNESHWAR: [27] 56/8 | 2,000 [1] 57/13 | 720 [5] 59/5 59/9 71/15 72/1 72 / 4 |
| 56/12 57/3 57/6 59/15 60/9 | 20 [2] 20/7 65/19 | 725 [1] $2 / 2$ |
| 61/14 61/20 61/25 62/12 63/2 | 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG [1] | 7270 [1] 1/20 |
| $64 / 1$ 64/7 65/1 65/8 65/20 | 1/3 | 7706 [1] 1/16 |
| 66/23 67/4 $67 / 967 / 17$ 68/1 | 20005 [1] 2/3 | $77098 \text { [1] } 1 / 12$ |
| 68/3 76/15 76/19 80/25 82/15 | 2012 [1] 65/6 | $772.467 .2337 \text { [1] } 2 / 16$ |
| 83/19 | 202-434-5567 [1] 2/3 |  |
| MR. BARNES: [11] 29/23 | 2020 [1] 87/4 | 8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 14 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 24 & 35 / 7 & 35 / 12\end{array}$ | 2021 [4] 1/5 65/4 65/15 88/4 | 8011 [1] $2 / 6$ |
| 35/16 35/24 37/4 37/6 38/5 | 2022 [14] 58/22 59/2 59/3 | 8th [7] 14/25 15/17 15/21 |
| MR. GILBERT: [18] 13/8 | 59/14 $59 / 15$ 59/15 $59 / 19$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 t h 17 \\ 20 / 721 / 3 \quad 30 / 638 / 1 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 13 & 13 / 21 & 16 / 17 & 17 / 9 & 23 / 25 \\ 25 / 17 & 26 / 19 & 27 / 1 & 27 / 13 & 28 / 8\end{array}$ | $59 / 20$ $66 / 21 / 23 ~ 67 / 5 ~$ $64 / 15$ | 9 9 |
| 29/7 29/15 33/7 35/18 37/8 | 2029 [1] 2/8 |  |
| 37/14 38/6 | 21 [1] 65/6 | 90 [1] 50/22 |
| MR. LEAR: [2] 41/20 44/25 | 212-836-8011 [1] 2/6 | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { 90-day [2] } & 50 \\ 90067[1] & 2 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| MR. McCLOUD: [11] 13/5 | 21202 [1] 2/12 | $95 \text { [1] } 74 / 6$ |
| 13/14 13/20 18/1 $25 / 3 \quad 27 / 4$ | 22 [1] 67/9 | $\text { 9th [8] } 14 / 25 \text { 15/17 } 15 / 21$ |
| 27/9 28/11 29/18 40/16 44/24 | 24-hour [1] 27/3 |  |
| MR. McGLAMRY: [7] 56/3 69/3 | 250 [1] 2/5 |  |
| 69/22 78/25 81/17 83/12 | 28 [1] 1/5 | A |
| 83/16 | 2800 [1] 1/19 | abbreviated [1] 26/14 |
| MR. PETROSINELLI: [8] 45/13 | 28th [1] 20/6 | abide [1] 34/24 |
| 49/5 52/13 53/7 54/20 55/4 $55 / 10$ $55 / 15$ | 2925 [1] 1/11 | Abilify [1] 61/2 |
| 55/10 55/15 <br> MR. PULASKI: [14] 48/2 | 2nd [4] 30/18 32/2 71/6 71/23 | ability [2] 7/5 14/23 |
| 48/17 $48 / 25 \quad 55 / 22$ 73/22 |  | able [15] 4/5 4/5 5/6 5/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}73 / 25 & 75 / 12 & 75 / 14 & 75 / 23\end{array}$ | 3 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}6 / 1 & 6 / 20 & 10 / 25 & 14 / 21 & 15 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 76/17 82/19 83/13 83/15 | 30 [3] 9/3 30/7 88/4 | /15 38/20 44/9 84 |
| MS. JOHNSTON: [9] 49/7 49/9 | 300 [2] 1/15 2/9 | about [68] $4 / 6$ 5/23 6/2 6/13 |
| 49/13 50/17 50/20 51/1 51/13 | 30326 [1] 1/16 |  |
| 51/24 52/25 | 305-384-7270 [1] 1/20 | $12 / 14$ $12 / 15$ $12 / 18$ $16 / 15$ <br> $19 / 4$    |
| MS. McGLAMRY: [6] 8/15 8/19 | 30th [1] 53/16 | 20/5 20/19 20/22 21/9 26/23 |
| 8/22 11/8 11/11 11/13 THE COURT: [95] | 310-284-3798 [1] 31st [1] $65 / 5$ | 27/15 28/4 $28 / 19$ 31/8 $34 / 12$ |
|  | 33134 [1] 1/ | 38/9 39/2 $39 / 25$ 44/1 $44 / 2$ |
| / | 3391 [1] 1/ | 44/5 44/6 44/22 47/2 47/9 |
| /s [1] 88/5 | 3750 [5] 14/7 14/14 $15 / 23$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 47 / 13 & 47 / 21 & 51 / 12 & 57 / 16 \\ 57 / 25 & 59 / 24 & 62 / 2 & 65 / 18 \end{array}$ |
| 1 | $3798 \text { [1] } 2 / 10$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}69 / 2 & 70 / 1 & 70 / 3 & 70 / 5 & 71 / 11\end{array}$ |
| 10 [1] 59/3 | 3rd [1] 66/18 | 71/15 72/1 72/19 73/2 74/25 |
| 100 [1] 72/4 | 4 | 79/4 81/21 85/2 85/7 85/10 |
| 100,000 [1] 57/14 |  | 85/18 85/18 86/7 86/9 86/10 |
| 10019 [1] $2 / 6$ | 4/11 [1] 68/1 | above [1] 88/2 |
| 103 [1] 1/22 | 4000 [1] 2/13 | Absent [1] 14/23 |
| 11 [2] 34/23 68/1 | 404-523-7706 [1] 1/16 | absolutely [4] 19/22 60/25 |
| 1100 [1] 1/19 | 410-783-4000 [1] 2/13 | $61 / 15 \quad 81 / 12$ |
| 1135 [1] 59/4 | 43 [1] 64/8 | acceptable [3] 25/5 26/21 |
| 11th [3] 30/21 32/3 66/20 | 4555 [1] 1/12 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { accept } \\ 27 / 12 \end{array}$ |
| 12 [1] 14/8 | 48 [1] 56/2 | access [7] 7/16 7/19 9/7 |
| $1292 \text { [1] } 25 / 25$ | 5 | 11/5 11/23 75/1 75/9 |
| $14 \text { [1] } 35 / 3$ | 54 [9] 18/8 18/15 22/15 30/5 | accessible [1] 8/9 |
| 15 [7] 15/9 27/10 27/14 | 30/9 30/15 30/19 31/19 33/7 | accommodations [1] 5/2 |
| 27/16 27/16 40/1 53/14 | 5567 [1] 2/3 | accomplish [4] 12/24 13/19 |
| $\underset{55 / 2}{\mathbf{1 5 t h}[4] \quad 4 / 22 \quad 41 / 4 \quad 54 / 18}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55th [1] 2/5 } \\ & 573-875-1991 \quad[1] \quad 1 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { account [3] } & 44 / 6 & 57 / 12 & 58 / 16\end{array}$ |
| 16th [2] 30/22 32/5 |  | accurate [5] 18/18 31/15 |
| 17 [1] $84 / 10$ | 6 | 36/9 48/25 49/1 |
| 1725 [1] 1/11 | 60 [4] 46/2 50/16 51/18 |  |
| 18 [2] 59/15 72/2 | 72/11 | acknowledge [1] 48/22 <br> across [1] 42/16 |
| 186 [1] 9/1 | $65 \text { [1] } 72 / 16$ | acting <br> [4] $22 / 6$ <br> $22 / 7$ 22/10 |
| 19 [1] 41/11 | 65201 [1] 1/23 | 22/10 |
| $\begin{array}{\|lll} 1991 ~[1] ~ & 1 / 23 \\ \text { 1st [2] } & 66 / 17 & 71 / 6 \end{array}$ | 7 | activity [2] 56/24 57/10 |
| 1st [2] 66/17 71/6 | 70 [1] 22/24 | $\begin{array}{\|cccc} \text { actually }[15] & 24 / 6 & 29 / 17 \\ 29 / 20 & 32 / 10 & 38 / 12 & 38 / 14 \end{array}$ |


| A | agreeable [1] | 25/20 27/5 28/4 28/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| actually... [9] 40/23 45/16 | agreed [13] 26/10 28/ | 29/20 31/15 32/20 36/12 37/2 |
| 45/19 56/25 59/5 64/4 65/5 | 45/19 53/15 62/22 73/15 | $45 / 6 \quad 47 / 25 \quad 51 / 14 \quad 52 / 12 \quad 53 / 11$ |
| ADAM [6] 1/10 55/23 56/14 | 74/13 74/14 | 55/24 56/5 56/6 56/9 60/22 |
| ADAM [6] 1/10 55/23 56/14 $73 / 23 \quad 82 / 10 \quad 82 / 20$ | agreeing [1] 65/16 | 61/24 62/7 69/23 70/2 71/18 |
| Adam's [1] 56/5 | agreement [19] 14/21 18/2 | 72/7 73/23 75/16 75/17 75/21 |
| add [1] 42/22 | 22/24 25/7 25/10 28/14 $28 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{llll}76 / 18 & 79 / 10 & 79 / 24 & 80 / 10\end{array}$ |
| added [1] 9/5 | $28 / 19$ $28 / 19$ $29 / 5$ $53 / 14$ <br> $63 / 13$ $70 / 21$ $71 / 12$ $75 / 8$ | 80/23 85/15 |
| addition [1] | $\begin{array}{llll} 63 / 13 & 70 / 21 & 71 / 12 & 75 / 8 \\ 76 / 23 & 77 / 8 & & \end{array}$ | amenable [2] 32/24 41/3 amend [1] 65/14 |
| additional [7] $8 / 25$ $48 / 13$  <br> $50 / 12$ $75 / 4$ $75 / 6$ $75 / 7$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { agreements [7] 58/18 } & 74 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { amended [7] } & 25 / 22 & 26 / 4 & 26 / 13\end{array}$ |
| address [10] 3/17 9/19 15/9 | 75/4 75/5 75/21 76/1 78/21 | 29/15 31/11 64/14 65/15 |
| 16/7 29/21 38/4 45/12 47/18 | ahead [6] 25/9 34 | among [5] |
| 54/12 72/2 | 62/4 67/22 86/4 | 62/24 77/17 |
| addressed [2] 14/11 | aisle | amongst [1] |
| addressing [1] 26/5 | akin [1] 59/12 | amount [1] 43/ |
| adequate [2] 24/12 80 | Alameda [3] 58/6 58/6 59/4 | analysis [2] 20/23 34/18 |
| adjudicate [1] 59/8 | albeit [1] 45/23 <br> aligned [1] 64/12 | ANAND [2] $2 / 4$ 56/7 and distributors [1] |
| adjudicated [1] 63/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { all }[84] & 3 / 5 & 3 / 19 & 3 / 23 & 6 / 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { and distributors } \\ & \text { and Mr [1] } 14 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { administration [1] } & 3 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ccccccl}\text { 7/2 } & 8 / 3 & 8 / 17 & 9 / 10 & 9 / 14 & 10 / 14\end{array}$ | and/or [1] 16/24 |
| administrative [4] 15/4 | 13/16 15/25 16/20 18/1 19/17 | Angeles [1] 2/9 |
|  | 19/21 20/3 20/9 20/10 21/5 | another [8] 3/16 41/3 41/14 |
|  | 22/25 23/5 $23 / 6$ 24/2 $25 / 7$ | 41/24 60/3 61/25 65/2 82/17 |
| admitting [1] 3/6 | 26/17 27/19 30/5 30/7 32/15 | answer [4] 10/23 17/3 17/10 |
| adopt [1] 21/18 | $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 23 & 34 / 17 & 35 / 15 & 36 / 5 & 36 / 10\end{array}$ | 19/4 |
| advance [5] 6/5 15/17 56/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 14 & 36 / 14 & 36 / 17 & 37 / 4 & 38 / 8\end{array}$ | answering [1] |
| 59/22 67/16 | $\begin{array}{llllll}40 / 22 & 42 / 15 & 42 / 17 & 43 / 4 & 44 / 8\end{array}$ | answers [1] 69/6 |
| advantage [1] 45 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}44 / 16 & 44 / 21 & 45 / 2 & 45 / 13 & 45 / 13\end{array}$ | anticipate [2] 24/6 28/2 |
| advantages [1] 19 | 48/10 50/25 51/2 51/11 52/10 | anticipated [1] |
| advice [1] 10/25 | 54/4 54/5 54/6 55/2 55/8 | any [40] 5/17 9/4 19/18 $21 / 8$ |
| advisable [1] 27/ | 56/19 60/18 61/17 61/20 | $\begin{array}{llll}21 / 12 & 22 / 15 & 22 / 15 & 25 / 13\end{array}$ |
| advisable [1] 27/7 | 62/20 63/25 66/22 66/24 68/3 | 25/24 26/10 $32 / 15$ 34/23 $36 / 6$ |
| ed [1] | 68/21 69/13 77/22 77/23 | 36/13 42/24 47/21 51/16 |
| cted [2] | 82/19 82/22 82/24 83/10 | 51/17 53/4 53/4 54/15 58/9 |
| ing | 83/21 84/20 84/24 85/17 | 60/5 60/14 62/8 67/16 69/1 |
|  | 85/24 85/25 86/19 | 71/21 72/5 72/19 73/17 75/19 |
| after [10] $8 / 22 \quad 23 / 20 \quad 34 / 22$ | allegations [1] 47/2 | 77/24 78/18 79/22 82/2 82/24 |
| 40/11 41/9 57/14 63/8 63/14 | alleged [1] 46/17 | 83/9 85/5 85/ |
| 65/15 79/4 | allow [2] 15/14 37/13 | anybody [2] 86/3 86/ |
| afternoon [11] 3/1 8/15 13/6 | allowed [1] 82/4 | anyone [5] 6/13 43/16 45/ |
| 13/8 13/9 13/11 29/22 29/24 | allows [1] 5/4 | 45/11 86/3 |
| 45/17 49/14 83/22 | almost [3] 6/10 7/25 33/14 | anything [27] |
| afterwards [1] 16/8 | along [8] 7/11 19/7 19/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 22 & 12 / 12 & 20 / 13 & 20 / 14\end{array}$ |
| AG [2] 57/23 66/4 | 5/15 35/23 58/14 81/15 | $52 / 11 \quad 53 / 7 \quad 55 / 9 \quad 63 / 8 \quad 63 / 24$ |
| again [23] 4/4 5/20 6/12 |  | $\begin{array}{llll} 68 / 25 & 72 / 12 & 73 / 20 \quad 77 / 12 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}6 / 23 & 13 / 23 & 21 / 23 & 25 / 19 & 31 / 7\end{array}$ |  | $77 / 1280 / 5 \text { 80/14 80/21 80/23 }$ |
| 31/13 50/11 52/16 53/9 55/24 | also [35] $3 / 25 \quad 7 / 3 \quad 7 / 9 \quad 9 / 15$ | 80/24 85/3 |
| 63/18 65/6 65/11 65/13 67/14 |  | anyway [1] |
| 70/23 72/18 81/22 83/2 87/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 16 & 26 / 18 & 27 / 12 & 30 / 3 & 32 / 7\end{array}$ | apart [1] |
| against [11] $16 / 23 \quad 17 / 1$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 8 & 32 / 11 & 38 / 3 & 40 / 4 & 40 / 10\end{array}$ | apologies [2] 49/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 13 & 31 / 20 & 33 / 25 ~ 56 / 10 ~ 58 / 2 ~ \\ 66 / 1 & 66 / 13 & 73 / 4 & 77 / 5\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}40 / 12 & 41 / 7 & 41 / 18 & 42 / 2 & 42 / 12\end{array}$ | apologize [4] 15/21 48/8 |
| 66/1 66/13 73/4 77/5 | 42/20 $43 / 14 \begin{array}{lllll} & 44 / 2 & 51 / 15 & 57 / 9\end{array}$ | 66/25 74/1 |
| agenda [5] 5/7 5/12 5/13 | 57/19 69/16 69/22 71/2 72/18 | apparently [1] |
| 5/19 $40 / 15$ agenda that [1] 5/12 | 81/13 | appeal [5] 15/25 30/24 30/2 |
| agenda that [1] 5/12 AGNESHWAR [10] 2/4 55/21 | although [10] 3/21 9/8 12/9 | 30/25 31/5 |
| AGNESHWAR [10] 2/4 55/21 | 19/2 22/8 37/22 56/6 69/19 | appealable [1] 14/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 61 / 24 & 69 / 15 & 70 / 10 & 71 / 15 \\ 72 / 21 & 73 / 3 & 79 / 4 & 80 / 20 \end{array}$ | $70 / 13$ 72/24 | appeals [2] 19/13 36/8 |
| Agneshwar said [1] 79 | although I [1] | appear [6] 3/20 5/19 9/3 9/4 |
| ago [1] 66/12 | always [14] 6/2 11/17 18/1 | 7/12 86/14 |
| agree [17] $22 / 21 \quad 22 / 23 \quad 27 / 5$ | 37/15 37/22 38/12 38/19 | appearance [1] 13/ |
| $30 / 430 / 9 \quad 32 / 16$ 32/21 33/3 | 39/23 43/20 44/7 52/25 83/16 | appeared [1] 39/19 |
| 33/4 33/20 40/19 41/23 42/6 | 84/14 86/10 | appearing [2] 13/4 38/13 |
| 48/12 48/19 48/24 68/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { am [55] } & 5 / 21 & 7 / 5 & 12 / 11 & 12 / 12\end{array}$ | appears [1] 60/7 |
| agree in [1] 32/16 | 12/13 13/2 13/25 19/2 20/15 | appellate [17] 14/5 14/6 |
|  | 20/24 21/1 21/7 22/10 22/10 | 14/24 15/23 15/24 16/1 16/4 |


