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THE COURT: Good afternoon. Why don't we let all of the folks in in the waiting room.

This is case number 20-02924, In Re: Zantac (Ranitidine) Product Liabilities Litigation, as well as case number 21-82184, Bretholz versus GSK. I will note that the latter case is being cross docketed into the MDL case. So, for purposes of today's hearing, we are going to treat this as one proceeding within the MDL, and we will produce one transcript of the hearing, which can be cross filed in the other case.

My understanding is the issues relating to Mr.
Bretholz may overlap with some of the discussion in the Valisure matter, and it is efficient then to maintain one record and keep everything in one place.

We set aside this afternoon for a series of discovery hearings. It is my understanding, and what I am prepared to address today, there are four matters.

First is a matter relating to an interrogatory relating to Boehringer Ingelheim relating to desiccant utilization in bottling. We will do that first.

The second issue will relate to Sanofi, non-preservation of emails, and the upcoming $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition, so $I$ will deal with that issue second.

The third issue will be the third party subpoena to Valisure, and the last matter will be the third party subpoena to Michael Bretholz.

To be clear, I will not be addressing today anything to do with Emery Pharma. I found out this morning that Judge Rosenberg ruled that the Court does have jurisdiction and has referred back to me a resolution of the Emery Pharma discovery matter. That will not be addressed today. We will deal with that separately and set a separate hearing on that matter.

With that, let me ask the parties in the first matter, the desiccant interrogatory issue, to please come on the screen, and let me allow the Plaintiffs to make their appearance.

MR. STANLEY: Good afternoon, Judge Reinhart, Brett Stanley, on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. On behalf of Boehringer Ingelheim?

MR. SHORTNACY: Good afternoon, your Honor, Michael Shortnacy for Boehringer Ingelheim.

THE COURT: I will try to make clear each time what I have received and what I have reviewed. I did receive a lot of material in preparation for today's hearing.

For this issue, I received Plaintiffs' PTO 32 submission, which was two and a half pages, a copy of the interrogatory that was served, as well as the Boehringer Ingelheim response, which was also about two pages.

So, did either party submit any other materials relating to this particular dispute? Mr. Stanley?

MR. STANLEY: No, Judge, that is what the Plaintiffs have submitted.

THE COURT: Mr. Shortnacy?
MR. SHORTNACY: No, your Honor, that is the sum total of BI's submission.

THE COURT: As I read the materials, it appears the issue is that Plaintiffs have requested information relating to whether Boehringer Ingelheim utilized desiccant, which I understand to be a drying agent, in manufacturing certain bottles -- I am sorry, bottles that were used to hold prescription drugs during the relevant time periods, that Boehringer Ingelheim has submitted a sworn response to the interrogatory saying that no desiccants were used for any bottles that were used to hold Zantac, and yet the Plaintiffs are requesting more information above and beyond that response.

With that, let me turn to Mr. Stanley. If you can articulate for me what it is you are asking the Court to order today and what it is you are looking for.

MR. STANLEY: Judge, we would like the Court to order Boehringer Ingelheim to identify other drugs that they used desiccants in in finished dose form that were bottled in high density polyethylene bottles, HDP bottles. HDP bottles are semipermeable, they allow moisture and light to get in.

One of the central themes of this case is protection of Zantac, which is a moisture sensitive, light sensitive, heat
sensitive drug, against these agents, because the sensitivity leads to degradation and we believe the formation of NDMA.

The use of desiccants in bottles, in HDP bottles, is always for the same goal, to reduce moisture inside the bottle. It does not matter which type of drug that you are talking about, when a desiccant is used in an HDP bottle, whether it is a sachet, which is a packet, or a cannister type desiccant, it is used to keep the atmosphere inside the bottle dryer to reduce or lessen the potential harm of degradation of the pill or interaction with moisture of the pill.

That is what we seek. Jumping beyond the form argument that this interrogatory was beyond that allowed by the rules, and into the substance, as you know, Judge, and as you discussed with the parties often, proportionality goes to the claims Defense has made in the case, and the relevance, and the burden, and we believe that all of this is part of BI's duty to respond to this despite being a different drug.

I can talk to the --
THE COURT: Wait, let me push back in that respect. Let me get some clarity from you. You say you want them to identify other drugs that use desiccants. What I understood, at least in part of their response was they are objecting to go back -- are you asking for all other drugs where they used it? Are you asking for an example, multiple examples? What exactly are the Plaintiffs asking for?

It is my understanding, at least in part, BI's objection was if they have to go back and identify every single prescription drug for which they used a desiccant in a bottle that is unduly burdensome. So clarify for me, what exactly is it are you asking for?

MR. STANLEY: Sure. Ultimately, with all of the Defendants, we offered if they could identify an exemplar drug that used a desiccant can't in an HDP bottle from the relevant time period, and with that, identify the type of desiccant and the cost, then that would satisfy what we are looking for on this interrogatory, and that was not something that was agreed to by BI, while the others did agree to do that.

That was the way that we thought we could minimize the burden here, and we thought it was a great compromise to allow for that identification.

THE COURT: Again, are you asking me -- that is what 1 am asking, are you asking me to order them to do that, or are you asking me to order them to respond in full to the interrogatory as drafted?

MR. STANLEY: The compromise we would ask for you to order is to identify from 2006, hopefully, but during the relevant time period, which is from 2006 to 2016, where a desiccant was used inside the bottle, and identify what type of desiccant and the cost per use of the desiccant, and the others have been able to find some cost information to say we bought
this amount, and just simple math gets you down to the price per unit or widget that goes into the bottle.

THE COURT: Thank you. Let me turn to Mr. Shortnacy and let him respond to that.

MR. SHORTNACY: Your Honor, thank you. I appreciate Mr. Stanley's, you know, sharpening the request at this point, and I just want to reiterate a couple of points that I think are relevant to the Court's analysis.

First of all, BI has already responded to north of 250 interrogatories, and as a part of a compromise on this specific issue, without requiring specifically they get leave of Court to do so, we responded to what, arguably -- and I still don't agree that it is necessarily relevant to issues in this case, but we provided information regarding OTC Zantac. We believe with that we have complied with any arguable duty to provide responsive information to the Plaintiffs' request.

What we are talking about now is the world outside of that with other products, and now Mr. Stanley has sort of narrowed the rabbit hole, but we believe that just because something is narrower doesn't make it relevant.

Your Honor, I have this in the papers, but the decision to place a desiccant in a product is a very technical thing, it's subject to scientific study, and it depends on the chemical composition and molecular structure of the API and excipients in the product and the packaging presentation and
formulation.
All of those things are all very different, so what they are asking us to do, even in a very narrow request, is to basically provide irrelevant information.

I will also say that even a narrowed request on its face maybe seems like it is subject to the Home Depot easy button, in fact it isn't. What Mr. Stanley is asking is that we go back to 2006. BI, of course, divested its entire CHC business, so there are challenges with going back in time for those periods. Products may have been made overseas, products may have been made by other affiliates that are no longer affiliates, documents from that time period may not exist.

When we start to peel back that onion, it becomes difficult. Even something as narrow as Mr. Stanley is framing it to be right now, it can be deceptively difficult to unwind.

I will make one final point, your Honor, if I may. They are also asking us to identify what is an "exemplar product" which in and of itself is putting on us the burden to kind of assess and establish what is an exemplar, and there may, in fact, be no exemplar.

This is outside of my area, I am not an expert in these matters, but each product is unique, the formulations and presentations of products are unique. So, that already is doing more than something that, again, appears perhaps on its face as sort of an easy button task. It really isn't when you
look at it.
THE COURT: You used the term CHC. For the record, what are you referring to?

MR. SHORTNACY: I apologize. That is the consumer health care business that BI divested in around 2016 to Sanofi, with that the entire business and all of -- most all of the people that worked in the business. Part of the business was to sell Zantac, that was one product.