| A | assuming [1] | be [2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| appellate... [10] 17/22 22/6 | assumption [1] 52/2 | BEACH [4] 1/2 $1 / 5$ 2/16 $5 / 5$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 8 & 25 / 13 & 26 / 3 & 26 / 12 & 29 / 14 \\ 31 / 10 & 34 / 16 & 36 / 3\end{array}$ | $\text { astute [1] } 8 / 2$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { because [35] } & 5 / 15 & 10 / 9 & 10 / 24\end{array}$ |
|  | Atlanta [1] 1/16 | 12/11 12/16 16/25 17/7 $20 / 5$ |
| applicable [2] 14/15 | attach [3] 15/6 24/16 66/24 | 20/6 20/15 21/17 $22 / 4 \quad 22 / 5$ |
| applicants [2] 39/2 39 | attached [7] 15/3 22/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}22 / 12 & 28 / 1 & 28 / 17 & 32 / 15 & 37 / 12\end{array}$ |
| application [1] 39/3 | 29/1 32/6 32/10 68/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}38 / 15 & 42 / 15 & 43 / 9 & 43 / 19 & 47 / 7\end{array}$ |
| applied [1] 14/14 | attaching [1] 21/14 | 47/8 $47 / 13$ 53/7 $53 / 17$ 55/25 |
| apply [1] 16/20 | attachment [1] 72/1 | 62/4 63/20 69/6 70/9 73/17 |
| appointments [1] 39/13 | chments [1] 66/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}75 / 10 & 81 / 22 \\ \text { 7een } & {[53]} & 3 / 2 & 3 / 24 & 4 / 16\end{array}$ |
| appreciate [14] 6/23 11/13 | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { attempt [1] } 87 / 10 \\ \text { attorneys [11] } & 7 / 15 & 48 / 15 \end{array}$ | been [53] $3 / 2 \quad 3 / 24 \quad 4 / 16 \quad 5$ |
| 11/16 11/25 20/2 27/2 38/8 | $62 / 24 \quad 69 / 21 \quad 74 / 23 \quad 75 / 12$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 21 & 20 / 5 & 20 / 11 & 21 / 21 & 26 / 15\end{array}$ |
| 40/20 42/3 $43 / 1$ 45/3 $52 / 16$ | 75/15 $75 / 17$ 75/19 $75 / 24$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 29 / 21 & 33 / 15 & 34 / 11 & 45 / 23 & 51 / 4\end{array}$ |
| 54/5 84/18 | 86/14 | 51/8 52/1 53/9 53/23 54/23 |
| apprise [5] 12/21 | audience [1] 54/13 | 56/2 56/20 56/23 57/18 57/19 |
| 39/11 51/18 87/1 | audio [4] 8/14 45/9 49/3 | 58/1 58/5 59/23 60/8 60/11 |
| apprised [5] 6/6 9/22 28/17 | 55/25 | 62/14 62/22 63/21 65/11 |
| 36/13 61/12 | August [22] 14/25 15/17 | 65/25 68/11 68/15 69/1 $70 / 10$ |
| apprising [1] 12/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 17 & 15 / 21 & 19 / 13 & 30 / 18\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll}70 / 11 & 71 / 3 & 71 / 8 & 72 / 18 & 75 / 2\end{array}$ |
| appropriate [4] 12/24 15/10 | /21 30/22 31/6 32/2 32/3 | 78/4 81/22 83/11 83/24 84/13 |
| 15/11 18/7 | 51/1 52/23 54/18 55/2 58/8 | before [31] 1/8 7/8 9/6 $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 13 & 15 / 21 & 16 / 1 & 16 / 9 & 27\end{array}$ |
| approval [1] 15 | 58/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 14 & 31 / 20 & 33 / 9 & 33 / 13 & 33 / 17\end{array}$ |
| approved [1] 60/23 | August 11 [1] 34/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 11 & 35 / 15 & 36 / 2 & 36 / 5 & 36 / 8\end{array}$ |
| approves [1] 9/12 approximately [2] | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { August 11th [2] } & 30 / 21 & 32 / 3\end{array}$ | 38/25 41/8 $49 / 4$ 52/18 $58 / 10$ |
| approximately [2] <br> April [3] 64/23 6 | August 15th [2] 54/18 55/2 | 59/25 60/12 67/7 69/11 71/7 |
| April 11th | August 16th [2] 30/22 32/5 | 73/15 74/17 87/4 |
| April 2022 [1] 64/23 | August 8th [3] 14/25 15/17 | begin [1] 69/8 |
| April 4 [1] 66/18 | 5/2 | beginning [4] 4/12 42/10 |
| are [255] | $31 / 6$ | behalf [12] 9/2 $13 / 10 \quad 24 / 1$ |
| aren't [2] | authority [3] 20/10 22/10 | 28/9 29/25 33/8 36/20 41/19 |
| argue [3] 79/14 79/14 | 7/22 | 43/4 49/16 $49 / 24$ 77/14 |
| argument [8] 12/19 15/5 | automobiles [1] | behind [5] 22/18 31/19 40/7 |
| 15/16 24/6 24/22 59/1 6 | available [3] 9/8 9/10 | 86/1 |
| 63/5 | Avenue [1] | behoove [1] |
| argumentative [1] 15/13 | avenues [2] | being [25] 4/22 5/5 |
| arguments [2] 30/16 59/25 | aware [7] 11/23 $36 / 442 / 1$ 71/18 75/16 75/17 86/7 | $\begin{array}{llll}6 / 17 & 16 / 21 & 17 / 15 & 18 / 11 \\ 6 / 18 & 28 / 24 & 28 / 25 & 31 / 8\end{array}$ |
| arising [6] 15/23 25/21 26/3 | away [3] $40 / 4$ 74/12 86/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 4 & 33 / 22 & 34 / 23 & 34 / 23 & 49 / 22\end{array}$ |
| /12 29/14 31/10 | awesome [1] 40/14 | 53/7 56/9 70/17 73/3 74/5 |
| around [6] 17/17 41/4 44/13 | B | 74/12 76/15 86/6 |
| 44/14 57/9 86/7 |  | belabor [1] 76/20 \|belief [1] 14/9 |
| arrangement [1] | baby [1] $8 / 18$   <br> back [16] $8 / 22$ $10 / 14$ $21 / 20$ | belief [1] 14/9 <br> believe [36] 12/9 14/25 15/9 |
| rived [2] 79/25 | 21/24 38/10 45/9 49/7 61/25 | 15/25 17/10 $26 / 6$ 29/1 $31 / 15$ |
| articulate [1] 16 | 62/19 64/6 66/7 67/8 79/18 | 33/25 37/1 41/17 50/21 51/4 |
| articulated [1] | 80/20 84/4 87/4 | 51/7 58/7 59/19 60/11 61/11 |
| articulating [1] | badge [1] 56/12 | 64/3 65/3 65/14 66/12 67/6 |
| as [165] | bag [1] 41/ | 68/10 71/6 71/23 74/12 75/18 |
| ask [11] 8/13 21/16 25/20 | balance [3] 24/15 43/17 | 77/6 78/7 78/8 78/19 80/14 |
| 39/5 48/5 52/17 61/25 69/20 | 43/21 | 81/3 86/11 87/13 |
| 69/25 85/18 87/1 | Baltimore [4] 2/12 57/23 | believe it [1] 61/11 |
| asked [6] 28/24 30/4 55/1 | 66/5 66/8 | believers [1] 78/24 |
| 62/2 70/3 81/2 | Bar [3] 14/13 16/5 17/21 | bellwether [13] 47/10 47/10 |
| asking [5] 9/18 27/21 28/6 | barely [1] 48/18 | 58/23 59/9 62/6 62/10 62/11 |
| 32/17 79/7 | Barnes [9] 2/8 2/11 29/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}62 / 23 & 63 / 11 & 70 / 12 & 71 / 14 & 72 / 4\end{array}$ |
| aspects [1] 44/16 | 29/22 33/11 34/4 34/15 35/ | 72/14 |
| assigned [7] 58/5 58/9 58/12 | based [4] 14/6 36/25 52/21 | benefit [14] 8/10 21/5 21/6 |
| 60/16 61/13 61/17 65/11 | based [4] $14 / 6$ 36/25 52/21 | $\begin{array}{\|rrrr} \text { benefit } & {[14]} & 8 / 10 & 21 / 5 \\ 21 / 10 & 21 / 6 \\ \hline 2 / 17 & 42 / 3 & 42 / 13 & 44 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| assistance [1] 30/14 | basically [6] 58/17 58/21 | 75/2 75/10 75/11 75/22 85/4 |
|  | 63/12 63/12 63/21 77/14 | 85/20 |
| assume [2] 36/12 73/11 assumes [1] 53/12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { basis [4] } \\ & 61 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | Bennett [3] 64/4 64/10 64/12 best [15] 10/2 11/24 12/2 |


| B | California there [1] 63/3 | caught [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| best... [7] 44/14 77/8 78/23 | $\begin{array}{\|lllll} \text { California's [2] } & 58 / 25 & 59 / 17 \\ \text { call [11] } & 10 / 24 & 14 / 18 & 29 / 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { causation [5] 59/13 63, } \\ 63 / 11 \quad 63 / 23 \quad 78 / 17 \end{array}$ |
| $85 / 14 \text { 85/17 86/9 86/10 }$ | $33 / 13 \quad 33 / 19 \quad 36 / 3 \quad 38 / 10 \quad 39 / 16$ | census [2] 46/2 84/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { better [1] } 83 / 9 \\ & \text { between [10] } 10 / 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $46 / 24 \quad 72 / 6 \quad 87 / 3$ | center [1] 77/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 18/25 } & 19 / 18 & 54 / 7 & 57 / 19 & 62 / 16\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { called [5] 23/22 39/2 46/25 } \\ & 70 / 10 \quad 75 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | Century [1] $2 / 8$    <br> certain $[13]$ $5 / 8$ $12 / 8$ 17 |
| $62 / 24 \text { 79/22 85/3 }$ peyond [1] 79/7 | calling [2] 79/9 85/3 |  |
| big [3] big | calls [6] 7/17 10/10 10/16 | 47/16 47/17 49/19 51/4 59/24 |
| bills [3] 53/5 53/9 54/8 | 10/23 36/11 36/12 | certainly [9] 10/14 |
| binding [1] 18/21 | calm [1] 79/3 | 18/19 22/9 51/18 54/8 54/2 |
| birth [2] 8/18 8/22 | came [3] 9/6 9/11 20/7 | 55/20 85/10 |
| birthday [1] 66/19 | can [66] 7/19 $7 / 23$ 8/5 8/9 | certificati $30 / 19 \quad 33 / 7$ |
| bit [13] 3/3 5/11 5/13 5/14 | 12/23 13/18 $13 / 19 \quad 13 / 21 \quad 14 / 3$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 13 / 1 & 21 / 23 & 34 / 10 & 40 / 4 & 48 / 9 \\ 49 / 21 & 57 / 25 & 62 / 20 & 79 / 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 16 / 7 & 16 / 7 & 16 / 11 & 16 / 12 & 16 / 15 \end{array}$ | certify [2] [1] $31 / 1$ |
| bit just [1] 3/3 | 18/19 19/2 23/17 27/5 28/14 | challenge [1] |
| board [2] 43/6 73/ | $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 22 & 32 / 8 & 33 / 21 & 35 / 2 & 35 / 4\end{array}$ | chambers [2] 10/24 37/2 |
| book [2] 5/1 5/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 15 & 37 / 17 & 42 / 2 & 43 / 22 & 44 / 8\end{array}$ | chance [3] 6/17 6/17 24/8 |
| both [18] 4/16 13/11 15/8 | 44/10 $44 / 17$ 44/18 $45 / 9$ 48/3 | change [3] 29/4 34/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 12 & 15 / 15 & 17 / 10 & 17 / 11\end{array}$ | 49/9 50/7 52/24 53/5 | changed [3] 5/20 21/21 34/10 |
| 18/11 23/15 27/4 35/5 38/2 | 18 54/24 60/2 61/24 62/20 | channels [1] |
| 42/14 42/24 43/2 43/10 49/23 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}2 & 71 / 20 & 73 / 14 & 73 / 18 & 73 / 21\end{array}$ | characterize [1] |
| 61/8 | 74/18 $74 / 19$ 75/15 $76 / 778 / 16$ | characterized [1] |
| Boulevard [1] 1/19 | 78/23 79/1 80/16 85/14 85/25 | chart [3] 56/17 61/15 68/ |
| BRADFORD [1] 1/21 | 96/10 | chasing [1] |
| brain [1] 22/18 |  | Chattanooga [1] 57 |
| brand [4] 17/1 5 | 47/25 | check [6] 3/15 9/21 11/ |
| 70/19 | cancer [1] 78/7 | 11/8 46/3 84/3 |
| brands [7] 30/3 31/3 31/20 | cancers [4] 46/18 63/22 | choir [1] 42/12 |
| 66/1 66/14 71/13 73/4 | 71/17 71/19 | choose [1] 85/ |
| break [1] 4/4 | Candy [1] | Christi [1] |
| breakfast [2] 40/1 41/8 | cannot [2] 70/24 73/1 | circle [1] 49/7 |
| breaks [1] 3/7 | [1] | Circuit [2] |
| brief [1] 81/7 | care [2] 29/11 | circulated [3] 5/12 6/10 |
| briefed [6] 23/10 23/10 | carefully [1] 67/2 | circumstances [1] |
| 24/21 24/24 35/5 62/5 | CAROLINE [1] 1/14 | cite [1] 37/3 |
| briefing [29] 19/5 19/7 | carry [1] 21/12 | City [1] 66/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 19 / 17 & 19 / 22 & 19 / 25 & 23 / 23 & 26 / 6 \\ 26 / 14 & 28 / 17 & 29 / 15 & 30 / 14 & \end{array}$ | case [78] $1 / 3$ 3/16 $6 / 19$ 7/4 | claim [2] 45/25 46/1 |
| 26/14 28/17 29/15 30/14 <br> $31 / 24$ 32/22 33/5 34/3 35/22 | 7/5 8/2 8/4 8/12 9/3 9/7 | claimant [2] 47/16 50/7 |
| 36/3 59/1 59/11 59/12 59/18 | 9/16 11/21 27/6 27/23 27/23 | claimants [3] 46/22 47/1 |
| 59/19 62/16 64/15 65/12 | 28/7 33/2 36/22 37/13 39/16 | 49/19 |
| 65/24 66/3 66/8 68/9 | 40/9 40/10 40/11 41/4 42/8 | claims [26] 14/11 14/15 |
| Briefly [1] 35/25 | 42/11 $43 / 10$ 44/9 51/12 53/20 | 16/22 16/25 17/13 18/11 |
| bring [1] 85/5 | 58/10 58/12 59/19 60/16 | 18/12 30/1 30/5 30/7 30/10 |
| bringing [1] 79/10 | 60/20 61/5 62/25 63/1 63/8 | $30 / 17$ 30/20 31/2 31/4 31/4 |
| brings [3] 40/23 64/2 65/9 | 63/16 63/20 64/9 64/9 64/17 | $31 / 18$ 31/20 33/7 33/25 36/5 |
| brought [3] 7/11 16/22 33/25 | 65/3 65/10 65/23 66/1 66/5 | 45/22 46/15 50/12 74/6 81/25 |
| brown [1] 41/2 | 66/10 66/11 66/12 66/14 | clarification [1] 22/3 |
| bucket [1] 52/3 | 66/16 67/3 $67 / 11$ 68/1 68/7 | clarified [1] 55/2 |
| buckets [1] 52/ | 68/8 68/16 69/15 73/3 73/6 | clarifying [4] 14/12 14/20 |
| bunch [1] 60/20 | 73/7 73/9 77/7 79/12 81/6 | 16/3 28/2 |
| business [5] 15/3 15/7 | 81/12 82/8 82/12 84/6 84/20 | class [1] 26/1 |
| 39/12 40/12 | 85/9 85/15 85/21 85/21 86/19 | clean [3] 15/14 55/3 55/6 |
|  | cases [53] 7/10 9/1 9/15 | cleaned [1] 55/ |
| button <br> [1] <br> 47/25 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}18 / 10 & 30 / 1 & 30 / 3 & 39 / 4 & 39 / 5\end{array}$ | cleaner [1] 28/1 |
| C | 57/13 57/14 57/18 57/21 | 27/17 27/25 28/11 33/10 |
|  | 57/23 58/1 58/4 58/5 58/15 | 33/21 36/20 36/25 73/24 |
| CA [1] 2/9 Cal | 61/8 61/17 61/19 63/12 63/13 | 78/20 87/17 |
| California [29] 57/15 57/16 | 64/18 65/16 65/18 66/4 66/7 | clearer [1] 20/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}57 / 25 & 58 / 1 & 58 / 3 & 58 / 4 & 58 / 13\end{array}$ | 67/16 68/22 69/22 71/16 | $\text { clearly [2] } 14 / 10$ |
| 58/21 59/5 $59 / 7$ 59/9 $59 / 18$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 71 / 16 & 72 / 14 & 73 / 1 & 75 / 14 & 75 / 16\end{array}$ | client [1] 9/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}60 / 1 & 61 / 18 & 63 / 3 & 63 / 10 & 70 / 8 \\ 70 / 20 & 71 / 2 & 71 / 16 & 73 / 2 & 74 / 11\end{array}$ | 75/17 $75 / 20 \quad 75 / 20 \quad 75 / 25 \quad 77 / 1$ | clients [3] 9/4 77/5 77/8 |
| $70 / 20$ 71/2 71/16 73/2 74/11 <br> $74 / 14 \quad 74 / 16 \quad 75 / 16 \quad 76 / 25 \quad 79 / 5$ | 77/5 77/22 $78 / 2 \quad 79 / 13 \quad 79 / 25$ | clock [2] 27/3 30/24 |
| $80 / 1282 / 23$ | $81 / 24 \quad 85 / 11$ | close [9] 15/3 15/7 26/25 29/4 60/6 60/17 62/3 62/16 |


| C | computer [4] 11/5 24/25 48 | 19/6 36/1 44/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| close... [1] 66/12 | concepts [1] 14/4 | conversations [4] 21/7 27/11 $79 / 582 / 22$ |
| closely [2] closes [1] | concerned [3] $82 / 6$ 83/4 $83 / 5$ | convey [1] |
| closest [1] 36/16 | concerns [1] 85/1 | Cook [1] 66 |
| closing [1] 59/18 | concise [1] 28/11 | coordinate |
| CM [2] 17/24 21/12 | conclude [2] 43/3 8 <br> concluded [1] 87/20 | coordinated [4] 76/15 80/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { CM/ECF [2] 17/24 } & 21 / 12\end{array}$ | conclusions [1] 21/9 | 83/15 83/19 |
| CMC [1] 57/1 | conduct [2] 39/22 81/7 | coordinating [8] 57/19 59/25 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { CME [1] } & 26 / 17 \\ \text { co [1] } & 76 / 13\end{array}$ | conducted [1] 3/24 | 60/5 74/25 76/6 77/16 77/17 |
| co-counsel | confer [1] 80/17 | 83/9 |
| coffee [1] 41/9 | conference [19] 1/8 3/1 | coordination [16] 61/23 70/2 |
| coleads [2] 69/ | 3/16 3/16 4/23 25/8 | 70/16 71/1 76 |
| collaborate [1] 82/19 | /6 41/9 41/9 42/8 42/11 | 80/15 81/16 81/20 82/3 82/25 |
| collaboration [8] 60/25 | /10 46/11 55/13 58/13 | $83 / 183 / 12 \text { 85/19 86/ }$ |
| 68/10 68/18 69/2 70/2 7 | conferences [5] | cordially |
| 81/8 81/12 | $58 / 1064 / 568 / 13$ | core [1] 46/13 |
| ```collaborative [2] 80/23``` | confidential [1] | Corpus [1] 66/11 |
| collaboratively [1] 77/21 | confidentiality [2] 7 | correct [5] 51/25 |
| colleagues [4] 40/25 42/16 | 76/23 | 88/1 |
| 80/17 85/9 | confidentially [1] 79/18 | corrected [1] |
| collect [1] | confirm [1] 80/4 | correctly |
| collected [1] 50/ | firmation [1] | corroboration |
| collecting [1] 46/21 | confirmed [1] 33/20 confirming [1] 79/ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cost [5] 5/4 43/ } \\ & 53 / 13 \text { 53/15 } \end{aligned}$ |
| collection [5] 46/12 46/14 $49 / 1650 / 451 / 3$ | confused [1] 7/20 | costing [2] 43/16 43/20 |
| Columbia [1] 1/23 | confusion [1] 10/12 | costs [2] 53/5 53/21 |
| combinations [1] 69/24 | connecting [1] 78/6 | 8/13 10/19 20/25 21/12 21/14 |
| come [14] 4/19 12/20 18/21 | connection [2] 10/10 46/13 | $\begin{array}{llll}22 / 11 & 22 / 21 & 23 / 11 & 23 / 12\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}19 / 23 & 24 / 24 & 43 / 18 & 43 / 19\end{array}$ | connectivity [1] 45/5 | 24/19 24/23 25/9 28/22 28/25 |
| 45/13 50/10 51/21 52/2 62/12 | Connelly [2] 13/7 40/18 | $30 / 15$ 32/7 32/10 41/7 44/3 |
| comes [3] 23/12 | Connolly [1] 2/2 | 49/7 61/25 76/16 76/24 80/24 |
| comfortable [3] $20 / 15$ 41/15 | conservative [1] 85/2 | 83/8 |
| 60/2 | consider [6] 21/14 25/20 | couldn' |
| coming [8] 4/2 14/5 14/6 | 30/15 71/25 74/22 81/20 | 86/16 87/7 |
| 42/2 51/22 58/8 73/24 79/15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { consideration [6] } \\ 25 / 331 / 23 \text { 19/11 } 24 / 8 \\ 82 / 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccc}\text { counsel [26] } & 4 / 23 & 6 / 5 & 8 / 1 \\ 8 / 11 & 8 / 13 & 13 / 3 & 18 / 9 & 42 / 2\end{array}$ |
| commence [1] 66/9 | consistent [1] 78/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 51/12 } & 52 / 4 & 69 / 17 & 70 / 1 & 70 / 1\end{array}$ |
| comment [2] 35/9 35/10 committed [3] 69/12 72/2 | consulted [7] 70/18 70/22 | 70/19 70/20 70/21 70/24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { committed [3] 69/12 } 72 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | 70/25 71/11 72/19 72/22 82/6 | $\begin{array}{llllll}71 / 12 & 71 / 13 & 73 / 1 & 74 / 14 & 75 / 5\end{array}$ |
| Committee [3] 41/25 44/12 | consumer [1] 66/4 | 76/13 82/3 82/7 82/23 |
| 69/10 [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contact [4] } 61 / 13 \\ & 68 / 2181 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | count [1] 4/21 <br> counties [1] 57/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \begin{array}{l} \text { common [4] } \\ 75 / 22 \end{array} & 75 / 2 & 75 / 9 & 75 / 11 \\ \text { communicate } & 121 & 55 / 6 & 82 / 19 \end{array}$ | contemplate [2] 32/23 62/7 <br> contemplated [2] 62/10 62/15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { country [4] } \left.\begin{array}{l} 77 / 23 \end{array}\right] \text { 57/9 77/22 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| communicate [2] 55/6 82/19 communicated [1] 20/9 | contemplates <br> [1] $72 / 9$ | counts [1] 8 |
| conicated [1] | contemplating [1] 78/12 | county [12] 58/5 58/6 59/ |
| communication [4] 44/11 | context [3] 27/12 72/20 | 61/23 64/9 65/10 65/19 65/19 |
| 81/16 81/22 81/23 | 73/10 | 65/23 66/2 66/10 67/10 |
| comparable [1] 72 | contingent [1] 62/1 | county-wide [1] 61/23 |
| comparing [1] 59/14 | continue [17] 3/22 4/18 | couple [5] 5/24 12/5 56/23 |
| competing [1] 15/2 | 10/22 31/21 45/22 49/25 50 | 57/22 76/21 |
| complaint [5] 25/23 26/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}52 / 17 & 74 / 7 & 74 / 9 & 74 / 17 & 85 / 8\end{array}$ | coupled [1] 17/2 |
| 26/13 29/15 31/11 | (17) 85/18 86/11 86/18 | course [13] 3/22 3/25 6/24 |
| complaints [15] $14 / 15$ 16/21 | 87/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 4 & 24 / 2 & 28 / 10 & 34 / 24 & 37 / 5\end{array}$ |
| 17/2 17/5 17/12 17/18 18/11 | continued [1] 51/9 | court [124] |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}18 / 12 & 18 / 14 & 26 / 1 & 27 / 19 & 33 / 23\end{array}$ | $86 / 19$ | Court's [9] 9/9 10/8 19/11 |
| $\begin{array}{cc}33 / 25 & 64 / 14 \\ \text { complete [2] } & 65 / 15 \\ \text { colit } & 78\end{array}$ | continuing [3] 48/13 49/23 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 19/13 } & 26 / 13 & 29 / 19 & 34 / 19\end{array}$ |
| complete [2] 46/17 78 completed [2] 65/25 |  | 34/24 65/13 |
| completely [1] 40/19 <br> completion [1] 4/16 <br> complex [1] 8/11 <br> component [1] 42/9 | ```contraption [1] 55/15 contribute [2] 44/18 44/19 control [1] 67/13 convenient [1] 53/17``` | ```courthouses [3] 4/10 4/14 4/19 courts [12] 7/16 61/4 68/10 74/4 75/6 75/8 76/6 76/10``` |


| C | $\begin{array}{lllllll}33 / 18 & 34 / 8 & 34 / 11 & 40 / 18 & 45 / 15\end{array}$ | discuss [4] 4/18 24/9 29 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cover [2] 37/6 45/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 49 / 17 & 53 / 13 & 53 / 14 & 53 / 19 \\ 53 / 20 & 54 / 3 & 58 / 2 & 64 / 21 & 72 \end{array}$ |  |
| coverage [1] 44/15 | $72 / 10 \quad 72 / 11 \quad 72 / 13 \quad 72 / 22$ | $35 / 24 \quad 62 / 21$ |
| covered [3] 14/15 33/16 | $\begin{array}{lll}73 / 16 & 77 / 15 & 80 / 5\end{array}$ | discussing [9] 14/19 21/6 |
| covers [1] 37/10 | Defendants' [5] 14/8 18/6 | 26/3 33/15 40/15 47/5 60/4 |
| COVID [3] $4 / 1$ 4/17 $41 / 11$ | 64/23 66/17 74 | 72/17 84/13 |
| COVID-19 [1] 41/11 | Defense [14] 15/8 32/3 32/5 | discussion [6] 3/14 3/15 |
| CPF [1] 72/7 | $36 / 153 / 10$ 53/15 53/24 63/17 | 12/1 25/8 47/12 |
| CPS [1] 48/13 | /18 71/13 72/19 75/5 76/2 | discussions [5] 12/4 29/25 |
| create [1] 9/13 | deficiencies [2] 46/3 46/5 | disingenuous [1] 81/21 |
| creative [1] 7/7 | deficiencies [2] 46/3 46/5 deficiency [1] 46/4 | disingenuous $[1]$ $81 / 21$  <br> Dismiss [13] $12 / 6$ $14 / 8$ $25 / 12$ |
| critically [1] 84/15 | deficient [2] 46/16 $47 / 1$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 37/8 } & 50 / 2 & 64 / 10 & 64 / 15 \\ 65 / 12\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { current [1] } & 9 / 25 \\ \text { currently [3] } & 41 / 6 & 50 / 3 & 51 / 3 \end{array}$ | definitely [3] 61/9 68/15 | 65/24 66/3 66/8 78/12 84/13 |
| Currently [3] 41/6 50/3 51/3 cutoff [1] 53/18 | 68/17 | dismissal [2] 22/3 53/12 |
|  | delivered [1] 50/1 | dismissed [5] 9/4 17 |
| D | Delta [1] 4/7 | 18/11 31/3 31/20 |
| D.C [ | delved [2] 68/7 | dismissing [1] |
| daily [1] 48/14 | nied [1] 32/9 | dispositive [3] 59/2 62 |
| Dann [1] 2/11 | depends [3] 53/24 53/24 | dispute [2] 18/3 |
| data [4] 17/11 18/17 47/7 72/2 | $67 / 19$ | dispute [2] disseminating [1] 10/ |
| database [2] 50/8 51/8 | depositions [2] 64/20 64/21 | distributor [2] 16/23 |
| date [21] 4/24 19/15 20/24 | describe [1] | distributors [5] 30/2 30/ |
| 31/1 37/24 38/1 50/20 51/16 | described [3] 17/9 19/8 | 31/16 31/17 34/1 |
| 55/7 59/15 59/15 62/3 62/3 | 30/20 | DISTRICT [5] 1/1 1 |
| 62/3 66/21 67/4 67/5 67/6 | deserves [1] 34/19 | ditto [1] 41/22 |
| 71/23 74/15 88/4 | designated [2] 43/2 46/18 | diversity [1] 44 |
| dates [6] 15/22 27/4 60/8 | designations [1] $71 / 17$ | dividends [1] 42 |
| 64/19 74/10 76/8 | designations [1] desirable [1] 19/15 | DIVISION [1] 1/2 |
| Daubert [14] 58/25 59/11 | desired [1] 68/19 | do [102] |
| 59/13 59/17 60/6 61/7 62/2 | detail [2] 3/18 36/7 | do all [1] 23/5 |
| 66/20 67/25 $70 / 4 \quad 78 / 3 \quad 78 / 17$ | detailed [1] 60/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { docket [11] } & 14 / 7 & 14 / 14 & 15 / 14\end{array}$ |
| 79/12 85/2 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { detailed [1] } \\ \text { details [2] } & 54 / 10 & 62 / 13\end{array}$ | dock |
| day [17] 31/25 33/13 33/17 | Development <br> [1] $41 / 25$ | 60/11 67/12 67/20 |
| 41/12 41/12 48/9 50/16 51/18 | devoted [1] 84/25 | docketed [1] 21/12 |
| 58/9 60/3 77/13 78/10 78/13 | DeVries [1] 2/11 | dockets [1] 6/20 |
| 81/13 83/22 84/5 86/13 | dialed [1] $49 / 10$ | document [2] |
| days [11] 9/3 20/7 26/24 |  |  |
| 34/22 34/22 35/2 35/3 46/2 | $39 / 2 \quad 39 / 17 \quad 39 / 17 \quad 57 / 3 \quad 57 / 4$ | 27/11 28/16 36/14 44/22 |
| 50/22 72/11 74/24 |  | 27/11 28/16 36/14 44/22 <br> 52/19 87/1 |
| de [1] 1/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}71 / 10 & 73 / 3 & 73 / 8 & 74 / 15 & 79 / 17\end{array}$ | does [11] |
| deadline [20] 14/5 14/6 |  | 29/3 34/25 37/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 24 & 15 / 17 & 15 / 23 & 15 / 24 & 16 / 2\end{array}$ | didn't [11] 5/17 15/19 16/10 | 77/11 78/18 83/21 |
| 19/12 26/24 27/3 34/16 35/15 | didn't $[11]$ $5 / 17$ $15 / 19$ $16 / 10$ <br> $29 / 11$ $36 / 4$ $37 / 14$ $43 / 18$ $43 / 19$ | doesn't [13] 6/12 |
| 54/18 64/20 64/21 64/22 | $79 / 4 \quad 86 / 16 \quad 87 / 6$ | $21 / 11 \quad 21 / 12 \quad 28 / 5 \quad 36 / 15 \quad 37$ |
| 64/23 66/19 66/20 87/2 | 79/4 86/16 87/6 | 21/11 21/12 28/5 36/15 37/3 |
| deadlines [2] 17/22 46/1 | $85 / 685 / 7$ | $85 / 10$ |
| deal [1] 77/4 | different [13] 20/20 23/3 | doing [20] $4 / 25$ 13/12 16 |
| dealing [1] 47/20 | 38/10 51/20 51/21 57/17 | 17/5 17/19 34/25 38/15 38/16 |
| dealt [1] 77/5 | 60/17 63/24 73/2 77/21 78/23 | $38 / 16$ 38/17 38/18 38/21 |
| dealt [1] 77/5 | 85/1 85/1 | 38/24 40/13 44/16 46/7 47/6 |
| December [2] 64/21 65/4 decide [1] | differently [2] 32/18 84/19 | 52/1 84/5 84/11 |
| decide [1] 80/6 decided [1] 63/7 | difficult [2] 8/2 8/6 | don't [47] 6/13 7/19 20/12 |
|  | difficulties [1] 11/20 | 22/11 $22 / 25$ 23/4 23/15 $23 / 16$ |
| decision [4] $17 / 16 \quad 87 / 5 \quad 87 / 7$ $87 / 8$ | difficulty [1] 51/17 | 23/17 25/23 27/20 29/3 32/14 |
|  | diligent [1] 52/17 | 33/4 37/2 38/17 38/17 39/15 |
| default [3] 23/12 23/21 | directing [1] 26/6 | 39/17 39/20 41/22 43/6 43/6 |
| $27 / 13$ | disadvantaged [1] 21/8 | 43/15 43/24 44/3 45/8 48/21 |
| Defendant [1] | disagree [1] 68/25 | 49/4 55/12 56/1 60/1 62/13 |
| Defendant's [1] 59/6 | disagreement [2] 19/1 60/14 | 62/14 64/3 69/18 70/15 71/24 |
| DEFENDANTS [38] 2/1 16/23 | disclose [1] 48/7 | 73/5 73/10 73/20 74/12 75/25 |
| 16/23 16/24 17/1 17/14 24/18 | discovery [11] 63/9 66/19 | 76/20 76/22 79/21 83/8 |
| 25/4 27/4 28/12 29/25 30/2 | 75/1 75/2 $75 / 4$ 75/6 75/7 | done [17] 3/22 6/24 17/11 |
| 30/18 31/3 31/13 31/13 32/23 | 76/2 76/3 76/5 82/11 | 20/9 22/11 36/23 53/6 53/16 |
| $30 / 18$ 31/3 31/13 31/13 32/23 | discretionary [2] 25/24 37/2 | 61/1 61/23 76/17 77/24 78/22 |


| D | engaged [3] 29/25 70/22 | exculpation [1] 55/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| done... [4] 80/24 85/14 | enjoy [2] 4/3 87/16 | exhaustive [1] 18/20 <br> exhibit [1] 18/16 |
| 85/16 85/25 | enjoyed <br> [1] <br> 41/1 | $\text { exist [2] } 28 / 5 \quad 37 / 3$ |
| dosage [1] 71/22 <br> double [1] 56/9 | enjoying [1] 13/24 | exists [1] 37/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { double [1] } & \\ \text { down [13] } & 13 / 24 & 21 / 2 & 37 / 12\end{array}$ | enough [2] 7/4 25/2 | exit [2] 46/4 48/1 |
| 42/20 53/7 58/17 58/24 63/15 | ensued [1] 87/9 | expanded [1] |
| 63/22 65/5 74/17 79/3 83/25 | ensure [3] | expect [6] 29/6 60/17 66/15 |
| $\underset{18 / 15}{\operatorname{draft}}\left[\begin{array}{lllll} {[4]} & 10 / 5 & 10 / 8 & 18 / 9 \end{array}\right.$ | entered [10] 10/23 12/6 | expected [1] 45/24 |
| draw [1] | 19/19 56/20 60/11 65/12 67/6 | expecting [2] 58/8 60/ |
| Dropbox [2] 9/13 9/23 | 70/14 71/6 71/8 | expedited [3] 23/22 26/14 |
| dropped [1] 50/7 | entering [1] 65/ | 35/9 |
| due [7] $4 / 1$ | enters [1] 15/20 | expeditiously [4] 72/25 |
| 65/15 66/17 66/18 | entire [1] 36/1 | 73/22 76/9 85/ |
| duplicative [2] 75/1 76/2 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { entirely [1] } & 36 / 9 \\ \text { entities [2] } & 53 / 7\end{array}$ | expenses |
| during [4] 19/5 33/13 41/1 | entities [2] 53/7 | experience [7] 4/3 7/10 |
| 54/16 | entry [12] 12/22 12/22 <br> 14/14 15/14 15/23 16/1 | 39/19 59/23 67/14 68/18 69/3 |
| E | 18/7 29/1 30/4 30/9 | expert [6] 64/18 64/22 64/23 |
| each [12] 4/13 7/3 7/20 9/17 | envision [3] 16/16 32/7 32/7 | 65/4 66/17 66/18 |
| 13/18 15/9 50/5 52/4 68/16 | equally [1] 39/24 | expertise [1] 7/9 |
| $72 / 1$ 72/14 86/13 | erroneously [1] 21/ | explain [2] 5/14 |
| earlier [6] 5/13 19/4 34/23 | especially [2] 60/18 | explaining [1] 10/ |
| 41/2 81/1 81/2 | ESQ [10] 1/10 1/13 1/14 1/17 | explanation [2] 20/19 |
| early [2] 50/9 87/6 | 1/21 2/1 2/1 2/4 2/7 2/11 | explicit [1] 16/1 |
| East [1] 2/8 | essence [1] 48/23 | explore [1] 85/24 |
| ECF [2] 17/24 | essentially [2] 14/3 64/19 | express [2] 7/4 44/ |
| educated [2] 7/11 86/7 | established [1] 49/18 | extent [7] 5/13 21/1 |
| effect [4] 18/19 19/19 53/16 | even [18] 8/2 11/1 16/12 | $32 / 12$ 32/16 52/18 54/10 |
| 60/18 | 20/25 $22 / 11$ 32/21 $36 / 15$ | extraordinary [1] 33/22 |
| effectively [1] 5/4 | $46$ | ey |
| effectuating [1] 10/6 |  | F |
| efficiencies [1] 7/2 | evening [3] 24/14 24/15 | facilitate [1] 10/2 |
| efficiency [1] <br> efficient [2] | 30/14 | fact [5] 4/25 70/18 78/1 |
| efficiently [3] 5/4 76/9 | event [6] 41/4 41/8 41/13 | 78/18 78/20 |
| 83/6 | 41/24 42/19 43/4 | factors [1] |
| effort [4] 18/21 44/1 76/1 | events [1] 42/3 | factual [1] 56/16 |
| 86/11 | ever [1] 6/13 | fair [3] 54/18 54/19 54/22 |
| efforts [1] 80/ | every [10] 7/3 7/4 7/20 57/7 | faith [2] 18/21 85/8 |
| eight [1] 10/18 | 77/9 78/17 83/5 84/19 84/20 | fall [1] 21/2 |
| either [10] 14/25 15/16 | - | falling [1] 17/8 |
| 21/18 29/20 42/24 65/24 | everybody [11] 3/1 $3 / 2$ 3/6 | family [2] 6/21 87 |
| 71/12 73/21 75/4 80/5 | /4 6/18 | far [11] 6/10 58/14 63/22 |
| elaborate [1] 80/17 | everyone [13] 3/23 5/15 6/16 | $82 / 6 \text { 83/3 83/4 }$ |
| elected [1] 49/25 | $6 / 23 \text { 11/18 } 36 / 1238 / 20 \quad 39 / 22$ | fashion [2] 37/19 84/3 |
| electronic [1] 70/16 | $43 / 1254 / 24 \text { 68/13 83/23 }$ | fast [3] 14/6 15/24 67/2 |
| elephant [1] 78/5 | $87 / 15$ | fault [1] 79/17 |
| Eleventh [3] 28/3 33/2 36/5 | everything [17] 4/15 6/11 | favor [1] 34/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { eloquently [1] } & 74 / 3 \\ \text { else [8] } & 39 / 22 & 45 / 11 & 55 / 9\end{array}$ | 6/23 38/5 43/20 48/12 48/14 | Fe [1] 57/23 |
| else [8] $39 / 22$ 45/11 55/9 $62 / 1965 / 22 ~ 72 / 12 ~ 74 / 20 ~ 76 / 8 ~$ | 48/19 60/15 63/21 74/2 74/20 | fear [1] 40/4 |
| $62 / 19$ elsewhere [1] $72 / 22 / 12 ~ 74 / 11$ | 76/8 $76 / 15$ 83/6 83/8 85/2 | feasible [1] 41/13 |
| elsewhere [1] 74/11 <br> email [9] 9/19 11/5 21/16 | evidence [2] 78/6 81/10 <br> evolving [1] 41/11 | February [3] 64/21 65/6 66/17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 79 / 9 \\ & \text { emailed [2] } 32 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | exactly [9] 12/9 15/22 65/2 | Federal [10] 6/3 55/20 61/6 |
| emails | 65/2 68/2 70/2 72/8 81/1 | 77/16 79/23 80/15 83/11 |
| emanating [1] 25/12 | 85/16 | 84/17 84/25 88/5 |
| embark [1] 12/13 | example [8] 7/20 20/3 42/8 | Federal/State [1] 55/20 |
| encapsulate [1] 16/11 | 47/10 70/8 70/17 71/2 71/14 | feedback [1] 8/ |
| end [7] 14/23 18/24 20/25 | excellent [3] 11/13 42/22 | feel [9] 5/17 20/16 20/21 |
| ```23/9 43/5 50/9 68/4 endeavor [1] 28/11 endeavors [1] 8/1 ends [1] 59/18``` | exception [1] 68/23 excitement [1] 3/19 exclusive [1] 17/16 | ```84/14 feeling [1] 4/3 feels [1] 62/18``` |