THE COURT: So the records from the relevant time period are in the possession of Sanofi, your co-defendant?

MR. SHORTNACY: I don't know that to be true, your Honor, and I don't know if those records would have rolled through that 2016 transaction. I didn't mean to imply that.

I only meant to imply that the relevant people who may have knowledge of those former consumer products may in fact no longer be with the company.

THE COURT: Okay. Are they still at Sanofi, your co-defendant?

MR. SHORTNACY: It would depend on who the person is. I do not know if -- not all of the BI people transferred to Sanofi, but it is possible.

THE COURT: I will be clear, BI played this game with me once before having to do with Promeco records where they claimed you had to get permission from some unnamed third party, who turned out to be tour co-defendant. I didn't
appreciate it then and I don't appreciate it now. You can ask Ms. Sharpe, Mr. Agneshwar, you can ask any of the 50 lawyers on this case who represent Sanofi to give you this information.

So, don't suggest to me that it is going to be so difficult to find it because you sold your products to somebody else. You sold it to your co-defendant who you talk to every day.

I will overrule that objection.
MR. SHORTNACY: Understood, your Honor. I apologize, I appreciate that your Honor is frustrated. I didn't mean to imply that that was a reason we are not providing information, because we are saying that it doesn't belong to us any more.

I am simply saying -- I'll reiterate the points I was trying to emphasize, I apologize for side tracking. Really what we are focusing on is the relevance of the information, which we believe it is not relevant to the issues in this case. This is information about other products. We have provided the information --

THE COURT: The Plaintiffs argue that it is relevant because if you can do it for another product, you could have done it for Zantac, and therefore they get to argue to the jury that if Zantac got undue moisture because you didn't put a desiccant in it, that was your choice and you are responsible for the choices you make.

Why isn't that a theory of relevance that would adhere
in this case?

MR. SHORTNACY: Well, your Honor, we would argue that that is not relevant because those decisions are unique to each product. So, the fact that you didn't do it in one formulation versus another would not be relevant to that.

And I would also focus on one other thing that we have in our papers, this information is available to Plaintiffs to make the argument that desiccant is available in the industry and desiccant had a cost. Those arguments can be made and don't require going through, you know, the sort of efforts and try to discern what, $A$, an exemplar product would be, and B, what its unit cost was.

In order to do that we would have to get the packaging, its formulation, figure out the cost allocation. There are steps involved in that process, your Honor, so that does create burden for us.

THE COURT: I understand. Let me go back to Mr. Stanley.

MR. STANLEY: Judge, I think you have an idea of our claims that we are making from our amended complaint, but we haven't talked about the defenses, and why this is relevant to their defenses as well, and that goes to why this should be produced.

In Defendants' amended answer to the Plaintiffs' personal injury complaint filed on August 23, 2021, the 14th
affirmative defense found at page 455 states, "Any acts performed by $B I$ in the design, manufacture, and marketing of the product at issue were in conformity with the state of the art existing at the time of such design, manufacture, and marketing, and public policy should hold that liability not be imposed on BI for untold risk not known at the time of design, manufacture, and marketing of the product at issue."

Also at page 455 is the 18th affirmative defense which states, "The methods, standards, and techniques utilized by BI in designing, formulating, manufacturing, and/or marketing the product at issue and in issuing warnings and instructions with respect to use are proper and in conformity with the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of knowledge in the field at the time the products were manufactured."

If you bear with me, I have two more to identify.
The 19th affirmative defense states, "The injuries and/or damages claimed by Plaintiff were the result of unavoidable circumstances that BI could not have prevented." That is also at page 455.

Finally, page 457, the 30th affirmative defense, that's three zero, "At the time the product left BI's control there was not a practical and technically feasible alternative design that would have prevented the harm without substantially impairing the reasonably anticipated or intended function of
the product."
Any evidence about the state of the art goes to whether or not they used a desiccant at the time in other products. BI has a duty to lessen the damage that could occur due to degradation if they know that it can occur. The evidence shows that they did know that the pill was subject to degradation for moisture, and if the state of the art said at the time to use a desiccant, then that is relevant and should be information that we can receive through discovery.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
I am going to overrule the objection based on relevance grounds. I do find this information is relevant, and I will order BI to produce -- was it an interrogatory -- to supplement their interrogatory response to identify $--I$ don't know that it has to be an exemplar drug, they just need to identify the name of the drug that they packaged in a bottle that had a desiccant in it.

Mr. Shortnacy, I am not requiring you to produce an exemplar suggesting that it has any direct connection to Zantac at all. The relevant fact is that $B I$ did manufacture bottles using desiccants, they had the capability to do it, and what it would have cost them to do it.

So, I will order a supplemental response to the interrogatory disclosing that information.

MR. STANLEY: Judge, if I may, to the extent exemplar
was a term of art, it wasn't intended to be that, just an example.

THE COURT: I understand. I just wanted to be clear because Mr. Shortnacy had raised that issue. I wanted to make sure I addressed that, I agreed with him on that issue.

The other thing is, to the extent BI is objecting that Plaintiffs are utilizing too many -- that this was an improper use of an extra interrogatory, BI waived that argument. A, they waived it by responding in the first place; and B, I would otherwise find it to be a proper exercise of an additional interrogatory and $I$ would authorize it for that reason, as good cause has been shown. That will be my ruling as to that issue.

I will thank the parties and move on to the next issue.

MR. SHORTNACY: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much. Have a good afternoon, everybody.

The next issue is the Sanofi email issue. Good afternoon Mr. Gilbert and Ms. Sharpe. If you want to enter your appearances, please.

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

MS. SHARPE: Good afternoon, your Honor. This is Paige Sharpe on behalf of Sanofi. If I may, your Honor, I would like to request one moment for a preliminary matter
before argument begins.

THE COURT: Okay. Go right ahead.
MS. SHARPE: Your Honor, I just wanted to reiterate the concerns that we expressed at the last discovery conference for the privacy of individuals who might be implicated by the email issues. We are assuming that the parties will use the same process here today that you outlined at the last discovery conference where individuals will be referred to by title or by some other generic reference and not by name.

We don't think initials are necessary, as Mr. Gilbert used at some points last time, but we would ask if the court would again reiterate that is the process that should be followed.

THE COURT: That is my expectation. Mr. Gilbert gave me his word last week that was how he was going to act. I believe Mr. Gilbert is going to do what he said, so I don't think it is necessary for me to reiterate it, but your point is taken.

I know there are five people at issue here. I know there is the individual who is directly responsible -- supposed to be responsible for taking certain action and then four other colleagues who worked with that person, and the Plaintiffs requesting access to the emails of those other individuals.

Your point is well taken, but $I$ have no doubt that Mr. Gilbert was going to do it anyway.
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MS. SHARPE: Thank you.
THE COURT: With that, let me just review. I did receive the PTO 32 submission from the Plaintiffs which also attached a couple of emails that were marked as highly confidential so we can discuss if the parties want to move to seal those. I received a separate submission from Sanofi which also appended some email correspondence back and forth.

Mr. Gilbert, did you submit anything other than what I have already referenced?

MR. GILBERT: No, your Honor, we did not.
THE COURT: Ms. Sharpe, did you submit anything other than what I already referenced?

MS. SHARPE: No, your Honor, that was everything.
THE COURT: Great. Mr. Gilbert, I think this is primarily your ask so let me allow you to go first.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, your Honor, may it please the Court. Again, this is Robert Gilbert representing the Plaintiffs.

Without repeating everything in our PTO 32 submission, allow me to frame this for your Honor in a way that $I$ hope will make it clear why this ask is not only reasonable, it is difficult for us to understand how in good faith Sanofi could refuse to provide the information.

First of all, under PTO 54, Defendants are obligated to produce custodial files at least 15 days before scheduled
depositions and to make their best efforts to produce custodial files 21 days before scheduled depositions.

More specifically, under the agreement that we negotiated with Sanofi regarding its spoliation of the employee emails at issue here, under the agreement that was entered into on May 5, 2021, Sanofi agreed in paragraph seven of that agreement, and it was attached as an exhibit to our prior PTO 32 submission which we incorporated by reference, Sanofi agreed that it would produce all non-objected to responsive documents at least 14 days prior to the first of the two depositions. The first of the two depositions.

The first of the two depositions that we are referring to was the deposition of the gentleman who we talked about last time who worked in the IT department at the time. His deposition was taken on December 14, 2021. If you work back 14 days from that, all of their documents should have been produced by December 1st, 2021.

Moreover, let me jump forward, on June 26, 2021, after spending two months meeting and conferring with Ms. Sharpe and her colleague to try to narrow the scope of the documents and topics for these two depositions, we served our formal request on June 26, 2021, and the requested issue here is set forth verbatim on page two of our PTO 32 submission, and that requested all documents and communications the Rule 30 (b) (6) designee reviewed, received, or prepared in order to prepare
and/or educate himself or herself to testify on behalf of Sanofi at this deposition.

They responded, Sanofi responded on July 13, 2021. Their initial response indicated that they would produce all documents that were not objected to with regard to the Rule $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ designee that were reviewed or prepared in order to prepare and/or educate himself or herself to testify on behalf of Sanofi at this deposition.

Their amended and supplemental response served on December 7, 2021, which coincidentally fell on or about the same date that they first disclosed to us that Jamie Brown was going to be their hired Rule $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ expert designee for this deposition, they said that none -- no documents were being withheld based on privilege.

And yet today, 12 days before the deposition of Sanofi's Rule $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ designee is scheduled to begin by agreement, by stipulation, we have not received the documents by acknowledgment of Sanofi that Ms. Brown -- all the documents that she used to prepare and/or educate herself to testify on behalf of Sanofi at this deposition.

What we are talking about specifically here are the documents that Ms. Brown prepared that were referenced in the declaration that Sanofi filed with its PTO 32 submission on January 4th.

Let me just say this to you, Judge, because I am not
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sure that this was clear when we met last on January 5th.
The very first time $I$ saw Ms. Brown's declaration or heard about its existence was sometime on January 4th, when Sanofi submitted its PTO 32 submission, one day before the hearing before your Honor.

So, we received Ms. Brown's declaration as part of Sanofi's PTO 32 submission, we reviewed it, and she referenced at paragraphs two and 12 the extent to which she had conducted, not conducting, but conducted interviews of members of Sanofi's ITS department, including the gentleman who I deposed back in December, including his supervisor on his legal hold responsibilities, and other members of the messaging team responsible for the automated script. All of this is in paragraphs two and 12.

After the hearing we had before your Honor on January 5th, I requested that Sanofi provide us with the names of all of those people that Ms. Brown interviewed, that they provide us with the notes that she made from those interviews in preparation to educate herself to testify on January 31st, and any documents that she received from them or reviewed in connection with those interviews to the extent they have not already been produced.

Sanofi's response, wait until the day before the deposition or two days before the deposition.

Your Honor, you and this Court have been all about
transparency throughout this process. Suggesting that they can wait until the day of, or one business day before Ms. Brown's deposition is supposed to be taken over the course of 11 hours on issues relating to the spoliation of thousands of company emails is the antithesis of transparency and fair play.

Under PTO 54, under the discovery agreement we entered into on May 5, 2021, frankly, they should have produced this document if it already existed on December 1st, 2021, based on the agreement that we entered into on May 5th. But if it wasn't prepared by then, the latest they should have provided these documents, based on PTO 54, would have been January 16, three days ago.

We haven't received it. They have told you in their submission that as a show of good faith -- and I am using the air quotes here -- they offered to produce it on Friday, January 28th, one business day before this deposition is due to take place.

The individuals that Ms. Brown interviewed are the very same individuals, your Honor, that we were asking you to compel Sanofi to produce responsive emails during our January 5th hearing.

We didn't know that until we got their submission the night before your hearing. We still don't know it because they haven't identified those employees except one by title. You denied our request then, but to allow Ms. Brown to have had
access to these people, to hold her notes and her outline until the last day before the deposition, and to also deprive us of the opportunity to have those emails from the employees themselves doesn't seem fair and equitable and appropriate in accordance with the way this Court has conducted and overseen discovery.

We would ask that your Honor order Sanofi to produce the information regarding Ms. Brown that we set forth in our PTO submission immediately so that we have it and we can proceed with our preparations for the January 31st deposition as scheduled. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Just so I am clear, what you are asking me to order them to produce are the names of the people, any notes that Ms. Brown took during those interviews, any documents she used to prepare and conduct those interviews, to the extent those documents have not already been produced. Am I correct that that is the ask?

MR. GILBERT: That is the ask, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying that.
Ms. Sharpe.
MS. SHARPE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Again this is Paige Sharpe on behalf of Sanofi.

Let me start by responding to a few of the points that Mr. Gilbert made, a few of which I don't think were in their submission, but I do think warrant a response.

First, Mr. Gilbert referenced PTO 54. He was talking about the production of custodial files. This is not a Sanofi custodian, as Mr. Gilbert knows. The $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witness is a nonemployee that Sanofi has brought in to serve as a $30(b)(6)$ witness, she does not have a custodial file to produce here. What we are talking about are reliance materials that she is putting together in preparation for the deposition.

Second, with respect to the argument that Sanofi agreed to produce documents 14 days in advance of the first of the two depositions, which would have been sometime in early December, Sanofi can't produce what it can't have.

The witness has been in the process of preparing over the past few months for her deposition, and she certainly did not finish preparation as of the beginning of December so that we would then provide her reliance materials for a deposition that is not set to take place for two more months. That is simply an impossibility that we could have provided the notes at that point.

In fact, your Honor, the witness' preparation is continuing even now, it is going to continue up until the eve of the deposition. We have an obligation to have a witness who is educated on a wide array of topics related to Sanofi's processes, to the preservation issue, to the remediation, and I can assure you that there is significant preparation that is ongoing with respect to what the witness is doing.

With respect to the declaration that the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witness provided in support of the last discovery conference, she does not reference documents there. She says that she conducted interviews of people. There is no reference to notes of those interviews, and $I$ can tell you she did not review any notes to prepare the declaration.

The declaration was based on her recollection of interviews that she has conducted over the course of the investigation, and Plaintiffs will have ample opportunity during the deposition to probe on the adequacy of her preparation.

So, you know, honestly, Judge Reinhart, we are at a little bit of a loss to understand why there is a dispute here because we are not disagreeing to provide reliance materials, the question here is really just one of timing. And given that the witness is continuing her work, continuing her preparation, we think the proper process is the one that is followed as a matter of course in $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ depositions where the witness provides reliance materials either at the deposition, that is not infrequent at all, or shortly before the deposition when they are fully prepared.

There is no obligation for a party producing a $30(b)(6)$ witness to provide piecemeal discovery along the way into their preparation process, and that is what we are talking about.

The documents that the witness has reviewed, as we have made clear to Plaintiffs, they have been produced to Plaintiffs. The witness has not relied or reviewed any documents that have not gone out the door many weeks ago to Plaintiffs, so that is not an issue here. They have all those documents.

In fact, with respect to these -- you know, their request for additional custodial files, it is not the case that the Plaintiff -- I'm sorry, that the witness has reviewed any additional custodial files or emails, if she had requested those and found them to be relevant to her investigation, we would have provided them to Plaintiffs, but there is no reason to think, as your Honor ruled at the last discovery conference, that, um-m-m, these emails would contain anything of relevance here.

That is pure speculation, and nothing has changed in the intervening two weeks since we were last before the court and had extensive argument on why it is not appropriate for them to get additional custodial emails.