| F | forth [6] 14/11 14/14 26/15 | 35/25 76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ferguson [1] 1/18 | $33 / 1$ 64/6 70/6 Fortunately [1] $4 / 15$ | Gilbert's [2] 18/17 35/10 give [8] 11/2 20/22 21/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { few [6] } 3 / 11 & 5 / 21 & 12 / 5 & 20 / 11 \\ 34 / 22 & 41 / 18 \end{array}$ | forum [1] 85/12 | $22 / 23 \quad 25 / 2 \quad 34 / 17 \quad 36 / 18 \quad 65 / 21$ |
| fewer [1] 51/7 | forward [15] 5/5 5/7 8/8 | given [9] $5 / 8$ 9/25 $14 / 24$ |
| field [1] 42/25 | $37 / 14$ 38/2 55/4 56/6 62/20 | 24/4 24/4 34/24 42 |
| fields [1] 72/2 | $74 / 7$ 74/9 76/9 82/1 $86 / 25$ $87 / 787 / 18$ | gives [3] |
| figured [1] 12/15 | founded [1] 27/23 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { giving [3] } & 8 / 8 & 8 / 22 & 10 / 25\end{array}$ |
| file [14] 9/14 15/8 19/13 20/14 21/14 24/19 25/14 | four [1] 56/10 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { go [28] } & 5 / 11 & 5 / 14 & 6 / 12 & 19 / 22\end{array}$ |
| 0/14 21/14 24/19 25/14 <br> 0/20 30/21 32/5 33/24 34 | fourth [2] 50/13 52/5 | 25/9 34/13 35/21 37/13 43/16 |
| $34 / 22 \quad 85 / 12$ | frames [1] 65/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}44 / 12 & 45 / 4 & 48 / 11 & 49 / 25 & 55 / 9\end{array}$ |
| filed [27] 8/25 15/25 17/17 | frankly [4] 11/1 17/15 21/6 | 56/3 56/6 57/5 57/6 57/24 |
| 17/22 25/3 25/10 25/11 25/14 |  | 61/24 67/15 67/16 67/22 |
| 25/15 25/25 26/17 26/18 |  | 68/13 73/14 80/20 84/9 87/7 |
| 45/25 48/13 57/13 58/1 $63 / 22$ | free [1] | goal [2] 19/23 51/2 |
| 64/10 64/11 66/12 66/13 | freer [1] 4/3 | goes [2] 38/20 52/4 |
| 66/15 68/1 73/9 77/5 85/13 | freeze [1] 6/14 | going [67] 5/11 5/14 5/18 |
| 85/14 | Friday [7] 24/14 24/15 24/16 | 12/4 27/18 29/16 29/20 31/5 |
| filing [5] 15/2 24/6 34/11 | $26 / 16$ | 32/20 |
| 46/2 73/12 | friends [1] 6/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll}40 / 1 & 40 / 2 & 40 / 12 & 43 / 17 & 44 / 23\end{array}$ |
| filings [2] 9/22 11/7 | front [1] 19/10 | 45/12 $46 / 19$ 47/5 47/18 $48 / 14$ |
| fill [1] 10/14 | froze [1] 48/16 | 48/24 50/13 50/16 51/22 52/6 |
| filled [2] 46/17 47/1 | Ft [1] 2/16 | 52/22 54/6 55/24 56/5 56/24 |
| final [7] 14/10 22/1 22/2 | full [5] 4/17 21/19 24/12 | 58/20 58/22 58/23 58/24 |
| 30/5 30/10 31/19 60/10 | [ 63/4 | 60/16 62/9 63/7 63/18 63/23 |
| finally [1] 65/21 | fully [9] 23/10 23/10 24/21 | 65/14 65/23 65/24 66/2 66/7 |
| find [2] 28/7 34/6 | 24/24 43/6 43/23 59/13 62/5 | 67/3 67/15 68/14 68/14 68/16 |
| fine [4] 27/13 35/8 76/10 |  |  |
| 85/6 | function [1] 46/13 | 79/24 80/3 82/2 82/15 83/6 |
| finish [1] 76/17 | further [6] 16/24 16/25 | 83/8 83/9 84/4 86/7 86/24 |
| finished [1] 76/18 | 22/23 25/11 80/7 82/25 | gone [5] 4/13 4/15 6/11 7/1 |
| Finken [1] 76/13 | Furthermore [1] 10/16 | 64 |
| first [30] 5/23 7/13 8/17 | future [5] 10/17 10/20 $25 / 25$ $39 / 13$ 40/11 | good [25] $3 / 1 \quad 5 / 25 \quad 6 / 10 \quad 8 / 15$ <br> 8/17 9/24 10/20 11/10 11/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 5 & 16 / 5 & 16 / 7 & 24 / 2 & 28 / 3 \\ 31 / 8 & 33 / 12 & 33 / 17 & 34 / 5 & 34 / 25\end{array}$ |  | 13/6 13/8 13/9 13/11 13/23 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}31 / 8 & 33 / 12 & 33 / 17 & 34 / 5 \\ 37 / 20 & 45 / 12 & 47 / 24 & 50 / 22\end{array}$ | G | 18/21 29/22 29/24 40/8 40/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}  \\ 0 / 20 & 45 / 12 & 47 / 24 & 50 / 2 \\ 0 / 22 & 50 / 23 & 50 / 25 & 51 / 1 \end{array}$ | GA [1] | 40/12 46/21 49/14 55/17 |
| 57/1 57/24 62/6 63/7 63/1 | gambling [1] 61/ | 80/11 85/8 |
| 78/18 86/5 87/5 | game [1] 78/1 | Goodell [1] |
| fits [1] 84/20 | gather [1] 6/1 | got [2] 9/11 48/23 |
| five [2] 24/5 26/24 | gathered [1] 71 | gotten [3] 44/15 52/5 65 |
| five-hour [1] 24/5 | general [9] 9/14 11/21 12/11 | Grant [1] 76/25 |
| fixed [1] 49/4 | 53/4 59/12 63/6 63/10 63/23 | granted [1] 32/9 |
| FL [3] 1/5 1/20 2/16 | generally [3] 12/2 21/2 | granting [1] 14/7 |
| fleshed [1] 62/14 | generally [3] 12/2 21/24 | grease [1] 42/17 |
| flight [1] 24/5 | 58/1 [7] 14/7 16/23 20/25 | great [9] 8/21 13/1 |
| FLORIDA [2] 1/1 4/11 |  | 45/2 46/8 55/3 55/9 86/22 |
| fly [1] 24/10 | generics [2] |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { focal [3] } & 74 / 5 & 74 / 12 & 74 / 22\end{array}$ | $\text { get [47] } 5 / 3 \quad 6 / 8 \quad 7 / 17 \quad 7 / 17$ | $\text { greatly [1] } 41 / 1$ |
| focus [4] 54/16 54/25 56/22 69/13 | $7 / 19$ $7 / 25$ $10 / 10$ | grounds [1] 33/1 |
| focused [4] | 10/22 11/11 11/23 19/10 | group [3] 10/1 53/15 53/24 |
| 79/20 81/25 | 19/14 21/11 $22 / 4$ 24/16 $24 / 18$ | groups [4] 53/10 53/13 54/3 |
| folders [1] 9/15 | 25/2 26/9 27/6 28/3 28/20 | 55/6 |
| follow [1] 40/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 4 & 42 / 2 & 44 / 22 & 45 / 22 & 48 / 13\end{array}$ | grow [2] 10/19 45 |
| following [1] 50/1 | 50/16 53/25 54/9 54/17 55/2 | guess [13] 11/4 12/2 28/18 |
| force [2] 4/17 4/17 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}63 / 8 & 66 / 22 & 70 / 4 & 74 / 17 & 75 / 5\end{array}$ | 38/10 $38 / 22$ 42/12 $43 / 5$ 43/8 |
| foregoing [1] 88/1 | 75/8 77/21 78/3 84/16 84/21 | 47/20 53/11 56/5 69/18 79/21 |
| form [18] 14/15 16/20 17/2 | 85/4 86/3 86/4 86/13 | guesstimate [1] 84/9 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 17/5 } & 17 / 12 & 17 / 18 & 18 / 11 & 18 / 12\end{array}$ |  | ```Gugerty [2] 29/20 29/23 GW [1] 84/22``` |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}18 / 14 & 26 / 18 & 27 / 19 & 32 / 8 & 32 / 9\end{array}$ | getting [14] 10/8 $10 / 13$ 11/7 <br> $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 15 & 12 / 19 & 21 / 2 & 35 / 23 & 38 / 2\end{array}$ |  |
| 33/23 46/2 46/17 72/7 80/13 |  | H |
| formal [3] $24 / 6$ 24/13 $25 / 3$ | $52 / 6$ | had [36] 3/3 6/16 13/12 19/5 |
| format [3] $21 / 18$ 38/3 $41 / 15$ |  | $21 / 6 \quad 24 / 8 \quad 27 / 10 \quad 27 / 15 \quad 29 / 10$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { forms [3] } & 46 / 16 & 46 / 25 & 47 / 1 \\ \text { formulation [1] } & 71 / 22 & \end{array}$ | 13/11 13/21 18/3 19/8 19/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 34 / 3 & 39 / 3 & 39 / 4 & 39 / 4 & 39 / 5\end{array}$ |
| formulation [1] 71/22 | 24/1 25/19 26/20 28/9 33/8 | 43/16 45/11 45/23 47/16 48/9 |


| H | 59/1 59/24 60/12 77/2 80/10 | $22 / 5 \quad 28 / 24 \quad 35 / 9 \quad 42 / 12$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| had... [17] 49/21 53/13 |  |  |
| 53/13 $57 / 1857 / 5$ 58/10 $60 / 12$ | hearings $81 / 1084 / 285 / 3$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 1 ' m & {[4]} & 31 / 6 & 42 / 24 \\ \text { I'm/16 } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 60 / 13 & 61 / 4 & 64 / 10 & 65 / 11 & 72 / 19 \\ 77 / 19 & 83 / 25 & 85 / 1 & 87 / 5 & 87 / 6 \end{array}$ | heartfeltly [1] $42 / 6$ | $77 / 3$ |
| half [3] 3/23 6/11 65/18 | heavy [1] 38/15 | iceberg [1] 8 |
| Hamilton [2] 64/8 65/19 | held [1] 4/13 | idea [3] 14/17 39 |
| hand [3] 56/2 56/2 77/4 | help [5] 16/3 $55 / 15$ $55 / 17$ | $\begin{array}{\|lll} \text { ideal [1] } & 77 / 6 \\ \text { ideas [2] } & 8 / 8 & 85 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| handed [1] 3/8 | helped [3] $3 / 5$ 6/9 41/25 | identified [1] 17/4 |
| $\text { dle [3] 39/24 39/25 } 40 / 2$ | helpful [9] 10/8 21/22 32/14 | identify [2] 17/11 17/19 |
| handling [1] 7/24 | 38/23 38/24 53/5 68/19 80/3 | idly [1] 20/24 |
| hanging [1] 45/5 | 83/24 | ignorance [1] 21/ |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc} \text { happen [6] } & 6 / 13 & 58 / 20 & 67 / 19 \\ 73 / 22 & 78 / 7 & 78 / 9 & & \end{array}$ | $\text { her [2] } 22 / 780 / 6$ | ilk [1] 38/10 <br> Illinois [3] 57/22 66/2 |
| happened [2] 49/3 74/4 | here [40] 3/10 3/12 3/13 | 82/23 |
| happening [3] 7/18 68/1 | 3/13 5/16 5/16 12/25 13/15 | imagine [1] |
| happening [3] $7 / 18$ 68/11 | 14/4 19/23 24/7 25/8 26/15 | immediately |
| happens [3] 62/19 67/18 | 29/1 29/1 $35 / 24$ 45/15 45/18 | impactful [1] 42/19 |
| 67/24 | 48/10 $56 / 1 \begin{array}{lllll} \\ 69 / 18 & 71 / 4 & 72 / 7 & 72 / 19 & 67 / 1\end{array}$ | implicate [3] 33/23 33/25 |
| happy [5] 19/25 42/24 76/11 | 72/7 72/16 73/13 |  |
| 76/11 83/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}73 / 22 & 74 / 17 & 75 / 11 & 76 / 11 & 78 / 8\end{array}$ | implicated [1] 34/17 |
| hard [6] 6/18 $14 / 6 \quad 15 / 24$ | 78/9 79/20 81/25 81/25 85/9 | implicates [1] 54/10 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 36/13 } & 39 / 10 \quad 73 / 14\end{array}$ | 85/14 86/23 | implications [1] 27/21 |
| has [63] 3/2 4/15 5/9 5/20 | Hi [1] 45/7 | implore [1] |
| 6/11 6/18 6/23 7/1 9/1 12/3 | him [11] 29/18 $39 / 19$ 45/9 | important [14] 7/16 8/6 |
| 18/3 20/9 26/15 34/10 41/17 | 17 64/6 76/17 79/6 79/7 | 39/11 39/24 80/2 81/15 83/24 |
| 41/25 42/23 44/15 46/18 | 79/9 79/10 | 84/3 84/7 84/10 84/12 84/14 |
| 47/21 49/2 49/3 51/7 51/8 | his [2] 36/8 48/ | 84/16 87/16 |
| 54/12 $56 / 23$ 58/15 59/17 | [1] $17 / 25$ | in-person [3] 41/7 41/13 |
| 59/19 60/11 62/21 63/21 64/3 | HON [1] 2/15 | inadvertently |
| 64/18 65/10 65/24 66/6 66/9 | Honestly [1] 67/18 | inaudible [1] 48/18 |
| 66/16 68/6 68/7 68/7 68/8 | Honestly [1] 67 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}68 / 11 & 68 / 12 & 68 / 21 & 69 / 1 & 70 / 10\end{array}$ | Honor's [8] $15 / 1 \quad 19 / 4 \quad 25 / 3$ | $32 / 18$ |
| 70/11 $70 / 13$ 70/14 71/7 72/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 31 / 6 & 31 / 23 & 53 / 17 & 53 / 22 & 83 / 2\end{array}$ | included [2] 61/16 82/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}73 / 11 & 75 / 2 & 77 / 1 & 77 / 24 & 78 / 3\end{array}$ | HONORABLE [1] 1/8 | including [3] 44/17 60/5 |
| 78/10 78/11 81/22 83/11 | hope [10] 6/16 6/16 6/20 | 74/20 |
| 83/24 | 9/12 13/11 13/23 44/10 75/21 | inclusive [1] 43/11 |
|  | 86/10 86/19 | incumbent [1] 17/7 |
|  | hopeful [3] 19/2 27/5 28/14 | independent [1] 80/6 |
| haven't [8] 20/13 22/12 24/8 | hopefully [10] 3/10 $4 / 2$ 4/4 | independently [1] 7/23 |
| haven $29 / 5$ $56 / 25$ $58 / 20$ 60/11 | 5/5 6/14 9/24 56/18 57/1 | indicate [1] 60/13 |
| having [14] 4/4 6/5 12/16 | 57/5 86/9 | indicated [1] 82/10 |
| 19/16 24/18 32/7 38/22 41/23 | hoping [1] 60/9 | individual [7] 9/15 16/22 |
| 42/3 42/8 42/14 50/5 51/17 | hostage [1] 55/12 | 17/1 17/16 17/21 50/6 50 |
| $78 / 17$ l | hosted [1] 41/2 | inefficiencies [1] 82/12 |
| he [23] 16/7 24/9 36/4 39/16 | hour [2] 24/5 27/3 | inevitably [1] 86/8 |
| 39/17 39/17 39/18 45/6 45/6 | hours [3] 33/14 56/3 84/10 | inform [1] 86/8 |
| 45/9 45/9 45/10 45/18 55/14 | Houston [1] 1/12 | information [13] 5/3 7 |
| 55/15 $56 / 3 \quad 76 / 23 \quad 77 / 1 \quad 77 / 1$ | how [38] 5/1 7/5 7/18 $7 / 19$ | 10/3 11/2 11/24 49/20 61/1 |
| 77/3 79/4 79/5 79/8 | 8/3 8/5 8/9 8/15 8/16 11/23 | 61/16 68/21 $72 / 1$ 72/5 73/9 |
| head [2] 47/9 87/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 18 & 21 / 24 & 22 / 4 & 31 / 12 & 34 / 25\end{array}$ | 81/3 |
| heads [1] 83/25 | 36/7 39/17 39/22 39/24 39/24 | informed [9] 11/24 12/3 |
| heady [1] 34/18 | 40/2 44/8 44/20 49/4 56/20 | 33/18 33/19 70/19 70/22 |
| healthy [2] 6/22 87/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}64 / 12 & 67 / 21 & 71 / 24 & 76 / 6 & 79 / 25\end{array}$ | 71/11 82/24 86/10 |
| hear [22] 4/23 5/23 5/24 6/2 | 82/18 84/4 84/11 84/18 85/25 | informing [1] 9/18 |
| 7/14 16/16 20/11 24/3 35/6 | 86/9 86/10 86/18 | initial [4] 14/17 14/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 21 & 40 / 13 & 40 / 14 & 44 / 5 & 47 / 24\end{array}$ | however [1] 79/18 | 63/11 84/23 |
| 47/25 48/3 48/4 49/2 49/9 | huge [1] 10/1 | initially [1] 29/17 |
| 80/13 84/11 84/14 | hundred [5] 17/14 18/18 | injury [9] 25/22 25/22 26/4 |
| heard [15] 32/22 35/11 37/19 | 33/24 72/12 86/23 | 26/13 29/15 31/11 46/12 |
| 37/19 37/20 40/20 43/16 | hybrid [1] 43/23 | 46/22 47/2 |
| 48/16 51/16 68/8 71/21 78/10 | I | innovative [1] 7/7 |
| 80/16 80/25 83/11 |  | input [1] 85/14 |
| heard from [1] 51/16 | I reach [1] | inquiries [1] 10/1 |
| hearing [9] 8/8 21/10 41/11 | I'd [9] 20/23 21/19 22/4 | institutions [1] 54/11 |