So, with that, your Honor, I am happy to answer any questions. Again, we would just ask that the Court allow the process to unfold as it should and the witness will prepare her reliance materials and provide them to Plaintiffs shortly before the deposition takes place.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Sharpe. Let me ask you a
couple of followup questions.
Mr. Gilbert is asking for three things, the names, the notes, if any were taken during the interviews, and any documents that were utilized to prepare for those interviews that have not been produced.

You just told me the third category is a null set, there is nothing in that, right?

MS. SHARPE: That's correct.

THE COURT: Are there notes, do they exist? Didn't Ms. Brown take notes during the interviews?

MS. SHARPE: My understanding -- and these are her preparation materials, not Sanofi's -- she is conducting her own investigation, and that she is taking notes, she is preparing an integrated set of notes that will be provided to Plaintiffs. There are not stand-alone notes for any individual interview that she has conducted, and just -- your Honor, you had mentioned that there are three things.

We did offer to provide them the names, and instead, they insisted on going forward with the discovery dispute here today.

THE COURT: I understand. It sounds to me -- I am going to order you to provide the names. It seems to me there is no harm there. That is a historical fact, these people were interviewed. Mr. Gilbert and his team can go back through their evidence and try to determine if they have relevant
materials they want to ask about. I will order that.
If you are telling me, as to the third category, there is nothing to order, then I can't order. The only issue for me to decide today is at what point in time should Sanofi be required to produce any notes that are specific to the interviews of those other individuals.

With that narrowing, let me go back to Mr. Gilbert and allow him to get the final word.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, Judge.
Ms. Brown is not only hired to be the 30 (b) (6)
designee for Sanofi, but by her own admission in her declaration she has been retained as an expert by Sanofi in connection with the email issues that are before the court.

This Court would not countenance an expert showing up and providing his or her report to the other side the day of his or her deposition for the first time so that in our adversarial system the person who is taking the deposition was forced to read, digest, comprehend, think about, and prepare for that deposition on the fly. And the fact is nothing -- the same rule should be applied here.

We are talking about the most important deposition regarding Sanofi's spoliation of these emails, what is going to answer questions that this Court will have, that we will have, that all of the litigants will have about why these emails suddenly disappeared from Sanofi's email server.

For us to receive this outline from Ms. Brown on the day of her deposition, or one business day before, is an affront to the process. I would suggest that you could get to the bottom of this very easily. You could say, hypothetically, Sanofi, you have two choices, give Mr. Gilbert and his team the outline 14 days before Ms. Brown's deposition takes place, or give it to them on January 31st, and her deposition will be rescheduled for 14 days later.

I'll bet you, because she will have to be done with her preparation by then, Judge, since that is when her deposition is going to be taken, I'll bet you if you give them that choice, we will get to the bottom of this issue quickly.

MS. SHARPE: Your Honor, if I may respond, because Mr. Gilbert raised several additional points there that he had not raised before.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.
MS. SHARPE: Your Honor, Ms. Brown is serving as a $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witness for the purposes of this deposition. That is stated in her declaration. This is not an expert deposition, this is a $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition. She is not serving an expert report in advance of that deposition.

Mr. Gilbert is now asking for something else, an outline. It sounds like he is now asking for something other than the notes of any interviews, he is asking for any other reliance materials and preparation materials, which we are
hearing that for the first time as well.
Again, she is still in the process of finalizing these materials, and she has the ability to do that, I would even suggest the obligation to be as fully prepared up to the date of the deposition as she should be, and so that is simply the process that is playing out here, your Honor.

MR. GILBERT: Judge, forgive me for interrupting. It is inaccurate for Ms. Sharpe to say that I am asking for something for the first time today.

In our PTO 32 submission, on page one we said, as well as Ms. Brown's notes or memos regarding such meetings.

MS. SHARPE: I am sorry, Mr. Gilbert, if I misunderstood. You referred to an outline and I understood you to be referring to something other than notes of the interviews that she has taken, which was clearly what I think both Judge Reinhart and I were contemplating based on the previous comments today.

THE COURT: I understood the issue. Mr. Gilbert had been very clear to me, he was asking for the notes or memorialization -- maybe notes is not the right word because it may be memorialized some other way -- but the memorialization, if there is one, by Ms. Brown of what she heard, whether she wrote a formal memo, whether she wrote handwritten notes, whether she dictated something. It was very clear that is what he was asking for, and that is what $I$ am ruling on.

It seems to me -- and I appreciate, Ms. Sharpe, your witness has to continue to prepare and will continue to prepare up until the minute she walks into the deposition room. It seems to me this is a historical fact. Her notes of interviews that have occurred in the past have occurred, and if she has segregable memorializations of those interviews, I don't have a problem ordering them to be produced a little bit early.

I am not sure the rules require it, but under Rule 16, I have broad authority to manage the case. I think this has been, as Mr. Gilbert says, the spirit in which you have always tried to operate.

What I don't want is for her to show up on the day of her deposition, she hands over a bunch of materials, and the Plaintiffs, perhaps correctly, come back to the Court and say we want to reconvene the interview because we didn't have enough time to prepare, and we just have a glitch and we waste some time.

Whereas, I think the prejudice to Sanofi in requiring a slightly earlier production is not going to be horrifying.

I am going to order the production of the memorialization, if there is one, of her interviews of the IT staff employees five business days -- I am sorry, the Wednesday before the deposition. The deposition is to occur, as I understand it, on -- is it January 31st, Mr. Gilbert?

MR. GILBERT: Yes, your Honor.

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

THE COURT: I am going to order the production by noon on Wednesday, January 26th. That will give Mr. Gilbert and his team two and a half working days, but $I$ know they always work on the weekend, so four and a half days to prepare. That should be sufficient time for them to prepare for that portion of the deposition.

That is without prejudice, Mr. Gilbert, if, when you get into the deposition, as with any other topics, if you can demonstrate that you have been prejudiced by not having these materials sooner, I would entertain a motion to reopen the deposition.

That will be my ruling as to this issue.
The names, Ms. Sharpe produce those by the same time, and since there is nothing else to produce in the third category, $I$ am not going to address the third category.

Mr. Gilbert, did you want to be heard further on your request that I reconsider my prior order?

MR. GILBERT: I would like to be heard, your Honor. I read the response from the Defendant. I don't believe that their position is well taken. We asked you to reconsider based on the very specific statements that Ms. Brown included in her declaration. You can see for yourself -- by the way, I want to say this because it is important to make this record.

Mr. Agneshwar, on behalf of Sanofi, stood before your Honor last time and repeatedly said that all of the requests
that we are making with regard to these employees was based on pure speculation, and I represented to the Court at that time it was not based on pure speculation. It was based on testimony by their witness, the gentleman who worked there on December 14 th, it was based on exhibits marked during that deposition, and I represented that to you. And you asked, well, are those exhibits attached to your PTO submission that we were asked to submit on 24 hours notice, and I told you they were not.

Our request for reconsideration, as well as our request for the information from Ms. Brown, attaches three of those exhibits so that you can see for yourself that Mr. Agneshwar's statements about our requests being based on pure speculation comes from a different universe.

Those exhibits clearly indicate that there were ongoing communications and discussions taking place between the gentleman whose deposition was taken and several of his colleagues and superiors in the IT department at Sanofi throughout the operative period of the fall of 2019 through the end of 2020.

That is who we wanted the emails from, that is who we believe the Court should have ordered the emails from. Under the standards for reconsideration, under the Hood v. Purdue case, the Court always has the opportunity to reconsider the need -- and two of those bases, the need to correct clear error
or to prevent manifest injustice.
If your Honor was led to rule as you did based on Mr. Agneshwar's statement that our claims were based on pure speculation, or that it was not relevant, or that it was unduly burdensome, clearly, your Honor, we have shown your Honor through what we submitted that that was not the case, and we would ask the Court to reconsider that ruling.

THE COURT: I will be clear, and I will hear from Ms. Sharpe in a second, to be -- we have been living with each other for almost two years now, and I think I made clear from the beginning that $I$ view all discovery rulings as without prejudice if the situations change, if facts change, or new information develops.

I received the materials, you did include the emails that hadn't been included previously. I recognize that the PTO 32 process sometimes doesn't give the parties as much time as they might like to develop the record. So, I am happy to consider it, but let me hear from Ms. Sharpe on the merits, if I can.

MS. SHARPE: Thank you, your Honor. The situation hasn't changed, the facts haven't changed. There is nothing new here that wasn't considered before. Your Honor had before him at the last discovery conference the same declaration that Mr. Gilbert is talking about today, that was part of the record, that was part of the discussion.

These emails were also part of the discussion at the last discovery conference. Your Honor might not have had the exact emails before you, but Mr. Gilbert certainly described them to you and he said the same thing about them and what they show as he is saying what they show today.

You could look at those emails. From our perspective, they don't suggest anything at all that anyone was aware of a problem here. There are email exchanges between one employee asking another employee for an updated copy of a report. There is nothing more to them than that.

There is no suggestion that there was an employee that thought anything had broken down in the legal hold process, and in fact, you have the declaration of the $30(b)(6)$, which you had before you the last time, where her investigation has shown that no one was aware of this issue. That is also supported by testimony that is in the record as well.

And so, it remains -- I will happily adopt Mr. Agneshwar's position that it is pure speculation that there is anything else in other custodial emails, and as I pointed out before, certainly if our $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ witness, in the course of her investigation, had identified additional emails or things that she thought she needed to investigate these issues that she thought were relevant, we would have gone and gotten those and produced them to Plaintiffs here.

There has been nothing at any point along the way to
suggest there is anything additional in other custodial files that haven't been produced here.

THE COURT: Anything, Mr. Gilbert?
MR. GILBERT: Yes, Judge. I want to be careful not to quote the documents that were attached to our submission since they have been designated highly confidential. By the way, we are not in agreement with Sanofi on that designation, but they have for the time being designated them as such.

Let me say this, your Honor, it is crystal clear from these emails -- and I can direct you where to look -- that there were communications that were taking place, there were meetings taking place regarding legal hold. There were communications taking place about what is the status of the legal hold between the gentleman I deposed, a female colleague of his, his superior, and others.

In addition, the gentleman who $I$ deposed testified about having at least one, but he believes more meetings with a gentleman in the Sanofi legal department whose initials I gave you during the last hearing.

It is on this record, Judge. For Ms. Brown, the designee, the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ designee, to say that she didn't ask for those emails, that is not the rule we apply. She may have chosen not to ask for those emails because she doesn't want to see what is in them.

These three exhibits, the testimony that we cited all
make a prima facie showing that colleagues of the gentleman $I$ deposed in the IT department, his direct supervisor in the IT department, and at least one gentleman in the legal department were clearly aware that there were extraordinary delays taking place in this gentleman's work in updating the legal hold list. We should be entitled to see the communications that took place among those people or by those people that did not involve the gentleman who I already deposed.

That is what we asked you for last time. You denied that request. We are renewing that request to you. We think it is a meaningful, important, relevant, and proportional request given the limited time frame and the limited number of people. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert.
MS. SHARPE: Your Honor, if I may, on a couple of these people that Mr . Gilbert referenced, because I think one point in particular will help short circuit some of this. He referenced and is relying primarily on emails exchanged with a woman, a female colleague who is on these emails, that is the person he is referencing in large part.

I can tell you that that person left the company in September 2020. She had no involvement with the Zantac matter, she is not a custodian, and we do not have a custodial file to produce for her. So, it is simply a non-issue.

Those are the emails that Mr. Gilbert is referencing,
so again, $I$ think it is a non-issue for you.
The third email is with a supervisor who did not have supervisory responsibility for the IT individual with respect to legal holds, so there is no reason to believe that he would have additional emails regarding the legal hold process. He didn't have any involvement whatsoever in the legal hold process.

THE COURT: Thank you. While I appreciate that, Ms. Sharpe, I don't know that I can accept your representations as evidence or testimony that $I$ should rely on in ruling here.

I did review the emails that Mr. Gilbert was able to submit with his supplemental request, and I have reconsidered de novo my prior ruling. I am going to adhere to that prior ruling even having considered the additional information and heard additional argument from the parties.

Let me clarify a couple of things. First of all, speculation is not the standard, so I don't necessarily find that it is purely speculative that there might be some email communication not involving the individual that Mr. Gilbert deposed that could be relevant to the issues in this case.

What I am finding is that the burden and the cost of looking for that and the likelihood that it is going to be found as compared -- the likelihood that it is going to be found, if it exists at all, is outweighed by the costs and burden of having to go look for it, and the likely benefit it
would provide to the litigation to go through that exercise.
I can see how Mr. Gilbert can read these emails and perhaps draw an inference. He is certainly free to argue that inference. He is free to develop it, and I assume he did develop it with the individual he deposed and he can try and develop it with the $30(b)(6)$ witness.

To be more clear, my specific finding is, applying the Rule $26(b)$ factors, $I$ find that the cost and inconvenience of conducting this search outweighs the likely benefit from conducting it. For that reason, I will adhere to my prior ruling.

Thank you both very much. I will move to the next matter.

MS. SHARPE: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you both very much, well argued.
The next matter is relating to the third party
subpoena to Valisure by -- the subpoena was actually issued by GSK, but joined in by all the other Defendants.

MR. EGAN: By Sanofi, your Honor.
THE COURT: By Sanofi, thank you. Let me have counsel for Valisure make your appearance.

MR. EGAN: Good afternoon, your Honor, William Egan of Robinson and Cole representing Valisure.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. And counsel for the Defendants.

MR. OOT: Good afternoon, your Honor. Patrick Oot for GSK.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. I did have a chance to review the materials. There is a lot, so let me go through what I got.

There is a joint summary that was submitted by the parties yesterday. There was a separate document titled Brand Defendants in Opposition to Valisure's Motion to Quash, a 16-page document which I did review. GSK also submitted electronically a very lengthy spreadsheet and something called master Valisure exhibits, which are 496 pages. I didn't read those, I will be honest with you. Then Valisure submitted the Motion to Quash along with Exhibits 1 through 11, which I have reviewed.

I believe GSK also submitted a timeline as a demonstrative aid, which I have, but I can't say I reviewed it carefully, and I did receive a separate demonstrative aid, but that was relating to Mr. Bretholz.

Mr. Egan, did you submit anything else that $I$ have did not referenced already?

MR. EGAN: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Oot, did you submit anything further that I have not referenced yet?

MR. OOT: There were exhibits to the opposition, your Honor. We noticed those were not included, but most of those
are in the timeline, and we appreciate that you did not go through all of the individual exhibits. They were more for the record to back up the overall timeline, and we thought that it would be helpful to use that timeline to narrow the facts. We had two junior attorneys on the team put that together.

THE COURT: That is fine.
MR. EGAN: Briefly on the timeline, your Honor -- I apologize.

THE COURT: I will get to that in a second.
When I say I reviewed the exhibits, let me make something clear that $I$ think $I$ made clear earlier in the litigation, but $I$ will say it again now.

I don't read your emails. You all send a lot of pages of emails back and forth to each other. I never read them because here is my view: You had your chance to negotiate. If you are in front of me, you need a ruling from me, and how you got here doesn't matter.

Unless you are citing me to an email because you are saying they committed to do something that they are today refusing to do, I don't read your emails, I don't care. All I am reading is self-serving emails that lawyers send to each other because they think it is going to influence the judge, and it just does not matter to me. So, that I did not read, but I did read the subpoena, the response, the objections, etc.