| I | John [1] 56/5 | K |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| instructions [1] 6/10 | JOHNSTON [10] 2/7 4 | Kaye [1] 2/5 |
| intend [1] 86/18 | $47 / 24 \quad 49 / 2 \quad 49 / 7 \quad 52 / 13$ | keep [6] 9/21 28/16 36/13 |
| intended [4] $36 / 4$ 52/25 | Johnston's [1] 52/12 | 39/20 44/21 61/12 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}79 / 23 & 85 / 5 \\ \text { intent [2] } & \\ \text { 54/9 66/24 }\end{array}$ | join [4] 31/16 45/10 55/22 | keeping [1] 51/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { intent [2] } & 54 / 9 & 66 / 24 \\ \text { interaction [1] } & 38 / 22\end{array}$ | $55 / 22$ | Keller [9] $13 / 25$ 14/2 14/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { interaction [1] } & 38 / 22 \\ \text { interest [6] } & 11 / 25 & 62 / 25\end{array}$ | joining [1] 3/4 | $15 / 19 \quad 19 / 6 \quad 24 / 5 \quad 30 / 8 \quad 36 / 2$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { interest [6] } 11 / 25 \text { 62/25 } \\ 68 / 1770 / 171 / 180 / 15 \end{gathered}$ | joint [2] 28/25 86/11 | $\begin{array}{\|cccc} \hline 36 / 8 \\ \text { key [2] } & 64 / 19 & 68 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { interested [3] } 41 / 3 \quad 70 / 5 \\ & 86 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { JOSEPH [1] } 2 / 1$ | Kherkher [1] 1/11 <br> kind [25] 10/5 11/2 12/13 |
| interested and [1] 70/5 | judge [38] 1/9 13/14 27/14 29/16 35/19 37/11 38/19 39/7 | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 11 & 20 / 16 & 20 / 20 & 20 / 23 & 22 / 6\end{array}$ |
| interests [1] 80/22 | 39/7 $39 / 10 \quad 39 / 11 \quad 48 / 3 \quad 58 / 5$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 5 & 36 / 22 & 40 / 4 & 48 / 5 & 51 / 10\end{array}$ |
| interrogatories [1] 64/19 | $58 / 7$ 58/8 58/11 58/11 58/19 | 54/9 55/3 56/20 59/21 62/3 |
| interrogatory [2] 64/22 | 60/13 $60 / 13 \quad 60 / 16 \quad 61 / 1 \quad 61 / 3$ | 62/13 66/4 68/18 69/5 79/3 |
| 64/23 | $61 / 13$ 61/14 $61 / 18 \quad 62 / 15$ | 79/22 80/13 |
| interrupt [1] 56/1 | 62/18 62/21 64/4 64/10 64/11 | kinds [3] 10/10 10/12 43/25 |
| interruption [2] 48/22 49/12 | 65/11 65/12 68/23 80/1 80/12 | know [97] |
| intimidated [1] 40/5 | $84 / 20$ | know that [1] 44/15 |
| introduction [1] 40/14 | judge's [2] 39/6 67/13 | knowing [4] 15/21 79/9 86/24 |
| invite [3] 29/16 29/20 78/14 | judges [22] 38/24 39/2 $39 / 5$ | 87/3 |
| invited [2] 61/6 73/17 | 39/13 $44 / 11$ 57/19 59/24 61/5 | knowledge [3] 10/12 36/14 |
| inviting [3] 4/19 81/13 | 61/7 61/11 61/17 68/12 68/22 | $74 / 16$ knowledgeable [1] 12/17 |
| $87 / 11$ invoices [7] 53/9 53/21 | 77/20 78/14 80/11 81/4 82/18 | knowledgeable [1] 12/17 <br> knows [9] 3/23 10/19 45/24 |
| 53/22 54/1 54/8 54/17 54/22 | 85/1 85/2 85/16 86/9 | 47/7 49/18 55/16 63/4 69/9 |
| invoked [1] 23/4 | judgment [9] 12/23 18/8 22/1 | 79/6 |
| involve [3] 23/11 30/3 31/3 | $87 / 3$ | Kopelowitz [1] 1/18 |
| involved [2] 35/25 68/22 | judgment under [1] | L |
| involvement [1] $82 / 5$ involving [2] 30/1 30 | July [11] 1/5 20/6 20/7 30/6 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { involving } \\ & \text { is [408] } \end{aligned}$ | 53/19 59/13 59/15 59/19 62/5 | lack [1] 78/5 <br> landscape [1] |
| is a [2] 25/7 42/6 | 1/23 88/4 | language [3] 18/19 26/10 |
| is on [1] 78/1 |  | 31/22 |
| isn't [3] 10/1 36/9 39/9 |  | large [5] 14/13 16/5 17/21 |
| issue [29] 7/16 8/6 9/2 9/6 |  | 57/8 63/5 |
| 16/5 16/6 18/6 18/10 19/10 | juncture [1] 7/4 | large-scale [1] 57/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}20 / 10 & 23 / 25 & 26 / 12 & 28 / 15\end{array}$ | June [4] 30/7 50/22 53/16 | larger [2] 54/13 72/8 |
| 29/17 $29 / 21$ 33/5 33/12 $34 / 5$ |  | largest [1] 70/9 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 16 & 34 / 19 & 43 / 3 & 51 / 19 & 70 / 4\end{array}$ |  | last [16] 4/6 5/21 12/4 20/6 |
| 79/11 81/11 81/21 82/15 84/2 | June 30th [1] 53 | 21/3 $23 / 13$ 30/14 $46 / 1155 / 20$ |
| 85/15 | jurisdiction [7] 58/13 59/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}56 / 2 & 56 / 10 & 58 / 11 & 60 / 12 & 74 / 24\end{array}$ |
| issued [1] 16/13 | 65/10 67/20 67/21 77/10 | 80/16 86/5 |
| issues [16] 14/4 25/13 30/24 |  | late [1] 23/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll}36 / 3 & 36 / 3 & 36 / 15 & 43 / 14 & 45 / 5\end{array}$ | jurisdictional [1] 30/24 | later [6] 15/16 23/20 24/23 |
| 51/16 59/8 60/5 60/20 68/8 | jurisdictions [3] 56/23 | 25/14 25/16 80/17 |
| 81/8 83/24 85/5 | $78 / 23$ | latest [1] 4/24 |
| it [300] |  | law [15] 22/15 22/25 23/3 |
| it's [10] 36/17 38/16 40/8 | וj | 27/23 27/23 27/23 27/25 33/2 |
| 45/13 50/21 86/2 86/3 86/3 | just [74] 3/3 16/11 16/12 |  |
| 86/4 86/5 |  | 37/3 61/5 |
| item [1] 49/7 | $23 / 21 \quad 25 / 20 \quad 27 / 6 \quad 27 / 17 \quad 27 / 25$ | laws [1] 75/7 |
| its [2] 14/10 70/14 | $28 / 1 \text { 28/4 28/13 29/13 } 32 / 9$ | lawyer [3] 9/1 39/7 39/8 |
| itself [5] 14/9 15/6 23/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 28 / 1 & 28 / 4 & 28 / 13 & 29 / 13 & 32 / 9 \\ 33 / 9 & 33 / 16 & 33 / 24 & 34 / 4 & 35 / 11 \end{array}$ | lawyer's [1] 39/9 |
| 42/14 53/18 | $35 / 23 \quad 36 / 19 \quad 36 / 25 \quad 37 / 3 \quad 38 / 13$ | lawyers [14] 17/17 17/20 |
| J | 38/19 39/9 39/20 40/6 42/12 | 38/13 38/14 38/20 38/24 39/6 $40 / 9 \text { 40/23 } 42 / 14 \text { 67/22 } 76 / 24$ |
| Jaime [1] 7/25 | 43/25 44/21 44/23 48/10 | 77/23 79/24 |
| James [1] 8/18 | 24 58/20 60/21 61/25 62/2 | lay [1] 37/4 |
| January [3] 31/6 65/5 67/6 |  | LDC [14] 5/23 5/24 5/25 |
| January 31st [1] 65/5 |     <br> $70 / 14$ $70 / 25$ $72 / 21$ $73 / 7$ <br> $3 / 11$    | 38/12 38/14 40/22 40/25 41/3 |
| January 9th [1] 31/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 74 / 21 & 77 / 15 & 78 / 20 & 80 / 3\end{array}$ | 41/8 41/14 41/24 42/9 44/15 |
| JCCP [3] 57/15 70/8 $70 / 15$ |  | 84/15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jersey [1] } 61 / 3 \\ & \text { job [3] } 46 / 8 \quad 86 / 9 \quad 86 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $86 / 6 \quad 87 / 3 \quad 87 / 3$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|llll} \hline \text { lead [6] } 8 / 1 & 29 / 21 & 43 / 4 & 43 / 7 \\ 44 / 2456 / 7 \end{array}$ |
| jobs [1] 7/6 | justice [1] 14/3 | leadership [12] 39/1 39/12 |
| Joe [3] 45/14 52/14 53/8 |  | 41/25 43/19 46/18 71/5 76/13 |

## I

leadership... [5] 77/12
77/17 78/25 83/4 83/4
leading [2] 44/1 58/22
leads [5] 7/24 38/23 39/10
46/23 47/12
LEAR [7] 1/21 1/22 38/11
39/16 39/21 41/18 41/20
learn [3] 12/15 23/4 61/18
least [9] $10 / 11 \quad 35 / 6 \quad 37 / 18$ 50/5 54/12 55/20 56/14 64/6 84/1
leave [2] 43/17 59/25
leaving [1] 31/19
Leech [1] 2/11
left [4] 63/8 63/24 63/24 66/25
legal [5] 10/25 19/18 22/14 22/19 27/22
lend [1] 23/25
lends [1] 53/18
lengthy [3] 14/1 $33 / 13 \quad 60 / 19$
Leon [1] 1/19
less [5] 22/8 40/5 40/6 71/10 77/12
lessen [1] 78/18
lessened [1] 77/25
let [21] 5/21 7/14 8/17 12/25 23/16 33/9 34/14 37/2 37/25 38/23 45/7 45/9 52/19 53/11 55/24 56/25 69/5 69/8 76/17 80/13 80/20
let's [13] 4/21 6/8 12/1 12/19 13/3 13/3 14/18 22/24 37/17 38/21 40/14 45/6 49/2
letter [1] 9/17
level [2] 73/2 81/20
levels [1] 57/10
Lexitas [2] 46/14 54/7
LIABILITY [1] $1 / 5$
liaison [1] 7/24
lifting [1] 38/15
light [3] 77/8 80/18 80/18
lighter [1] 38/9
like [36] 5/3 8/4 10/24
11/21 18/25 20/21 20/23 21/19 22/9 22/13 22/20 23/22 $32 / 8 \quad 32 / 10 \quad 33 / 4 \quad 35 / 9 \quad 35 / 9$ 37/18 39/21 40/7 40/7 41/18 44/7 44/23 48/2 55/22 58/15 68/8 69/3 70/25 72/21 73/7 80/24 83/3 84/9 87/4
likely [2] 28/17 69/25
likes [1] 12/13
limit [4] 30/23 35/6 35/7 35/16
limitations [3] 27/8 71/18 71/21
limited [4] 26/7 60/5 64/17 72/3
limits [1] 27/13
line [1] $42 / 20$
lines [2] 19/7 35/23
link [3] 9/13 9/20 9/21
list [4] 9/5 18/14 18/20 18/22
listed [1] 39/4
listen [3] 78/14 81/13 84/24 listening [1] 81/6
listing [1] 56/19
litigant's [1] 9/16
litigants [13] 5/22 7/18
8/10 8/24 9/5 9/18 9/25 10/3 11/19 11/19 11/20 85/12 85/20
litigate [1] 58/16
litigated [2] 63/23 77/7
litigating [3] 62/25 69/21 69/22
litigation [36] 1/5 3/13 3/24 6/24 6/25 7/12 7/19 11/21 13/18 16/25 42/13 42/18 $44 / 17$ 44/20 57/8 57/11 57/15 57/17 61/2 61/4 67/24 69/10 69/14 70/9 71/18 74/6 $74 / 7 \quad 74 / 13 \quad 74 / 22 \quad 75 / 3 \quad 77 / 13$ 77/14 77/16 78/5 78/19 81/25
litigations [5] 61/1 61/6 69/17 73/7 77/18
little [14] 3/2 5/11 5/13 5/14 13/1 21/23 34/10 40/4 54/2 56/22 57/25 62/4 62/20 79/3
LLP [4] 1/22 $2 / 5$ 2/8 $2 / 11$
LMI [9] 17/12 18/17 46/7
50/4 50/7 50/11 51/7 51/21 54/7
loaded [1] 9/22
local [11] 23/23 $34 / 14 \quad 35 / 5$ 35/8 35/12 35/14 35/16 58/2 58/2 58/3 66/13
location [1] 73/25
logistical [1] 43/14
long [4] 18/11 61/10 74/18 78/1
longer [3] 51/6 69/6 84/9
longest [1] 68/7
look [19] 5/5 5/7 8/8 11/11
23/15 23/20 32/17 38/2 44/21 47/2 48/2 54/24 55/6 67/2
69/3 69/14 79/17 86/25 87/18
looked [1] 59/14
looking [9] 3/17 20/20 20/21 21/1 22/16 22/17 56/18 73/6 80/9
looks [3] 32/8 32/10 44/23
loose [1] 82/25
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { loosely }[3] & 74 / 25 & 76 / 6 & 82 / 10\end{array}$
Los [1] 2/9
lot [8] 36/10 36/11 42/1
44/15 63/14 67/20 68/9 83/23
loved [1] 87/17
loyalty [1] 49/24
LUKE [5] $2 / 1$ 13/6 25/4 $28 / 12$ 40/18
lunch [1] 41/2

## M

machinery [1] 46/6
made [5] $42 / 23$ 46/10 $51 / 4$
70/14 74/5
main [1] 47/19
mainly [1] 9/2
majority [1] 57/11
make [23] 5/2 5/18 6/24 8/2

8/9 11/24 14/13 17/16 18/9 19/17 26/9 28/11 33/10 37/14 42/12 60/3 69/13 73/22 74/21 85/15 87/3 87/5 87/6
makes [6] 16/19 24/3 25/18 42/19 85/19 86/2
making [1] 46/21
manageable [1] 87/12
management [13] 3/16 37/13 41/5 42/8 42/11 43/10 58/10 58/12 58/14 60/21 64/9 64/17 68/16
manner [1] 5/3
many [12] $4 / 3 \quad 7 / 10 \quad 39 / 1$
$46 / 15$ 56/20 68/12 77/19
79/24 85/13 86/25 87/8 87/8
March [2] 66/18 87/4
Martin [1] 56/5
master [22] 5/10 7/25 12/3 14/2 14/19 19/6 20/8 25/22 26/4 27/11 28/16 36/2 36/14 $44 / 22$ 51/16 51/19 52/19 54/7 69/9 72/17 73/16 87/1
master's [1] 30/13
match [3] 10/9 47/3 47/5
materials [1] 75/10
matter [6] 21/15 33/16 39/8 39/23 77/6 88/2
matters [7] $4 / 8$ 5/8 6/19 25/21 39/24 39/25 53/4
may [35] 5/25 10/17 12/8 12/9 20/3 24/12 25/25 25/25 28/3 32/14 $36 / 16$ 39/12 $39 / 15$ 40/1 41/12 52/8 55/15 55/21 60/16 63/1 63/1 66/21 67/1 67/4 67/5 67/9 67/15 68/23 69/20 73/23 76/5 78/22 80/6 84/18 85/6
maybe [23] 5/10 $12 / 5$ 13/1 16/6 22/10 22/22 22/25 23/3 $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 18 & 23 / 21 & 28 / 2 & 36 / 13 & 36 / 15\end{array}$ 49/7 51/21 54/7 54/17 55/21 59/21 61/13 70/18 78/13 84/6
MCCLOUD [26] $2 / 1 \quad 13 / 6 \quad 13 / 8$ 13/22 14/2 14/19 16/7 16/9 16/16 18/1 20/2 24/9 25/4 26/2 28/12 29/17 33/16 38/10 $39 / 17$ 39/18 39/18 39/21 $40 / 18$ 41/20 41/22 42/23
McGLAMRY [18] 1/13 1/14 1/14 8/15 55/21 55/24 56/2 56/4 68/25 69/4 74/2 74/7 76/14 76/22 79/1 80/20 81/17 81/18 md [2] 1/3 $2 / 12$
MDL [50] $3 / 13$ 7/13 $9 / 14$ 27/23 31/21 33/24 36/22 $\begin{array}{lllll}39 / 12 & 40 / 12 & 44 / 12 & 44 / 17 & 57 / 8\end{array}$ 57/13 59/22 63/2 63/6 64/11 64/13 67/7 67/17 67/23 67/23 67/24 68/15 68/17 69/12 69/21 70/7 70/10 72/24 74/5 $74 / 12 \quad 75 / 14 \quad 75 / 16 \quad 75 / 17$ $\begin{array}{lllll}75 / 20 & 75 / 25 & 76 / 1 & 76 / 4 & 76 / 24\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}77 / 1 & 77 / 13 & 77 / 15 & 77 / 16 & 77 / 20\end{array}$ 77/22 77/22 77/25 78/22 78/25
MDLs [2] 36/23 40/11
me [47] 5/10 5/21 7/14 8/17

| M | moot [1] 28/ | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| me... [43] 12/3 12/18 12/25 |  | name [3] 17/13 39/9 72/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 17 & 15 / 19 & 20 / 9 & 20 / 12 & 20 / 19\end{array}$ | $19 / 19 \quad 19 / 21 \quad 20 / 16 \quad 24 / 3 \quad 34 / 18$ | named [3] 54/15 54/15 66/1 |
| 21/5 21/16 $22 / 12$ 22/23 $22 / 23$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll} 37 / 21 & 40 / 5 & 42 / 19 & 46 / 11 & 47 / 15 \end{array}$ | namely [1] 46/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 9 & 23 / 16 & 33 / 9 & 37 / 2 & 37 / 4\end{array}$ | $51 / 5 \quad 56 / 24 \quad 62 / 18 \quad 67 / 2 \quad 72 / 5$ | narrowed [2] 58/24 63/22 |
| 38/13 $39 / 13$ 40/13 40/23 | $76 / 14 \quad 83 / 9$ | nationwide [2] 57/8 67/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}41 / 17 & 43 / 22 & 45 / 7 & 46 / 23 & 48 / 3\end{array}$ | morning [4] 18/8 $24 / 25$ 50/5 | nature [8] 6/7 8/12 11/7 |
| 55/11 55/25 56/10 56/25 69/5 | morning [4] 18/8 24/25 50/5 | 12/23 18/3 19/2 26/25 53/5 |
| 69/8 $76 / 13$ 80/2 $80 / 13$ 80/20 | most [11] 3/2 3/3 6/20 9/7 | navigate [1] 8/11 |
| 82/24 $84 / 3$ 84/11 84/12 $86 / 8$ | $18 / 6 \text { 21/22 68/18 69/25 78/2 }$ | navigating [2] 8/2 11/20 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}86 / 16 \\ \text { 8ean } & \text { 8] } \\ \text { 20/18 } & 37 / 24 \quad 39 / 15\end{array}$ | $81 / 15 \quad 81 / 25$ | NE [1] 1/15 |
| $\begin{array}{cccc}\text { mean [8] } & 20 / 18 & 37 / 24 & 39 / 15 \\ 58 / 3 & 61 / 10 & 62 / 10 & 77 / 11 \\ 86 / 1\end{array}$ | motion [67] 5/23 9/15 12/2 | near [1] 25/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}58 / 3 & 61 / 10 & 62 / 10 & 77 / 11 \\ \text { meaning [1] } & 86 / 25\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 7 & 12 / 16 & 14 / 8 & 15 / 4 & 15 / 5\end{array}$ | nearly [1] 57/13 |
| meaning [1] 46/25 meaningful [2] $6 / 25$ | 15/13 16/15 21/14 21/15 22/4 | necessarily [6] 17/6 18/20 |
| meaningful [2] 6/25 <br> measure [1] 10/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 22 / 5 & 22 / 5 & 22 / 13 & 23 / 10 & 23 / 11\end{array}$ | 20/13 28/7 38/22 70/15 necessary [2] 18/19 84/14 |
| measures [1] 43/24 | 23/23 24/4 24/6 24/12 24/13 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { need [21] } & 3 / 21 & 9 / 20 & 12 / 22\end{array}$ |
| mechanism [3] 18/5 58/4 | $\begin{gathered} 25 / 13 \\ 26 / 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 12 & 23 / 15 & 23 / 16 & 23 / 19\end{array}$ |
| 61/22 |  | 24/22 28/17 36/18 43/11 |
| meet [2] 41/1 87/14 |  | 51/23 54/25 55/1 $55 / 1 \quad 55 / 15$ |
| meeting [2] 41/14 51/17 | $329 / 62$ | 62/18 79/15 80/16 82/14 |
| members [7] 5/24 6/1 38/21 |  | 82/24 |
| 40/22 40/25 44/18 84/15 |  | needed [6] 5/1 5/15 $12 / 9$ |
| memorandum [2] 23/5 23/6 | $37 / 8 \quad 37 / 10$ | 12/10 13/17 49/10 |
| memorialize [1] 17/23 |  | needs [1] 53/6 |
| memorializing [1] 29/13 | motioning [1] | negate [1] 25/2 |
| Memphis [1] 57/20 | $\text { motions [27] } 9 / 7 \text { 9/10 9/14 }$ | negotiate [1] 77/7 |
| mentioned [7] 10/18 19/12 | $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { 9/14 } & 9 / 22 & 12 / 6 & 25 / 12 & 35 / 22\end{array}$ | negotiated [6] 58/18 70/19 |
| 38/25 64/5 72/21 73/2 77/15 | $/ 259 / 1362 / 8 \quad 62 / 964$ | 71/9 73/15 77/24 82/9 |
| mentoring [1] 40/ | 64/10 64/12 64/15 65/12 | negotiating [2] 76/25 78/21 |
| merits [2] 30/15 34/2 | $/ 1365 / 2366 / 266 / 666 /$ | negotiation [2] 60/20 79/18 |
| mess [1] 73/20 | $66 / 15 \quad 66 / 20 \quad 67 / 25 \quad 70 / 12$ | negotiations [1] 76/24 |
| met [1] 36/1 | $78 / 12$ | never [2] 39/18 55 |
| Mexico [2] 57/23 66/6 | motivates [1] 86/19 | new [19] $2 / 6$ 3/5 46/1 51/22 |
| Miami [1] 1/20 |  | 57/22 57/23 58/8 58/11 60/15 |
| MICHAEL [2] 1/13 8/18 |  | 61/3 61/13 61/18 62/14 62/21 |
| middle [2] 54/9 78/3 |  | 65/23 66/6 67/9 73/9 73/25 |
| midnight [3] 24/14 26/23 | moving [4] 55/3 61/21 76/9 | next [17] 5/23 6/1 10/5 |
| 27 | moving [4] 55/3 61/21 76/9 | 11/11 15/16 21/2 24/23 45/ |
| might [14] 3/14 5/17 19/17 |  | 46/23 47/11 49/7 50/9 51/3 |
| 22/7 $44 / 9$ 44/20 $46 / 3$ 48/1 |  | 78/3 87/2 87/13 87/18 |
| 49/6 62/11 70/25 81/14 82/16 | $\text { Ms. [10] } 8 / 15 \quad 45 / 12 \quad 45 / 13$ | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { NextGen [7] } & 5 / 25 & 38 / 12 & 38 / 14\end{array}$ |
| 82/17 | 47/13 $47 / 18$ 47/21 $47 / 24 \quad 49 / 7$ | 40/22 41/24 41/24 42/9 |
| Mike [4] $81 / 18$ | $52 / 13 \quad 76 / 13$ | $\begin{array}{\|cccccc} \hline \text { nice }[7] \quad 3 / 103 / 103 / 15 & 4 / 4 \\ 38 / 12 & 38 / 19 & 48 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| mind [3] 39/20 44/21 58/17 | Ms. Finken [1] 76/13 | night [1] 24/22 |
| mindful [2] 11/17 43/14 |  | nine [2] 8/24 10/ |
| minimum [1] 80/2 | $47 / 1347 / 1847 / 2147 / 2449 / 7$ | no [33] $1 / 315 / 9$ 16/24 $16 / 25$ |
| minute [1] 70/5 |  | 20/19 25/14 25/16 27/25 |
| minutes [2] 5/21 84/10 |  | $\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 23 & 34 / 10 & 34 / 16 & 34 / 16 & 35 / 4\end{array}$ |
| misconstrued [1] 25/24 |  | 37/17 37/17 37/17 39/18 $49 / 3$ |
| missing [1] 10/13 |  | 49/5 49/13 $52 / 14$ 55/11 67/10 |
| MO [1] 1/23 |  | 67/23 69/7 71/17 71/18 71/20 |
| moment [5] 6/14 16/15 32/21 |  | 77/6 79/11 79/15 81/22 84/20 |
| 42/19 46/19 | 65/13 | nobody [1] 52/19 |
| momentary [1] 48/20 | multiple | non [4] 11/19 15/13 47/1 |
| Monday [14] 15/7 15/15 20/25 | mute [1] | 59/7 |
| 21/1 22/20 23/8 23/9 23/18 |  | non-argumentative [1] 15/13 |
| 23/19 $24 / 19$ 30/18 $31 / 25$ | muted [1] 48/2 <br> my [22] $22 / 6 \quad 31 / 22 \quad 33 / 12$ | non-California [1] 59/7 |
| 33/19 36/2 | my [22] $22 / 6 \quad 31 / 22 \quad 33 / 12$ | non-deficient [1] 47/1 |
| money [1] 43/20 | $46 / 23 \quad 49 / 10 \quad 49 / 11 \quad 50 / 4 \quad 54 / 9$ | nonjury [1] 4/16 |
| monitor [3] 3/22 4/8 4/18 | $56 / 10 \quad 56 / 25 \quad 66 / 19 \quad 68 / 4 \quad 68 / 18$ | nonresponsiveness [1] 9/2 |
| monitoring [1] 4/8 | $69 / 18 \quad 76 / 25 \quad 77 / 19 \quad 82 / 22$ | normally [2] 16/14 21/13 |
| month [6] 4/11 4/12 58/8 | $86 / 10$ | Northern [1] 61/2 |
|  $59 / 22$ $71 / 10$$\quad 87 / 13$ | myself [3] 23/20 79/3 86/15 mysterious [1] 40/6 mystery [1] 13/1 | ```not [131] note [1] 7/21 noted [4] 33/11 34/15 40/2``` |