With that, Mr. Egan, I will hear you on the
demonstrative aid.

MR. EGAN: Briefly, your Honor, we don't have any objection to their using it. The summaries of the underlying documents that they use $I$ think are not necessarily fully accurate. I don't think they are intended to deceive the Court, but they certainly are shaded in their favor. So, to the extent the Court does review the timeline and the summaries of underlying documents, we disagree that they fully accurately describe the underlying documents.

Having said that, $I$ am not accusing Mr. Oot of doing anything improper. You put on your case as effectively and as strong and forcefully as you can, but we disagree as to how some of the characterizations play out, and we ask that you to take that into consideration if you are reviewing the timeline in making your decision.

THE COURT: Thank you. To me, it is a demonstrative aid, which means it is not factual evidence. If the representations in the demonstrative aid are not supported by other evidence in the record, then they won't be considered. If they are, they will be considered, and both sides can advocate however they would like to advocate.

One other preliminary matter, and I asked the special master to communicate this question to the parties to this matter as well as to the Plaintiffs. It seems to me the relevance theory by the Defendants here is that Valisure has
produced a report, study, whatever noun you want to use, which concluded that Ranitidine causes cancer, and the Plaintiffs -the Defendants believe that there was bias and motive to predetermine the outcome of that report.

The discovery that is being requested here is to try to challenge the validity and the weight of that report on the grounds that there was bias and a motive.

At a very high level, Mr. Oot -- and I will let you articulate this much more fully as we go ahead. At a very high level, is that essentially the relevance theory here?

MR. OOT: That is at a very high level, your Honor, a good analogy of our position. I should point out that -- and we did appreciate the receipt of your question -- that the Valisure testing permeates throughout this litigation. It was referenced on Science Day, it was -- the testing in the Braunstein 2021 study is actually Valisure's testing.

So, I think trying to unbundle Valisure's work from this litigation could be very difficult, and it is our understanding that it is critical to Plaintiffs' case both in the PI matter, and then also the knowledge of the economic loss cross action Plaintiffs that the reason they think they have economic loss related to Zantac is because of the citizen's petition and the underlying testing.

THE COURT: I understand. I will let you fully develop that argument.

Mr. Egan, I suppose, outside of this subpoena, you don't have a dog in that fight. If the Plaintiffs want to try to use the study, they can, and if they don't, they don't have to.

MR. EGAN: That is correct, your Honor. We have not been asked to be an expert in this case, testifying or non-testifying. They have not asked us if they can use our report. No dog in the fight is well put.

THE COURT: So, Mr. McGlamry or Mr. Gilbert, can I pose the question $I$ want to pose directly to the Plaintiffs. The question is this: Are the Plaintiffs intending to rely upon the results of the Valisure study as substantive evidence to try to prove their claim that Zantac causes cancer?

MR. MCGLAMRY: Your Honor, this is Mike McGlamry on behalf of Plaintiffs. The answer to your question is, no, we are not.

THE COURT: So you are not going to show up at trial, or on Daubert or anything else, and your experts are not going to rely on this Valisure study in any way?

MR. MCGLAMRY: That is correct, your Honor, and I will just add this. Plaintiffs have not retained Valisure or any person or employee from Valisure as an expert in this litigation. Our experts, as you know, are going to be disclosed next week, and they do not rely on the Valisure citizen's petition, study, whatever you want to refer to it,
its testing or data or science in any way to render their opinions on general causation.

THE COURT: Okay. You are not going to try to introduce the Valisure study, whether as an expert or otherwise, you are not going to try to introduce that to prove your claims.

MR. McGLAMRY: That is correct.
THE COURT: Other than maybe as background to explain why certain conduct was undertaken?

MR. MCGLAMRY: That is correct, your Honor. If you will recall, in the master complaint it is referenced because it is a point in time of things that happened, and it is a fact that it happened, and the Defendants have so answered in their answer to our complaints that those things did happen, but we are not relying upon it in our case.

THE COURT: I understand. To use a different analogy -- I want this to be very clear on the record, because I think this is a significant position that the Plaintiffs are taking, and I don't want there to be any question going forward.

This strikes me as a lot of what $I$ used to see as a prosecutor where the police would come in and say we had a confidential informant who told us that John Smith is a drug dealer, and so we sent an undercover officer to John Smith's house and he bought drugs from John Smith.

All we are going to introduce at the trial is what happened with the undercover officer. The confidential informant is not going to be mentioned, the confidential informant is not going to come up. If the confidential informant comes up, it will just be to explain why we did what we did, and the judge will instruct the jury that is not admitted for the truth, that they cannot draw any inference based on that, that it simply could be true, could not be true, it doesn't matter.

Am I correct, Mr. McGlamry, that is where we are?
MR. MCGLAMRY: Yes, your Honor, you are absolutely correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. McGLAMRY: Can I disappear, then?
THE COURT: You may, you have answered my question. MR. OOT: Your Honor, may I respond to that?

THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Oot, given that concession, why are we going down the road here with Valisure and Mr. Bretholz?

MR. OOT: First of all, the Braunstein 2021 study that was previously mentioned, that is Valisure testing, and it is one of the studies that was referenced in Science Day. The underlying -- liquid -- how do we do this -- the liquid chromatography mass spectrometry testing component of it actually was completed by Valisure.

So, the Braunstein research and testing is actually

Valisure testing, so if Mr. McGlamry is confirming that that is no longer a study that they are going to be relying on, it was one of the ten studies referenced on Science Day, that would be helpful to clarify.

THE COURT: Just so I am clear, what I was questioning -- maybe I need to get Mr. McGlamry back. What I was questioning about was, the original Valisure study which led ultimately to the citizen complaint, etc. etc., if somebody else had retained Valisure as a third party laboratory to provide laboratory services, I don't know that.

Mr. McGlamry, I don't know if you want to respond to that or not.

MR. MCGLAMRY: Your Honor, I am not sure how I am supposed to respond to that. What you are hearing is what they brought up, not what we brought up. Again, we are not relying in any way on the citizen's petition or expertise of Valisure.

So, beyond that, I will be honest with you, I did not participate in the Braunstein deposition, which they took, not us, and it is not something we are relying on.

THE COURT: Okay, I understand. Thank you.
MR. OOT: Your Honor, can I cite the Braunstein deposition? Again, it is something that they are relying on.
"Question: Valisure alone performed the laboratory analysis described in the research letter, correct?"

The answer from Dr. Braunstein is: "Correct."

The published Braunstein 2021 actually contains the LCMS SGF study because his epi study was removed. The quote from the deposition actually ends at yes.

Just to confirm, is the gas chromatography mass spectrometry -- I am going to butcher this, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think it is spectrometry.
MR. OOT: And the simulated gastric fluid study was included in the underlying Braunstein research which came from Valisure.

THE COURT: Okay, we will get to that in a second. So, let me ask, Mr. Oot, if you could address these two issues separately.

Assume that -- assume away the Braunstein study.
Okay? What is the relevance of what you are asking for from Valisure. If you want to show that Valisure is in cahoots with the Plaintiffs' lawyers, and they are engaged in some sort of conspiratorial behavior to try to gin up these lawsuits so they can make money and the Plaintiffs' lawyers can make money and everybody can make money, therefore they would have a motive to falsify their initial study, if that initial study is not part of the litigation, what is the relevance of whether there is a conspiracy or not?

MR. OOT: You will also see from the timeline, your Honor, that there was influence from Valisure all through, you know, lobbying, they hired Tom Daschle's group to speak to

Congress, to influence the FDA to head in a certain direction --

THE COURT: I am sorry, let me simplify this hypothetical for you.

Assume everything you say is true, Valisure is out to set you up, set up your clients, do horrible things and falsify every data that they possibly can to make you look bad, but the jury is never going to hear that Valisure ever produced any study.

Why is it relevant to get into that area of inquiry?
MR. OOT: So, your Honor, I think the underlying conduct that the jury should hear, the marketing campaign that went into filing this litigation, and the conduct around it, I think the facts associated with this litigation are underlying that it started from a petition. It is almost like a bait and switch, you can't file a complaint -- it is still in the master complaint, and it is also across the country referenced in the State cases as well, as the reliance on what Plaintiffs are relying on here.

So, the position that the jury will never see this, I think we are talking about discovery here and whether it is relevant to the defenses. Our defenses include exactly what you said, your Honor, that this is ginned up litigation, and the underlying science is almost a bait and switch at this point where if they are not relying on this, what are they
relying on?
We see, again, through the timeline that they -- that Valisure had knowledge, including, by the way, Ron Joffe, who we will talk about very soon, $I$ am sure, with Mr. Shortnacy on the deposition subpoena and the subpoena for Emery.

That is one of their experts, and you also see in the timeline Ron Joffe telling Valisure that their research is flawed, that their testing methodology is flawed. They knew this and they filed this citizen petition anyway.

We can walk through the timeline, your Honor, but I think that is extremely relevant that the expert that they are using, that we are litigating over as we speak, whether or not that expert and the materials associated with that expert should be produced. I think that underlying information is important to expose, you know, just the timing of, again, when Emery also understood that the testing methodology is flawed.

THE COURT: Like I said, I am going to let you fully develop your argument, but $I$ just wanted to address that initial subject.

Let me turn to -- Mr. Egan, let me start with you because it is your Motion to Quash technically.

So, from reading your papers and looking at the memo, it looks to me that you want me to do two things in the alternative. One is to either quash the subpoena in full, or in the alternative, that there is a more limited universe of
evidence that you would be willing to cull through, and then $I$ should order that any further discovery be limited to only that smaller use of documents, and that other areas of factual development could be handled through sworn statements, interrogatories, declarations, or other non-production documents.

MR. EGAN: Or at the deposition that is scheduled for February, correct.

THE COURT: Or through the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition. Is that still your request today?

MR. EGAN: Yes, your Honor. My client did produce about 1600 documents to begin with, and from what you see in the brief that's been filed with the Court and the timeline you are about to see, it looks like they have plenty of evidence to challenge what appears to be, confirmed now by Mr. McGlamry, as just background.

Yes, we would like you to quash the subpoena entirely, except for, obviously, what we have already produced, and say we are done. That would be terrific.

But to the extent that the Court does have an interest in allowing the Defendants to explore things further, you saw reference to a 51,000 line hits list and a smaller hits list that we did on a more focused search, our request is that they select up to a thousand documents from the smaller list, but if they are only selecting a thousand, it doesn't really
matter which list they use.
THE COURT: The way you got to the smaller list, as I understand it, is you applied a delimiter that was designed to limit it only to Zantac or Ranitidine and to carve out benzyne and some other --

MR. EGAN: Benzyne, metformin and APAP are three other citizen petitions my client was involved in.

My client asked me to emphasize that we are not in the citizen petition business as our primary function, but we have filed them. They don't want to be seen just as a Plaintiff's firm lab, that is not what they are, and they asked me to enforce that.

Yes, what we did is we knocked out benzyne, which is in sun screen, metformin, which is a separate drug dealing with diabetes, and APAP, which is in rapid acting Tylenol.

THE COURT: You also knocked out anything else that didn't reference Ranitidine with --

MR. EGAN: Your initial statement is right, yes. We also took out newsletters. If there is a Google letter that mentions Zantac was pulled off the shelf in some Arizona pharmacy, it is a newsletter, that's not a communication or an analysis. We pulled that.

THE COURT: And these 10,000 or 50,000 documents that you are talking about, is this primarily email, or is it other electronically stored data, or is it custodial, noncustodial
files? What is it?

MR. EGAN: It is emails, your Honor, and it is also a bunch of underlying documents, attachments to emails, and separate reports, Word documents that were prepared. Mr. Oot has been through the spreadsheet and he may have some additional comments for what he has seen on there. Yes, everything on the Valisure server that was pulled by an independent vendor that we hired, that they approved, called Haystack, and using a hit search, they came up with that list, not limited to email.

THE COURT: What is your legal objection in support of the request that you are making?

MR. EGAN: The legal objection, your Honor, is that it is overbroad and that -- two things primarily, it is not relevant to the issues in the case. The documents that they are requesting, they are asking for documents from citizen petitions that have nothing to do with Ranitidine. They are asking for documents having to do with our investors and sources of income that have nothing to do with Ranitidine. They are asking for all sorts of business plans and communications that, again, have nothing to do with the testing or analysis of Ranitidine.

They may be able to get a little bit of leeway with regard to the question of bias or influence, but asking for a -- using the 51,000 hits list search, they have asked us to
review privilege log and produce 29,000 .
Given what we just heard, that this is just background for the case, that is not proportional to the needs of this case. It has cost us a fortune to get here and it is going to cost another fortune to get there if we do all that, and this should not be imposed on my client. We will address costs later, but just the effort of going through that is not proportional to what is required here.

If they want to go after the science behind the Plaintiffs' expert report, fine. I think Mr. Oot said if they are not relying on Valisure, what are they relying on? I think Mr. McGlamry made it clear they are relying on their own expert report.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Let me turn to Mr. Oot to respond. What is your objection to them using the delimiter that takes the hits down from 51,000 to 10,000?

MR. OOT: Your Honor, generally, we have not been objecting to a process to whittle down the documents. E started with 100,000 documents. We -- the research terms generated 50,000. We went through the metadata report and that culled it down to around 30,000 documents, is what $I$ think the number is.

The issue that we had with Mr. Egan's proposal was the connector. So, in other words, if Ranitidine and the word benzyne appears in the same document, that would automatically
be excluded. So, that was an issue that we thought that wouldn't be resolved by the connectors that Mr. Egan proposed.

So, the answer there is also on proportionality grounds, they are objecting to the subpoena. They had four, you know, senior level people working on the citizen petition, so Mr. Egan's firm had two partners working on the citizen petition. Mr. Frank Gregory -- sorry, Gregory Frank was also working on the citizen petition.

So, Valisure has spent a considerable amount of money in building this litigation where the litigation is really getting ahead of the science, is what it is sounding like to me. We also don't have an answer of whether or not the Braunstein study is in because the underlying testing is Valisure testing.

As we'll see in the timeline, too, your Honor, the influence that Valisure played in the science generally, it is not just the citizen petition, it is the influence of David Light telling Braunstein not to publish the Kanter study, and again, these topics all come through in the timeline and -- the overall demonstratives, by the way, your Honor, they are not emails back and forth between Mr. Egan and I, they are actually substantive evidence from this litigation and things that have been produced by other parties, but have not been produced by Valisure.

If it would be helpful, I could walk through the
timeline.

THE COURT: If it will be helpful to you, it will be helpful to me.

MR. OOT: Great. Mr. Cummings will be sharing the screen to run through that.

THE COURT: Wonderful. How long do you think it will take to run through the timeline, Mr. Oot?

MR. OOT: I am hoping to get through it in less than five minutes, your Honor.

THE COURT: At some point, I wanted to take a break for Ms. Stipes. Why don't we go through the timeline and perhaps that will be a good breaking point. Then we will take a short recess. Take whatever time you need to go through the timeline. I don't mean to rush you.

MR. OOT: If Mr. Cummings could switch his screen so it is in the slide show mode.

THE COURT: I did print out the timeline.
MR. OOT: The first slide that we are looking at here is the September 2018, when Valisure was formed. The reason we are showing that, your Honor, is we just don't have any information about Valisure's, you know, prelaunch fund raising stages, and it is important to us where that money is coming from because, again, it is -- the litigation is getting ahead of the science.