| N |
| :---: |
| noted... [1] 41/10 |
| notes [1] 45/12 |
| nothing [3] 56/11 60/13 $77 / 23$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { notice [2] } & 31 / 5 & 46 / 5 \\ \text { notices [3] } & 11 / 7 & 15 / 25 & 48 / 14 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |
|  |
| notifying [1] 12/20 |
| noting [1] 62/2 |
| notion [1] 42/6 |
| November [1] 74/15 |
| now [29] 5/20 14/1 18/10 |
| 21/2 23/10 34/7 38/9 43/9 |
| 46/25 47/2 47/20 49/9 49/23 |
| 50/24 54/17 58/9 58/24 59/4 |
| 61/17 62/15 62/21 64/14 66/7 |
| 66/21 73/24 77/2 81/22 83/1 |
| 83/7 |
| Nueces [2] 66/10 67/10 <br> nuisance [1] 66/5 <br> number [14] 9/25 10/17 11/5 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |
| 74/24 |
| numbers [3] 4/7 69/14 81/24 |
| NW [1] 2/2 |
| NY [1] $2 / 6$ |
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officially [1] 69/11
often [1] 39/9
oh [2] 39/16 39/18
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46/17 47/15 55/16 56/13
57/21 57/21 57/22 57/22
58/11 59/7 61/1 61/3 61/22 63/14 64/5 66/5 66/6 66/25 69/6 70/8 73/4 73/6 77/13 78/10 81/9 82/17 84/7 84/20 84/22
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44/7 44/9 44/11 $50 / 1$ 51/19
52/3 53/4 53/13 54/8 61/6
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ours [3] 27/4 62/4 65/5
ourselves [3] 17/25 42/16 83/19
out [41] $4 / 2$ 5/11 5/14 5/17 7/24 13/1 15/1 20/7 20/10 21/23 27/19 29/3 29/13 35/5 $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 22 & 37 / 4 & 46 / 17 & 47 / 1 & 50 / 13\end{array}$ $51 / 3$ 51/21 51/22 52/3 52/6 53/10 54/23 62/12 62/14 64/3 64/6 65/22 68/12 70/15 71/24 $\begin{array}{lllll}72 / 12 & 74 / 3 & 74 / 9 & 79 / 9 & 80 / 11\end{array}$ 81/4 87/8
outlined [2] 30/17 34/4
outset [1] 41/10
outstanding [2] 53/22 72/16 over [22] 6/18 6/25 7/5 7/14 12/4 16/6 16/9 20/11 36/7 55/9 55/13 55/24 57/14 59/7 68/7 74/6 74/24 77/22 77/23 81/6 86/18 87/2
overall [1] 11/25
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P.C [1] 1/14
pace [2] 45/23 76/10
Pacer [2] 7/20 9/8
page [4] $27 / 8 \quad 35 / 5 \quad 35 / 7$
35/16
pages [5] 15/9 27/10 27/14
27/16 27/17
paid [4] 53/7 53/23 54/1 54/17
PALM [4] $1 / 2$ 1/5 $2 / 16$ 5/5
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Park [1] 2/8
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| P | 81/5 | al [3] 49/18 49/22 52 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| part... [11] 22/21 22/22 | perspectives [1] 13 | portals [1] |
| 32/16 $34 / 440 / 15$ 60/18 60/21 | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { Pertains [2] } & 9 / 16 & 27 / 18 \\ \text { PETROSINELLI } & {[14]} & 2 / 1 \end{array}$ | Porter [1] 2/5 portion [1] 54/14 |
| 63/11 71/4 74/5 84/23 | PEM/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { position [4] } & 59 / 6 & 59 / 6 & 70 / 3\end{array}$ |
| partial [1] 22/2 participants [1] | 48/19 $48 / 25 \quad 52 / 10 \quad 52 / 14$ | $78 / 4$ |
| pate [2] | 52/24 53/3 53/8 54/20 | positions [2] 19/18 69/11 |
| ticipated [2] 14/1 33/14 | pharmacy [1] 49/17 | positive [2] 8/1 80/9 |
| participating [3] 7/12 75/12 | phone [4] 10/23 10/24 49/10 | possible [7] 8/10 19/1 |
| 75/21 | 85/3 | 28/11 72/25 73/22 81/8 85/22 |
| participating attorneys [1] |  | 8 |
| 5/12 | piece [3] 41/24 47/14 | poten |
| participation [2] 52/13 | Pierce [1] 2/16 | $19 / 19 \quad 25 / 24$ |
| $75 / 25$ particular [8] $11 / 1 \quad 12 / 10$ | Pierce/West [1] 2/16 | potentially [2] $10 / 18$ 46/4 |
| $\begin{gathered}\text { particular } \\ 39 / 8 \\ 44 / 4 \\ 58 / 5\end{gathered} 11 / 1 / 12$ | pilot [1] 4/12 | power [1] 22/18 |
| $81 / 9$ | place [5] 48/7 54/12 60/9 | PowerPoint [3] 6/4 6/5 56/22 |
| particularly [7] 9/25 11/21 | 64/17 73/21 | PPF [1] 72/7 |
| 39/11 47/9 57/12 79/4 82/11 | places [1] 82/7 | practice [12] 5/23 |
| particulars [2] 20/13 20/16 | Plaintiff [10] 7/16 23/13 | $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 7 & 23 / 23 & 26 / 7 & 26 / 11 & 29 / 12\end{array}$ |
| parties [29] 9/11 9/13 10/4 | 29/6 32/21 63/16 63/16 63/1 | 37/6 37/8 37/10 84/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 12 / 8 & 14 / 11 & 14 / 20 & 14 / 25 & 18 / 4\end{array}$ | /1 66/11 | practices [1] 44/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}18 / 4 & 18 / 21 & 18 / 25 & 24 / 2 & 25 / 7\end{array}$ | Plaintiff's [1] 16/5 | practitioners [1] 8/3 |
| 25/10 $26 / 10 \quad 30 / 6 \quad 31 / 19$ 33/7 | PLAINTIFFS [49] 1/10 8/25 | preaching [1] 42/12 |
| $34 / 17$ 51/19 58/16 58/17 | 13/10 $16 / 22$ 17/7 17/21 17/24 | preceded [1] 16/ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}62 / 22 & 70 / 11 & 76 / 24 & 78 / 13\end{array}$ | 18/22 21/25 24/2 25/11 25/14 | preemption [1] 14/8 |
| 79/22 81/6 85/21 | 25/16 $25 / 18$ 26/21 28/10 | preemptive [1] 10/20 |
| parties' [2] 8/24 19/18 | 15 30/1 30/4 30/8 30/20 | prefer [2] 19/21 35/3 |
| parts [1] 3/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 9 & 32 / 12 & 32 / 13 & 32 / 14 & 33 / 3\end{array}$ | preference [1] 70/12 |
| party [2] 66/13 | 33/9 37/25 41/19 55/24 56/21 | preferred [1] 87/2 |
| pass [1] 79/12 | 59/4 63/21 64/8 64/14 64/20 | prejudiced [1] 52/20 |
| past [3] 3/23 20/11 80/12 | 65/14 65/19 69/5 69/10 71/25 | prepare [1] 24/12 |
| path [1] 74/17 | 72/6 72/13 72/22 80/5 81/19 | prepared [3] 56/3 56/6 80/14 |
| patient [1] 6/14 | 82/21 83/3 83/4 | prerequisite [1] |
| Pauline [3] 2/15 48/21 88/5 | Plaintiffs' [28] 14/13 15/18 | prerogative [1] 83/2 |
| pause [1] 48/21 | 17/17 18/9 19/12 22/13 31/5 | prescription [1] 49/23 |
| pausing [1] 25/20 | 32/4 36/7 37/9 41/23 42/2 | present [4] 15/5 22/12 43/13 |
| payments [1] 54/14 | 46/18 $48 / 15$ 64/22 $65 / 3$ 66/17 | 50/13 |
| pays [1] 42/20 | $\begin{array}{llllll}67 / 22 & 69 / 17 & 69 / 21 & 70 / 1 & 70 / 20\end{array}$ | presentation [10] 6/4 6/7 |
| Peachtree [1] 1/15 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}70 / 24 & 71 / 12 & 74 / 14 & 82 / 3 & 82 / 7\end{array}$ | 42/23 45/3 52/21 55/21 56/15 |
| pending [5] 10/19 14/24 17/1 | 82/22 | 68/5 78/11 83/11 |
| 56/21 57/9 | plan [6] 3/19 3/21 5/4 43/8 | presentations [1] 81/7 |
| people [6] 11/4 36/11 36/11 | 43/8 43/8 | presented [3] 69/1 |
| 46/16 85/20 86/13 | $\begin{array}{lrl} \text { plane [2] } & 13 / 25 & 55 / 1 \\ \text { planes [1] } & 48 / 9 & \end{array}$ | 80/19 <br> presenting [2] 3/12 7/15 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { per [3] } & 24 / 13 \\ \text { perceive } & 31 / 5 \\ 52 / 18 & 53 / 14\end{array}$ | planning [3] 3/4 4/21 87/4 | $\text { preside [2] } 6 / 25 \text { 7/5 }$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { perceive [1] } & 52 / 18 \\ \text { percent [4] } & 17 / 15 & 18 / 18\end{array}$ | plans [2] 5/9 5/24 | presided [1] 68/6 |
| $\begin{array}{ccc} \text { percent [4] } & 17 / 15 & 18 / 18 \\ 22 / 25 \quad 74 / 6 & & \end{array}$ | platform [3] $3 / 25$ 13/5 87/14 | presiding [2] 81/5 86/18 |
| Perfect [1] | Plavix [1] 61/3 | presumably [1] 59 |
| performed [1] 39/5 | play [3] 14/4 31/2 56/5 | presume [1] 20/6 |
| perhaps [8] $4 / 5$ 5/8 $12 / 8$ | plays [2] 71/24 77/17 | presuming [1] 62/ |
| 41/4 41/8 47/12 47/15 81/13 | pleading [1] 18/16 | pretrial [1] 45/25 |
| period [4] 34/15 50/16 50/17 | please [3] 6/13 36/19 87/15 | pretty [7] 45/16 50/12 62/16 |
| 54/24 | pleased [1] 76/14 | 64/12 65/6 65/13 66/9 |
| permission [1] 29/19 | PLLC [1] 1/11 | prevail [1] 79/1 |
| permit [1] 49/19 | plus [3] 33/23 46/2 86/23 | previously [1] |
| person [23] 3/11 3/20 4/22 | point [24] 3/15 11/1 18/17 | prior [4] 10/6 15/22 19/15 |
| 5/1 36/13 36/16 41/7 41/7 | 19/16 27/19 29/10 40/23 | 64/5 |
| 41/13 $42 / 5$ 42/8 43/9 43/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 13 & 43 / 24 & 46 / 23 & 48 / 17\end{array}$ | private [1] 75/5 |
| 43/12 $43 / 22 \quad 43 / 23$ 43/23 | 51/11 51/15 60/2 65/16 69/13 | privy [2] 21/7 59/24 |
| 51/11 51/15 86/25 87/5 87/7 | 3 74/22 | pro [15] 5/22 $7 / 15$ 7/17 8/10 |
| 87/13 | 80/17 81/12 82/25 | 8/23 8/24 9/5 9/5 9/18 9/25 |
| personal [6] 25/22 25/22 | pointed [1] 68/12 | 10/3 11/18 11/19 11/20 84/11 |
| 26/4 26/13 29/15 31/11 | points [2] 62/25 81/15 | proactive [2] 10/20 80/9 |
| ersons [1] 54/15 | Ponce [1] 1/19 | probably [8] 21/16 28/23 |
| erspective [10] 15/18 18/6 | pool [1] 72/4 | 37/25 46/11 47/11 53/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} 18 / 13 & 19 / 8 & 19 / 12 & 37 / 9 & 70 / 7 \end{array}$ | poor [1] 55/25 | 53/25 84/9 |
| 18/13 19/8 19/12 37/9 70/7 | Pope [1] 1/14 | problem [2] 34/10 36/17 |


| P | purpose [1] $70 /$ | [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| problems [1] 52/18 | purposes [4] 4/21 5/16 31/1 | reduce [1] 72/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { procedural } & {[7]} & 12 / 8 & 18 / 5\end{array}$ | pursuant [6] 25/7 30/16 31/5 | reference [1] 73/3 |
| 18/7 19/3 22/15 23/4 29/4 rocedure [2] 27/24 78/8 | 74/8 75/1 75/6 | referenced [4] 20/8 69/1 |
| procedure [2] procedures [1] $77 / 9$ | pursue [4] 16/25 27/19 46/19 $74 / 18$ | $70 / 10 \quad 71 / 15$ references [1] |
| proceeding [8] 3/9 3/25 4/22 <br> 4/25 57/18 71/5 82/8 82/13 | push [5] 62/19 62/20 72/25 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { references } \\ \text { referring [2] } & \text { 13/2 } & \text { 75/22 }\end{array}$ |
| proceedings [4] 3/23 6/ | 74/7 82/1 | reflect [1] |
| 87/20 88/2 | pushed [1] | flecting [1] |
| process [24] 8/9 9/17 10/6 | $\begin{array}{cccccc} \text { put [7] } & 16 / 18 & 42 / 5 & 43 / \\ 54 / 12 & 60 / 1 & 73 / 21 & 74 / 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { regard [5] } 14 / 10 \text { 26/1 33/ } \\ & 69 / 20 \text { 80/3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 17/5 39/1 39/3 46/4 46/5 <br> 47/6 47/10 49/21 49/25 50/ | putting [1] 72/20 | regarding [1] 30/1 |
| 51/8 58/23 59/8 61/5 71/14 | Q | y [21] 6/2 $45 / 445$ |
| 72/17 73/21 78/8 78/24 82/9 | qualify [1] 17/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 45 / 21 & 45 / 23 & 46 / 6 & 46 / 13 & 46 / 14 \\ 46 / 15 & 47 / 8 & 47 / 20 & 48 / 13 & 49 / 19 \end{array}$ |
| 84/19 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { qualify [1] } \\ \text { quality [1] } & 55 / 25\end{array}$ | $49 / 25 \quad 52 / 24 \quad 53 / 3 \quad 53 / 21 \quad 55 / 10$ |
| processes [2] 58/15 77/9 | question [6] $17 / 3$ 19/4 $33 / 9$ | 57/12 57/14 84/15 |
| produced [2] 51/3 52/23 | 53/23 60/24 61/25 | regularly [2] 11/6 11/8 |
| product [1] 47/17 | questions [6] 10/12 41/17 | reiterate [4] 28/13 36/19 |
| productions [2] 51/4 51/11 | 42/24 47/21 55/1 68/15 | 68/5 68/6 |
| productive [3] 80/7 80/10 | quickly [4] 19/11 $62 / 16$ 79/2 | relate [1] 85/5 |
| P0/22 | $\begin{array}{\|llll} 82 / 22 \\ \text { quite [4] } & 11 / 1 & 21 / 6 & 55 / 14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { related [3] 25/13 60/20 } \\ & 72 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| PRODUCTS [1] 1/5 professional [1] | $83 / 25$ | relates [8] 5/8 12/7 25/12 |
| professionalism [1] | R | 27 |
| professionals [1] | raise [2] 17/13 | 26/12 33/5 37/10 |
| progress [2] 46/10 46/21 | raised [3] 33/13 33/17 81/9 | relatively [1] 56/1 |
| prompt [1] 84/2 | raising [1] 20/8 | relax [1] 87/16 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { proof } \\ 46 / 22 \end{gathered}$ | RANITIDINE [1] 1/4 | relaxation [1] 6/17 |
| proofs [1] 47/15 | rather [2] 24/11 24/1 | relevant [1] |
| proposal [1] 36/7 | rationale [1] 22/19 | reliable [3] 47/7 47/8 47 |
| proposals [1] 71/11 | RE [1] 1/4 | relief [25] 16/10 16/13 |
| propose [4] 20/24 24/7 24/13 | $28 / 15 \quad 28 / 19 \quad 81 / 4$ |  |
| 30/14 [27] 16/17 18/9 | reached [5] 28/19 29/5 64/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 4 & 22 / 14 & 25 / 12 & 31 / 8 & 31 / 9\end{array}$ |
| proposed [27] 16/17 18/9 | 64/6 80/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 12 & 32 / 3 & 32 / 8 & 33 / 2 & 33 / 4\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 15 & 19 / 5 & 19 / 16 & 20 / 18 & 21 / 9\end{array}$ | reaching [1] | 33/22 36/21 36/22 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 11 & 21 / 14 & 22 / 16 & 23 / 7 & 24 / 14 \\ 24 / 17 & 25 / 15 & 26 / 16 & 26 / 17\end{array}$ | ready [3] 20/14 48/10 56/3 | rely [1] 27/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 17 & 25 / 15 & 26 / 16 & 26 / 17 \\ 26 / 18 & 28 / 21 & 29 / 7 & 29 / 12 & 32 / 7\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { real [3] 39/22 } & 41 / 14 & 78 / 6\end{array}$ | relying [3] 7/9 28/1 36/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 18 & 28 / 21 & 29 / 7 & 29 / 12 & 32 / 7 \\ 32 / 15 & 32 / 18 & 33 / 1 & 38 / 3 & 43 / 4\end{array}$ | really [28] 6/11 11/10 11/16 | remain [3] 51/12 52/17 60/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}32 / 15 & 32 / 18 & 33 / 1 & 38 / 3 & 43 / 4 \\ 62 / 22 & & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 25 & 15 / 5 & 16 / 10 & 20 / 9 & 20 / 11\end{array}$ | remained [1] 69/12 |
| proposing [3] 10/9 10/11 | 21/4 21/12 22/5 22/8 23/19 | remaining [2] 51/10 53/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { proposing [3] 10/9 10/11 } \\ & 31 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | 23/19 23/22 39/20 40/9 40/14 | remains [4] 4/17 7/1 62/4 |
|  | 40/19 44/5 44/17 48/19 54/16 | 84/15 |
| propounded [1] 75/3 | 71/1 82/18 83/24 84/6 86/1 | remand [1] 66 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { provide [7] } & 9 / 19 & 34 / 18 & 49 / 15 \\ 71 / 25 & 72 / 6 & 76 / 3 & 76 / 5 & \end{array}$ | reason [1] 87/12 | remember [1] 49/ |
| 71/25 72/6 76/3 76/5 | reasonable [3] 54/19 54/19 | remiss [1] 15/18 |
| provided [10] 5/10 6/4 9/20 | 54/22 | repeat [1] 3 |
| 34/15 56/17 61/16 72/9 73/8 | reasons [2] 42/10 46/21 |  |
| 76/4 81/3 | reasons [2] 42/10 46/21 | replaced [1] 68/23 |
| provides [1] 28/7 | rebut [1] 45/18 | replicated [1] 44/9 |
| provision [1] 34/14 | recall [1] 64/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}  & \text { ply } y & {[15]} & 23 / 11 & 23 / 11 \end{array} 23 / 12$ |
| proximity [1] 60/6 | receive [1] 20/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 25/1 } & 25 / 17 & 26 / 22 & 30 / 21 & 32 / 5\end{array}$ |
| PSC [2] 38/21 69/10 | received [2] 39/3 | 34/9 34/14 |
| PTO [15] 10/5 10/8 10/9 | recent [3] 4/6 50/1 61/1 | report [3] 45/16 $46 / 8 \quad 48 / 25$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 11 & 10 / 23 & 11 / 1 & 11 / 2 & 53 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { recently [3] } & 4 / 11 & 34 / 12\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Reporter [3] } & 2 / 15 & 88 / 5 & 88 / 6\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}70 / 11 & 70 / 17 & 71 / 4 & 71 / 7 & 71 / 7 \\ 71 / 23 & 72 / 16 & & & \end{array}$ | 84/22 | reports [4] 4/6 65/4 66/17 |
| $71 / 23 ~ 72 / 16$ PTO's [1] $21 / 19$ | recognize [4] 10/17 11/19 | 66/18 |
| PTOs [2] 9/9 71 | 41/12 84/5 | request [5] 24/13 29/9 30/19 |
| PULASKI [19] $1 / 10$ 1/11 $45 / 5$ | recognizes [1] 7/3 | 33/6 51/5 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 45 / 7 & 45 / 18 & 46 / 24 & 47 / 5 & 48 / 4\end{array}$ | record [8] 13/4 21/15 25/19 | requested [1] 49/15 |
| 48/16 $48 / 23$ 55/12 55/16 | $33 / 1033 / 21$ 40/17 51/11 88/2 | requesting [3] 31/18 $32 / 3$ |
| 55/23 69/2 73/23 76/17 80/21 | ds [17] 46/12 46 |  |
| 81/17 82/20 | 46/24 47/3 47/14 47/16 $47 / 22$ | requests [5] 51/7 51/21 |
| purchased [1] 47/16 | $51 / 151 / 251 / 551 / 752 / 22$ | required [1] 33/2 |


| R | rudimentary [1] 71/25 | screen [4] 38/15 $38 / 17$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| rescue [1] 55/13 | rule [12] 14/8 18/8 18/15 |  |
| research [1] 20/22 | 31/19 35/12 35/15 67/23 | scripted $[2]$ $44 / 3$ $44 / 4$   <br> se [15] $5 / 22$ $7 / 15$ $7 / 17$ $8 / 10$ |
| residents [3] 59/5 59/7 | ruled [4] 30/11 64/12 64/13 | 8/23 8/24 9/5 9/5 9/18 9/25 |
| resolve [1] 19 | 66/6 [15] 22/16 23/24 27 | 10/3 11/18 11/19 11/20 84/11 |
| resources [1] 85/22 | rules [15] $312 / 16$ 23/24 $27 / 24$ | searching [1] 28/5 |
| respect [8] 26/8 53/3 55/10 | 34/14 35/5 35/8 35/16 36/24 44/12 44/13 58/15 61/4 70/15 | $\begin{array}{rlllll}\text { second } & {[8]} & 16 / 6 & 16 / 8 & 19\end{array}$ |
| 69/1 74/3 74/20 84/13 84/23 | $75 / 6 \quad 77 / 9$ | $64 / 15$ |
| respective [2] 15/8 43/5 | ruling [5] 12/21 14/14 14/16 | secondhand [1] 70 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { respond [10] } & 23 / 13 & 29 / 18\end{array}$ | 19/14 34/24 | Secondly [1] 79/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 34 / 13 & 35 / 15 & 52 / 11 & 69 / 5 & 73 / 18 \\ 76 / 16 & 76 / 21 & 79 / 2 & & \end{array}$ | rulings [12] $12 / 8$ 16/20 $26 / 1$ | section [1] 63/5 |
| responded [1] | 26/4 26/13 29/14 31/10 62/9 | Security [1] 72/3 |
| responding [1] 60/2 | 62/11 62/12 65/14 84/ | see [36] 8/21 |
| response [9] 22/21 24/19 | run [3] 30/25 30/25 57/3 | 12/9 12/19 13/3 13/23 |
| 24/19 25/15 32/19 34/9 34/21 | run from [1] 30/2 | 15/14 21/20 21/21 21/25 22/4 |
| $37 / 460 / 24$ | running [1] 46/7 | 22/20 23/15 28/25 32/21 |
| responses [3] 64/18 64/22 | S | $/ 645 / 745 /$ |
| 64/24 | safe [2] 4/20 87 | 48/4 55/17 61/9 67/12 68/20 |
| responsibility [2] <br> 17/20 | safety [1] 42/ | 84/4 85/21 86/22 86/22 |
| res | said [14] 19/21 28/13 39/23 | seeing [5] 3/11 3/11 47/25 |
| responsive [4] 7/22 10/25 | 40/21 48/12 48/19 48/23 67/3 | 86/25 87/18 |
| 52/18 56/18 | /9 69/1 75/9 79/4 80/18 | seek [4] 22/14 22 |
| rest [1] 6/17 | same [13] 7/9 11/18 11 | $18 / 4 \text { 22/1 31/1 }$ |
| result [3] 18/24 25/8 $78 / 7$ | $13 / 15 \text { 19/17 } 23 / 1 \quad 28 / 13 \quad 36 / 19$ | $31 / 14 \quad 36 / 20 \quad 36 / 21 \quad 39 / 12$ |
| resulting [1] 12/5 | 37/4 $72 / 8$ 72/23 $76 / 3$ 85/16 | seem [1] 40/1 |
| results [1] 23/1 <br> retailer [10] 16/24 47/16 | Santa [1] 57/23 | seems [5] 10/2 48/10 54/18 |
| retailer [10] 16/24 47/16 | SARAH [1] 2/7 | 76/9 87/11 |
| $52 / 2 \quad 66 / 13 \quad 7$ | Sargon [6] 58/25 59/11 59/16 | seen [8] 12/12 20/13 20/14 |
| retailers [15] 30/3 30/12 | 60/6 62/8 70/4 | 22/12 40/20 58/20 60/10 76/7 |
| 31/16 31/17 34/1 47/14 49/24 | sat [1] 58/17 | selected [3] 63/1 63/16 |
| 50/10 51/5 51/17 51/24 52/3 | save [1] 23/17 | 72/14 |
| 58/2 70/20 71/13 | saving [1] 43/24 | selection [8 |
| retailers' [2] 33/6 | saw [3] 39/16 39/18 87/8 | 58/23 62/5 62/23 63/17 70/12 |
| retiring [2] 58/7 58/7 | say [31] 14/23 15/1 | 71/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { review [2] } & \text { 10/8 } & 10 / 15\end{array}$ | 22/7 22/24 $28 / 3 \quad 28 / 18$ 32/1 | selections [1] 59/9 |
| RICHARD [1] 2/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 9 & 38 / 21 & 39 / 16 & 41 / 18 & 41 / 22\end{array}$ | send [4] 9/17 10/14 52/3 |
| Richmond [1] 1/11 | 43/5 43/10 44/6 45/18 49/2 | 55/12 |
| right [33] 5/20 13/16 14/1 |  | sense [12] 24/3 25/18 36/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 1 & 22 / 9 & 26 / 10 & 29 / 2 & 36 / 10\end{array}$ | $82 / 2 \quad 82 / 16 \quad 84 / 1$ | $72 / 18 \text { 85/15 85/19 86/2 }$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}38 / 8 & 40 / 5 & 45 / 2 & 45 / 13 & 52 / 10\end{array}$ | saying [9] 15/19 24/4 25/6 | sensitive [5] 37/21 37/22 |
| 54/5 55/8 58/24 59/16 61/17 | $31 / 15 \quad 43 / 16 \quad 43 / 25 \quad 50 / 23 \quad 69 / 8$ | 37/24 43/10 43/15 |
| 61/20 62/9 62/15 62/21 66/21 | $79 / 15$ | sent [3] 53/9 79/6 $79 / 9$ |
| 68/3 77/2 78/19 81/22 83/7 | says [3] 52/24 60/11 76/23 | September [10] 3/17 4/ |
| 83/10 86/6 87/8 87/10 87/11 | $\text { scale [1] } 57 / 8$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{rllll} \text { rights } & {[5]} & 26 / 3 & 26 / 12 & 29 / 14 \\ 31 / 10 & 86 / 2 & & & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { scenario [2] } & 71 / 3 & 73 / 3\end{array}$ | 65/15 87/1 87/11 |
|  | scenes [1] 86 | September 15 [1] |
| ripe [2] 59/13 62/8 | schedule [20] 5/22 12/20 | September 15th [2] 4/22 41/ |
| Ripley [1] 1/22 | 19/7 20/17 23/23 26/14 29/15 | September 7 [2] 59/15 59/18 |
| Road [1] 1/15 | $30 / 14$ 30/17 $31 / 24 \quad 32 / 22 \quad 33 / 5$ | series [1] 58/18 |
| ROBERT [7] 1/17 13/9 24/1 | $34 / 3$ 37/13 37/14 37/15 63/5 | session [3] 41/2 84/25 85/1 |
| 25/19 26/20 28/9 33/8 | scheduled [2] 41/4 41/7 | ```sessions [1] 84/24 set [13] 14/11 14/14 26/15``` |
| ROBIN [2] 1/8 2/15 | schedules [1] 35/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 26 / 24 & 27 / 2 & 29 / 13 & 42 / 1 & 46 / 1\end{array}$ |
| Rogers [1] 61/1 | scheduling [10] 59/17 65/17 | 49/22 54/18 60/8 70/16 87/13 |
| role [3] 52/12 $77 / 17$ 78/25 | 66/14 66/16 66/22 72/23 74/8 | setting [4] 33/1 35/22 48/1 |
| roll [2] 50/13 60/19 | 74/10 76/8 85/15 | 48/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { rolling [5] } \\ & 50 / 25 \text { 51/4 } \\ & 51 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | Scholer [1] 2/5 | several [3] 39/19 63/13 |
| room [3] $48 / 5$ 49/11 $78 / 5$ | science [9] 68/7 78/11 78/11 | 74/24 |
| ROSENBERG [4] $1 / 3$ 1/8 $2 / 15$ | 78/13 79/11 79/11 79/14 | shall [3] 25/10 25/14 25/15 |
| $48 / 3$  <br> round [2] $64 / 15$ <br> rounds [1] $68 / 11$ |  | shared [2] 34/12 56/25 <br> sharing [2] 53/13 53/15 |



| S | 8/22 8/23 11/14 11/16 13/14 | 9] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Suite [4] 1/11 1/15 1/19 2/9 | $\begin{array}{llll}13 / 22 & 18 / 2 & 20 / 2 & 29 / 16 \\ 38 / 6 & 37 / 5\end{array}$ | Thornburg [1] |
| summarize [1] 31/7 | 17 41/20 41/21 41/21 | thorough [1] 23/7 |
| summary [2] 31/23 80/13 | 52/15 53/1 53/2 55/5 55/17 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { summer [6] } & 4 / 5 & 4 / 6 & 6 / 18\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}61 / 20 & 64 / 1 & 83 / 10 & 83 / 13 & 83 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 12 / 25 & 14 / 11 & 14 / 11 & 14 / 14\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 13 & 59 / 1 & 87 / 16 \\ \text { support [3] } & \end{array}$ |  $83 / 19$ $83 / 20$ $83 / 23$ $84 / 8$ <br> $7 / 19$     | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 20 & 15 / 22 & 16 / 21 & 17 / 4 & 17 / 12\end{array}$ |
| support [3] 30/19 49/5 86/12 supports [1] 28/8 | thankful [1] 52/13 | 17/20 17/20 21/7 25/1 26/23 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { suppose [3] } & 22 / 16 & 37 / 25 & 42 / 5\end{array}$ | Thanks [1] 38/8 | 27/3 30/17 38/2 39/3 39/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { sure [14] } & 5 / 15 & 11 / 23 & 26 / 9\end{array}$ | that [659] | $39 / 6$ 42/25 43/11 $43 / 18$ 44/21 |
| 33/10 42/24 53/12 62/1 69/23 | that's [1] 75/23 | 46/20 46/22 46/24 47/3 47/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}70 / 2 & 72 / 7 & 74 / 21 ~ 77 / 3 ~ 79 / 24\end{array}$ | the essence [1] 48/23 | 49/24 50/3 50/9 51/6 51/6 |
| 85/16 | their [42] 7/6 8/13 8/14 | 51/7 51/11 52/6 54/9 54/13 |
| surprised [1] 52/20 | 9/19 9/21 13/3 17/1 17/11 | 56/20 57/18 58/4 58/5 59/8 |
| suspect [3] 6/19 10/16 11/4 | $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 22 & 24 / 18 & 24 / 19 & 30 / 18\end{array}$ | 61/8 62/13 64/12 65/13 66/7 |
| suspects [1] 3/7 | $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 19 & 30 / 20 & 32 / 5 & 32 / 19 & 34 / 11\end{array}$ | 67/1 68/22 69/6 69/11 69/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { system [2] } & 11 / 25 & 70 / 16\end{array}$ | 34/14 34/22 47/1 50/8 50/8 | 69/25 72/1 72/12 72/20 73/1 |
| T | 62/3 64/14 67/25 70/3 72/23 | those who [1] 49/24 |
| take [20] 6/17 7/21 10/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}75 / 3 & 75 / 6 & 75 / 8 & 75 / 8 & 82 / 7\end{array}$ | though [5] 16/3 40/7 56/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 1 & 13 / 12 & 16 / 7 & 18 / 17 & 31 / 4\end{array}$ | 82/8 82/8 82/12 82/13 86/9 | 61/4 69 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}43 / 1 & 43 / 6 & 44 / 6 & 44 / 23 & 45 / 2\end{array}$ | them [30] 4/13 8/11 9/18 | thought [7] 8/8 9/24 15/12 |
| 45/17 55/24 56/12 57/12 |  | 19/14 20/23 41/6 |
| 58/16 79/8 87/16 | 32 | usal |
| taken [3] 4/16 51/6 63/21 | 21/20 23/6 23/15 32/2 33/19 | housand [1] 33/ |
| takes [3] 29/11 $40 / 4 \quad 74 / 12$ | $0$ | $5$ |
| taking [7] 3/7 29/21 34/12 | $81 / 13 \text { 83/7 85/7 }$ | threatened [1] 77/20 |
|  | theme [1] 86/19 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { three [2] } & 21 / 6 & 45 / 21\end{array}$ |
| talk [7] 5/23 16/15 38/9 | themselves [1] 85/21 | through [20] 1/8 5/1 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc}44 / 2 & 44 / 5 & 44 / 6 & 57 / 24 \\ \text { talked [6] } & 27 / 15 & 31 / 7 & 56 / 14\end{array}$ | then [43] 9/14 9/20 12/1 | 8/11 17/12 $23 / 5$ 26/5 39/1 |
| alked [6] 27/15 31/7 56 | 15/15 16/7 21/1 21/16 22/6 | 49/25 50/8 52/2 53/16 53/16 |
|  | 22/17 22/20 23/7 23/9 25/6 | 58/23 64/18 65/23 66/2 66/8 |
| talking [11] 10/1 12/13 | 27/20 27/20 29/5 29/18 32/4 | 76/7 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 14 & 20 / 5 & 26 / 2 & 39 / 25 & 59 / 24 \\ 76 / 22 & 77 / 3 & 78 / 13 & 81 / 21\end{array}$ | 35/6 45/12 $46 / 3 \quad 46 / 4 \quad 49 / 7$ | throughout [3] |
| 76/22 77/3 78/13 81/21 | 51/23 52/3 57/21 62/5 62/9 | 6/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { task [1] } & 4 / 17 & & \\ \text { team [4] } & 36 / 1 & 44 / 19 & 55 / 13\end{array}$ | 63/7 63/16 63/17 63/17 63/22 | tick [1] |
| team [4] 36/1 44/19 55/13 | 63/23 64/14 65/4 65/5 66/10 | ticking [1] 30/2 |
| $86 / 12$ teamed [1] 56/10 | 71/7 72/3 73/4 80/20 84/16 | time [43] 5/18 6/21 $7 / 3$ 7/13 |
| teamed [1] 56/10 | there [137] | 7/17 7/17 7/21 10/3 13/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { technical [1] } & 49 / 1 \\ \text { techniques [1] } & 7 / 7\end{array}$ | there's [1] 57/15 | 13/12 13/24 19/17 23/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { techniques [1] } & 7 / 7 \\ \text { technology [1] } & 8 / 3\end{array}$ | Therefore [2] 17/19 17/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 12 & 25 / 2 & 26 / 23 & 30 / 23 & 30 / 25\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { echnology [1] } & 8 / 3 \\ \text { ell [12] } 12 / 18 ~ & 13 \end{array}$ | Thereupon [1] 87/20 | $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 17 & 34 / 21 & 35 / 4 & 36 / 18 & 37 / 19\end{array}$ |
| 20/17 $20 / 19$ 22/23 38/13 | these [22] 4/8 16/17 17/17 | 37/21 37/22 37/24 42/7 50/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}20 / 17 & 20 / 19 & 22 / 23 & 38 / 13 \\ 43 / 22 & 55 / 14 & 71 / 20 & 75 / 15\end{array}$ | 42/3 43/25 46/15 51/16 58/14 | 54/24 56/17 58/12 62/18 65/6 |
| /22 55/14 71/20 75/15 | 58/18 59/9 60/8 61/17 63/23 | 67/24 67/24 68/19 71/24 72/6 |
| $76 / 24$ ten [6] | 64/18 65/16 68/10 68/13 | 80/16 84/8 84/24 85/25 87/16 |
|  | 68/22 69/22 71/11 75/20 | timeframe [1] 52/12 |
| tends [1] 77/22 | 79/13 | timeframes [1] 59/2 |
| tends [1] 77/22 <br> Tennessee [8] 57/17 57/18 | they [104] | timely [1] 52/23 |
| $\begin{array}{rr} \text { Tennessee } & {[8]} \\ 61 / 21 \quad 64 / 2 & 65 / 10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | they're [3] 38/14 66/7 82/12 | times [4] 21/21 39/19 67/19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 61 / 21 \\ & 82 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | thing [13] 25/21 28/18 29/2 | 74/24 |
| terminology [1 | 37/2 42/22 44/7 56/21 78/19 | timetable [1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { terms [14] } & 12 / 11 & 16 / 4 & 16 / 4\end{array}$ | 81/16 85/16 86/6 87/10 87/11 | timing [4] 35/6 35/6 53/17 |
| 18/5 18/25 30/23 44/7 52/11 | things [33] 4/5 6/13 7/18 | 60/6 |
| 53/6 53/9 53/22 71/22 71/24 | 11/7 21/5 21/25 22/9 23/6 | tip [1] 84 |
| 73/11 | 28/24 36/19 37/22 39/2 43/25 | to do [1] 4/6 |
| terrific [2] 10/7 56/8 | 44/10 $44 / 21$ 45/21 47/19 | today [18] 3/12 4/23 5/7 |
| Texas [13] 57/22 66/10 66/11 | 8/24 52/24 53/5 54/6 55/1 | 12/17 14/23 24/5 24/15 26/2 |
| 67/10 67/11 68/1 $72 / 21 \quad 72 / 22$ | 55/6 62/15 63/15 67/1 72/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 13 & 35 / 22 & 35 / 24 & 37 / 18\end{array}$ |
| 73/3 74/11 74/21 75/17 82/23 | 76/21 81/6 81/7 84/4 84/5 | 40/16 40/24 41/11 52/21 57/3 |
| texts [1] 45/6 | 85/12 | 71/4 |
| than [16] 15/9 20/4 24/11 | [93] | Today's [1] 3/25 |
| 24/18 25/14 25/16 34/23 | thinking [6] 22/18 27/1 36/18 44/1 44/23 85/4 | ther [12] 9/11 15/12 $17 \quad 24 / 16 \quad 42 / 15 \quad 43 / 7 \quad 59 / 24$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}36 / 14 & 41 / 22 & 45 / 23 & 69 / 6\end{array} 70 / 9$ | thinks [1] 43/12 | $59 / 25 \quad 63 / 25 \quad 72 / 20 \quad 73 / 21$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}71 / 10 & 82 / 25 & 83 / 9 & 84 / 9\end{array}$ | $\text { third [5] } 46 / 23 \quad 50 / 3 \quad 50 / 6$ | $86 / 16$ |
| thank [39] 6/5 6/8 8/7 8/20 | $66 / 1373 / 4$ | token [1] 7/9 |


| T | unable | le [2] 18/13 42 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| told [2] 58/11 82/7 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { uncontroversial } & \text { [1] } & 56 / 15 \\ \text { under [17] } & 15 / 2 & 15 / 23 & 16 / 20\end{array}$ | value [1] 41/14 variant [1] 4/7 |
| tomorrow [7] 14/24 15/2 15/3 24/7 24/11 24/15 24/16 | $\begin{array}{clllll}\text { under } & 18 / 8 & 23 / 23 & 25 / 1 & 26 / 1\end{array}$ | various [12] 45/25 50/10 |
|  | $31 / 19$ 33/2 $33 / 7$ 35/5 45/24 | 57/9 68/10 68/22 77/5 78/12 |
| 77/1 | 70/21 71/23 75/11 82/8 | 78/21 81/4 81/6 81/7 81/7 |
| took [1] 84/24 | understand [23] 3/1 3/6 5/7 | varying [1] 57/10 |
| top [1] 52/17 | 5/22 6/3 8/19 12/7 21/4 29/8 | vast [2] 44/11 57/ |
| topic [2] 43/3 44/17 | $33 / 22$ 37/20 43/18 $49 / 14$ | vehicle [2] 18/7 23/4 |
| topics [2] 5/16 44/4 | 52/8 56/7 70/13 70/15 | vendor [5] 46/14 46/14 5 |
| totally [2] 18/20 42/6 | understandable [1] 19/20 | vendors [2] 54/1 54/8 |
| touch [1] 51/12 | understandably [1] 20/5 | verdict [1] 74/16 |
| ck [1] 50/1 | understanding [7] 6/15 22/18 | version [2] 58/25 59/17 |
| tracked [1] 65/13 | 33/12 $34 / 5$ 50/4 76/25 80/4 | versus [1] 50/1 |
| traditional [6] $19 / 22$ 19/25 | understands [1] 74/21 | very [32] 4/9 4/9 7 |
| 20/16 24/4 34/7 39/15 | undertake [1] 17/25 <br> underway [2] 6/8 64/16 | 8/6 12/11 22/22 23/6 23/7 <br> 27/17 29/4 36/20 36/25 36/25 |
| n | undoubtedly [1] 47/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 25 & 40 / 21 & 42 / 9 & 42 / 10 & 42 / 20\end{array}$ |
|  | unexpected [1] 5/8 | 47/8 48/6 57/1 58/13 59/21 |
| ranscript [2] | unfairly [2] 52/20 52/20 | 60/19 60/19 64/11 72/3 79/2 |
| sparent [2] 28/4 | Unfortunately [1] 24/8 | 81/9 83/1 83/7 |
| transparently [1] 85/9 | unilateral [1] 29/6 | vetting [1] 84/2 |
| travel [2] 4/4 5/9 | UNITED [2] 1/1 1/9 | via [2] 9/8 52 |
| traveling [1] 48/6 | unless [2] 41/17 47/20 | video [3] 8/14 45/8 56/1 |
| treat [1] 11/17 | unlike [1] 33/15 | videos [1] 3/12 |
| treated [1] 37/22 | unnoticed [1] 7/1 | view [8] 15/24 17/15 23 |
| trial [21] 57/3 58/22 59/2 | unopposed [1] 28/2 | $33 / 22 \quad 43 / 25 \quad 77 / 2$ |
| 62/6 62/10 62/12 62/17 62/23 | until [8] 20/14 20/24 23/20 | views [3] 60/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}63 / 1 & 66 / 21 & 67 / 4 & 67 / 4 & 67 / 5\end{array}$ | $26 / 23 \quad 52 / 2 \quad 70 / 18 \quad 73 / 8 \quad 81 / 22$ | vigorously <br> [1] 3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 67 / 6 \text { 67/15 67/15 } 67 / 16 \text { 67/16 } \\ & 74 / 1074 / 17 \text { 76/8 } \end{aligned}$ | up [32] $4 / 6$ 4/10 $9 / 11$ 9/21 | vis [2] 68/15 68/15 |
| trials [3] 4/12 4/16 67/14 | 12/20 14/5 14/6 18/21 19/23 | visualize [1] 32/8 |
| tried [2] 63/13 84/2 | 31/4 31/5 42/1 43/17 46/7 | voice [1] 69/18 |
| triggers [1] 45/25 | $46 / 25$ 47/6 48/17 49/22 | W |
| trip [1] 5/2 | 19 70/16 73/20 | waited [1] 3/2 |
| true [7] 46/25 47/4 47/6 | 79/10 79/15 82/18 85/5 | waiting [4] 20/11 49/11 52 |
| 62/4 79/11 79/16 80/11 | update [4] 6/3 49/16 $61 / 18$ | 58/19 |
| truncated [1] try [10] 7/22 | 79/23 | waive [3] 24/20 24/20 25/1 |
| $27 / 17 \text { 27/25 } 36 / 25 \quad 37 / 3 \quad 55 / 17$ | updated [1] 68/24 | waived [1] 34/9 |
| $56 / 25 \quad 85 / 17$ | updates [1] 44/22 | waiving [2] 25/16 26/2 |
| trying [13] 13/14 28/2 28/3 | upload [1] 9/13 | want [67] 3/17 4/22 4/24 |
| 36/12 52/8 54/1 54/4 77/20 | upon [9] 7/9 11/6 17/7 28/1 | $\begin{array}{llll}5 / 14 & 6 / 2 & 6 / 8 & 8 / 7 \\ 12 / 18 & 12 / 18\end{array}$ |
| 86/3 86/4 86/4 86/5 86/6 | 28/20 28/21 28/25 36/24 | 16/15 21/4 21/8 21/18 21/2 |
| Tuesday [6] 21/1 23/20 24/20 |  | 22/4 22/9 23/16 24/4 25/23 |
| 24/21 25/16 26/17 | urgency [2] $34 / 16$ 35/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 9 & 26 / 23 & 26 / 24 & 27 / 8 & 27 / 18\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { turn [8] } & 7 / 14 & 8 / 13 & 16 / 6 & 16 / 9\end{array}$ | us [30] 4/3 9/8 9/19 24/15 | 27/18 28/1 28/20 28/23 $28 / 24$ |
| 24/24 32/20 47/21 79/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}25 / 2 & 25 / 5 & 30 / 8 & 33 / 13 & 34 / 12\end{array}$ | 29/11 31/4 $32 / 14$ 32/22 $33 / 10$ |
| turned [1] 87/7 | $34 / 22$ 35/8 35/19 41/24 42/24 | 36/18 37/20 39/21 40/6 43/15 |
| turning [1] 3/12 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}43 / 17 & 44 / 8 & 45 / 8 & 46 / 8 & 58 / 11\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}43 / 15 & 43 / 19 & 44 / 2 & 44 / 5 & 44 / 6\end{array}$ |
| tweak [1] 21/19 | 64/2 65/9 70/2 72/16 73/15 | 47/7 54/10 56/1 60/1 62/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { two [25] } & 11 / 5 & 14 / 4 & 14 / 4 & 15 / 6\end{array}$ | 75/3 77/5 81/11 82/7 82/25 | 67/2 67/22 68/5 68/5 72/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 7 & 15 / 16 & 15 / 20 & 15 / 22 & 19 / 8\end{array}$ | 83/9 | 73/19 $73 / 19$ 73/20 74/21 |
| 20/18 $26 / 24 \quad 27 / 3 \quad 33 / 14 \quad 35 / 21$ | usage [2] 71/22 71/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}76 / 20 & 76 / 21 & 78 / 20 & 79 / 3 & 79 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 35/22 46/10 56/11 57/17 | use [11] 8/3 21/17 27/3 | 80/4 82/18 83/23 85/21 |
| 58/10 59/22 61/1 66/4 $72 / 4$ | 46/12 46/22 46/24 47/2 47/15 | wanted [10] 5/15 20/12 $21 / 15$ |
| 81/5 84/10 | 70/8 78/6 85/25 | 40/24 49/15 52/11 55/9 56/22 |
| TX [1] 1/12 | used [2] 7/8 56/9 | 74/1 85/4 |
| type [3] 22/1 66/5 71/19 | useful [3] 47/9 61/10 61/11 | wanting [1] 7/18 |
| types [1] 58/14 | using [2] 17/11 39/13 | wants [3] 34/21 47/13 67/21 |
| U | usually [1] 21/11 | 5/12 5/12 5/15 6/6 9/7 9/24 |
| ultimately [6] | V | 14/20 18/18 19/7 19/10 19/14 |
| 1246 |  | 19/16 19/23 20/10 20/24 31/8 |
| [1] | vacation [1] 13/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 12 & 33 / 17 & 33 / 19 & 35 / 25 & 36 / 4\end{array}$ |
|  | vague [1] 12/11 | 39/16 39/19 48/20 48/22 |
|  | vagueness [1] 13/2 | 49/22 50/15 55/9 55/14 56/10 |


| W | 10/23 16/13 23/17 24 | without [8] 15/16 16/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| was... [47] 58/3 60/13 60/18 | 24/24 $38 / 1238 / 25$ 39/3 $42 / 7$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 5 & 72 / 5 & 72 / 11 & 74 / 15 & 75 / 8\end{array}$ |
| 60/21 63/4 66/11 66/12 66/13 |  | won't [5] 20/21 23/19 48/5 48/7 80/16 |
| 66/24 66/25 67/3 67/3 67/4 | $79 / 14 \quad 81 / 21 \quad 85 / 25 \quad 87 / 5$ | wonder [1] 70/25 |
| 67/6 67/7 67/7 67/7 67/8 | whenever [2] 20/24 81/14 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { word [6] } & 6 / 6 & 21 / 18 & 26 / 18\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}67 / 9 & 67 / 10 & 70 / 19 & 71 / 5 \\ 71 / 7 \\ 71 / 9 & 71 / 12 & 71 / 23 & 73 / 9\end{array}$ | where [35] 9/1 9/13 14/15 | 38/3 42/5 86/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}71 / 9 & 71 / 12 & 71 / 23 & 73 / 9 & 74 / 13 \\ 76 / 23 & 76 / 25 & 78 / 11 & 79 / 22\end{array}$ | 16/21 16/24 20/3 20/4 23/5 | words [2] 41/18 65/ |
| 79/23 79/25 80/3 82/7 84/3 | 30/15 39/12 46/16 47/1 47/6 | work [16] 11/4 |
| 84/10 84/12 84/22 84/22 | 48/5 55/12 $56 / 23$ 58/6 59/13 | 38/16 38/21 39/5 44/10 46/7 |
| 84/25 84/25 85/5 86/22 86/24 | 63/6 63/20 65/3 70/21 73/19 | 52/24 53/16 53/18 57/2 63/19 |
| 87/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}76 / 11 & 76 / 12 & 76 / 12 & 77 / 19 & 78 / 2\end{array}$ | 77/21 85/12 86/20 |
| Washington | 78/2 78/11 79/25 81/15 83/7 | workable [1] |
| wasn't [1] | /16 85/22 | worked [6] 14/25 36/8 39/4 |
| wave [4] 50/3 50/6 50/13 | wherever [1] 81 | working [10] $6 / 18 \quad 7 / 2 \quad 14 / 20$ |
| 52/5 | whether [16] 4/23 15/20 | 49/8 50/4 52/22 56/2 73/14 |
| way [24] 5/17 7/11 8/25 10/2 | 20/11 21/3 27/22 32/21 36/22 | 83/1 86/15 |
| 12/2 $12 / 15$ 23/2 $24 / 21$ 30/16 | 38/1 $39 / 25$ 43/22 47/3 $62 / 12$ | works [4] 35/19 84/19 84/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}60 / 8 & 63 / 12 & 63 / 18 & 69 / 5 \\ 70 / 14 & 76 / 14 & 77 / 6 & 77 / 25 \\ 78 / 18\end{array}$ | 67/22 68/13 70/5 78/16 | 86/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 70 / 14 & 76 / 14 & 77 / 6 & 77 / 25 & 78 / 18 \\ 81 / 15 & 85 / 11 & 85 / 23 & 86 / 3 & 86 / 17 \end{array}$ | which [32] 7/2 10/16 14/24 | workup [1] |
| /15 85/11 85/23 86/3 86/17 | 15/22 23/9 24/11 31/13 31/25 | world [2] |
|  | 32/10 38/16 40/23 45/23 | worms [1] 37/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { we [338] } \\ & \text { we 'll [3] } \end{aligned}$ | 46/12 46/23 48/23 52/12 | worries [1] |
| webinar [1] | 56/19 66/4 66/10 67/3 70/4 | worry [2] 6/13 48/21 |
| website [2] 9/9 50/8 | 0/11 71/5 71/7 72/7 73/5 | worse [1] 48/10 |
| wedded [1] 5/21 | 74/25 76/10 81/2 81 | would [164] |
| Wednesday [3] 23/12 23/21 |  | wouldn't [5] 11/6 21/5 21 |
| 24/25 | while [9] |  |
| week [17] 10/5 11/11 15/17 | $14 / 9 \text { 17/19 20/8 36/3 }$ | wrote [1] 65/4 |
| 21/2 21/3 23/10 24/23 25/2 |  |  |
| 50/9 50/9 50/22 50/23 50/25 |  | X |
| 51/1 51/3 52/23 87/2 | 6/9 7/6 7/12 7/15 8/2 8/5 | Xx [1] 12/1 |
| weeks [9] 12/5 12/5 20/6 | 8/10 8/25 9/8 10/19 10/23 |  |
| 20/11 21/7 33/15 34/12 72/5 | $2 / 12 \quad 12 / 17 \quad 12 / 25 \quad 13 / 4 \quad 13,$ | $Y$ |
| 87/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 17 / 8 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 17 & 18 / 22 & 38 / 21 \end{array}$ |  |
| weight [1] 21/13 | $46 / 16 \text { 49/24 51/12 54/13 }$ | year <br> [7] 3/23 |
| Weiselberg [1] 1/18 | 62/24 68/22 68/23 69/21 | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 67 / 6 & 71 / 6 & 72 / 13 & 78 / 3\end{array}$ |
| welcome [2] 45/10 55/22 | $75 / 19$ 75/20 $85 / 20 \quad 85 / 21$ | years [1] 81/5 |
| well [39] $3 / 7$ 4/15 6/16 6/21 | 86/13 86/14 86/14 86/22 | yes [39] $8 / 20$ 11/12 17 |
| 7/12 8/7 8/16 11/15 13/12 | Whoever [1] 55/22 | $\begin{array}{rlllll}\text { yes } \\ 28 / 18 & 32 / 25 & 33 / 2 & 35 / 2 & 35\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 23 & 22 / 7 & 23 / 6 & 24 / 10 & 27 / 4\end{array}$ | whole [2] 58/18 60/ | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 35 / 13 & 35 / 17 & 35 / 19 & 37 / 7 \\ 37 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 27/12 $30 / 7$ 30/7 32/22 35/1 |  | $38 / 6 \text { 38/7 48/8 49/9 49/13 }$ |
| 35/16 35/21 36/2 43/16 44/10 | whose [1] 36/20 | $50 / 18 \text { 51/14 } 51 / 25 \quad 53 / 1 \quad 53 / 8$ |
| 46/7 48/14 $55 / 19$ 57/3 59/2 | why [20] $12 / 18$ 15/9 15/10 | 56/4 57/4 61/15 63/3 64/7 |
| 62/8 63/4 72/17 75/18 76/7 | 20/17 20/19 21/10 21/10 22/7 | 65/8 67/12 69/7 69/23 69/24 |
| 78/15 83/1 83/6 83/21 87/15 | 22/10 22/14 $22 / 23 \quad 27 / 18$ | 75/24 76/19 78/2 81/18 83/13 |
| well-deserved [1] 3/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}28 / 23 & 29 / 1 & 40 / 3 & 40 / 7 & 43 / 6\end{array}$ | 83/17 |
| went [3] 36/6 39/1 57/3 | 43/6 70/25 81/2 |  |
| were [32] 3/4 4/5 5/16 5/18 |  |  |
| 6/10 14/19 19/8 27/1 30/6 | wife's [1] 66/19 | $3 / 18 \quad 33 / 20 \quad 34 / 3 \quad 45 / 19 \quad 70 / 18$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}30 / 10 & 39 / 6 & 43 / 2 & 44 / 1 & 58 / 18\end{array}$ | will [118] | $79 / 6$ |
| 61/6 69/11 69/12 70/18 70/18 | Williams [3] 2/2 13/7 40/18 |  |
| 70/25 71/10 72/22 73/8 73/17 | willing [3] 7/6 25/1 30/9 | $66 / 9 \quad 66 / 9$ |
| 74/4 75/23 79/5 82/6 82/8 | Wilson <br> [1] $61 / 3$ |  |
| 84/11 86/23 87/4 | window [3] 50/15 51/18 54/17 | $67 / 9 \quad 73 / 9$ |
| weren't [2] 75/23 82/5 |  |  |
| Werts [1] 1/22 | Winifred [1] 58/6 | you [332] |
| WEST [5] $1 / 2$ 1/5 $2 / 5$ 2/16 | winnowing [1] 63/15 | you'd [1] |
| 5 | wire [1] 21 | u're [3] 10/9 27/20 38/17 |
| what [135] | wish [1] 87/15 | your [155] |
| whatever [9] $22 / 3$ 24/3 $41 / 15$ | wishes [1] 26/11 | ours [2] |
| 43/14 62/25 63/24 68/14 72/8 | Wisner [2] 76/25 79/6 | yourself [2] 8/11 39/23 |
| 85/12 | withdrawals [1] 10/19 | yourselves [1] 86/20 |
| whatever format [1] 41/15 | $\text { within [10] } 34 / 14 \quad 34 / 1$ | Z |
| wheels [1] 42/18 <br> when [25] 4/24 5/1 10/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 42 / 14 & 44 / 12 & 46 / 2 & 50 / 17 & 52 / 23 \\ 72 / 4 \quad 72 / 5 & 72 / 11 \end{array}$ | ZANTAC $[12]$ $1 / 4$ $3 / 13$ $6 / 19$ <br> $21 / 17$ $26 / 19$ $32 / 11$ $38 / 4$ $39 / 16$ |