So, if they are taking out Valisure and suggesting
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that the study is no longer going to be used, and the underlying testing, again, is in multiple additional studies after the citizen's petition, I think it is going to be really challenging to exclude all of that Valisure testing information because it is referenced and cited elsewhere.

Just jumping to the next slide here, again, we don't have documents related to the Adam Bretholz, Michael Bretholz's brother, of the -- why he was paying a thousand dollars to Valisure so he could test Ranitidine, another fact that is important because of Valisure's influence not just on their own science, but other science as well.

The next is very important, your Honor. This is March 29th, and remember, the citizen petition was filed in September. Emery's retention and testing is important here because it shows that Valisure knew its method was inaccurate and still submitted it to the FDA and publicized it anyway.

So, now we are involving Emery, who is a player in this litigation, if not a Plaintiffs' expert.

April 1st, Light tells Emery that the testing methodology, it knew its testing methodology was accurate related to the super heating. Jumping to April 4th, it shows Valisure's attempt to influence the science on Ranitidine and being able to deny direct funding.

The next is Valisure came to learn of the flaws in Dr. Mitch's studies, yet relied on it anyway to bolster its
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material.

The next is April 19th, this shows the involvement of Plaintiffs' attorney, class action Plaintiffs' attorney, influencing Valisure, who is also influencing other science.

Again, jumping to April 30th, it shows Valisure's knowledge of flaws related to the 2016 Mitch study, and then on May 2nd, it shows direct involvement in the citizen's petition by Plaintiffs' attorney, including directly developing the content of the petition.

So, again, I will go through this quickly, your Honor. The first here is May 8th, this is involving Mr. Bretholz. This is Mr. Bretholz advising Dr. Braunstein to delay telling his colleagues or anyone else about the risk of Ranitidine because they have upcoming meetings with the White House and the FDA. Again, continually affecting science in this litigation.

MR. EGAN: Your Honor, if I may, we disagree with some of the content that is being summarized here, or at least how it is. I will let Mr. Oot continue.

MR. OOT: The exhibits are directly referenced in the tab marks, so you can review the record yourself and make a determination based upon what you see on the timeline.

That is why we included the overall -- the large master exhibit list, so if you had a question, you could go back to that exhibit and look at that exhibit directly.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. OOT: May 8th, showing Valisure's lobbying campaign with the FDA to take action, as well as the PR campaign. Remember, they hired Tom Daschle's group, they are spending a lot of money to push this litigation forward and influence the science, not just with Valisure, but with other scientists.

Jumping to May 13th, this again shows that Valisure had knowledge that its testing was inaccurate, coming from Emery, and then on May 23rd, Light asks Emery to exclude information about the method and shows it knew that its testing was inaccurate.

So, again, the next is September 13th, your Honor, that is when the citizen petition was filed. I will skip over that, I think that is kind of pretty clear of our position on that, but $I$ think also the important thing, on the very same day that David Light's brother-in-law files the very first case, and David Light is Valisure's CEO, your Honor, in Florida, I believe.

So, then again the marketing machine starts to work, and shows that well marketed and well organized coordinated media campaign.

Jumping to the 19th, we see Michael Bretholz talking to Congressman -- woman Anna Eshoo. We took this picture off the internet that we found related to those visits to Congress,
again to influence the science, to influence the FDA, and then continually talking to Plaintiffs' attorneys.

The next is October 1st, after filing the citizen's petition. October 2nd, the FDA criticizes Valisure, and then what we will be talking about shortly is Michael Bretholz's role in all of this. He is playing a nonlegal role and talking to a CEO of a large investment bank and former chair of the Federal Reserve to try and set up a meeting to discuss Valisure, again to influence science, influence powerful people to influence the science and the FDA in this litigation.

So, coincidentally, we are talking about proportionality, and the money involved I think is key as well. We see on October 19th, that $\$ 4.3$ million in new investments comes in to Valisure. We see the amount of effort and the amount of energy being put in to influence the science related to this litigation is significant and this continues further on.

Again, October 17th, FDA emails Dr. Braunstein about FDA's concern about the lab methods.

November 6th, this shows Light actively involved in attempting to interfere with science and contradict the narrative built on Valisure's false and misleading test results.

December 9th, this shows Light actively attempting to interfere with the FDA's investigation because he feared it
would contradict the narrative built on Valisure's false and misleading test results. Emery initially criticized Valisure's citizen petition --

THE COURT: Can $I$ ask you to slow down a little bit for Ms. Stipes.

MR. BURSTYN: While Mr. Oot is paused, this is Sean Burstyn on behalf of Mr. Bretholz. Just very briefly --

THE COURT: Mr. Burstyn, if your point is that you think there are being inaccurate statements made, I understand that is your position. This is a demonstrative aid and $I$ will let Mr. Oot make his argument. If you want to respond to it when it is your turn, I will let you respond to it.

MR. BURSTYN: I shall. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Oot, please continue, but a little bit slower.

MR. OOT: Sure. I apologize, your Honor. I am trying to get through this quickly.

THE COURT: Don't rush. Take your time.
MR. OOT: That is December 15th, this shows Emery and communication related to Emery showing that this is what happened, the Valisure testing method was garbage and still submitted to the FDA anyway.

Again, December 15th, this shows again continued Valisure's lobbying campaign, and the followup from U.S. Representatives showing the success of Valisure's lobbying
campaign to influence the science and the FDA related to this litigation.

So, again, this is on December 29th, behind closed doors Dr. Braunstein is saying that Valisure's claims are not backed up by real science, and the Braunstein study is still one of the studies that is referenced on Science Day.

Jumping down to January 9th, this shows that the scientific community recognized the flaw in this data, and again, June 20th, Light testifies before the Senate Finance Committee, again attempting to influence science, and shows the success of Valisure's lobbying campaign.

Coincidentally, on July 14 th, they received another \$3. 7 million. Profiting from this campaign is important, Valisure started this whole litigation and you just can't take the bias out of -- just by removing Valisure because the underlying campaign and the underlying influence on science from the FDA, and who knows what other scientists, your Honor, we don't have the discovery, that is the whole point of this. Wrapping it up, your Honor, December 30th, the internal message from Valisure's cofounder and chief business development officer, sends an internal email saying that while independent studies can still be useful if they support Valisure's findings, that many lawyers will be paying attention to the findings.

So, again, attempting to influence litigation through,
you know, what $I$ would argue is junk science.
And finally on May 4th, we see Dr. Mitch did the right thing and retracted his study once he conclusively determined that the NDMA testing measured was entirely an artifact.

Then May 6th to July 6th, FDA cites Valisure for numerous violations, including failure to validate its analytical methods.

Your Honor, it is hard to say that we can remove Valisure from this litigation and really get in a position where the litigation is ahead of the science, because that is really what is happening if we were to take Valisure out because the underlying testing and the underlying model is based upon the Valisure citizen's petition.

You see millions of dollars that were spent in lobbying, you see millions of dollars that were spent in this marketing campaign and testimony on the Hill, multiple outside firms.

Again, just from the spreadsheet, Exhibit 57, you see two partners from Mr. Egan's firm communicating right around the citizen petition. I am not requesting those documents, your Honor, I am requesting that they be logged. So, we want the documents produced that hit on those terms and also that were whittled down that we think could be relevant.

Alternatively, if they are claiming they are privileged, we want them to designate them as privileged and
follow the log in process just like we have to.
It is challenging to say that we can take Valisure out of this and then we can have this litigation move forward. The FDA citizen petition process is not peer reviewed. The guardrails are 21 CFR 10.30, and that is the certification requirement.

This is kind of like the $26(\mathrm{~g})$ requirement that you have to disclose and certify that your representative data includes not just the good stuff, but the unfavorable content as well. We don't think any of that material made its way to the FDA. The FDA is a powerful and influential voice in the scientific community, and we think this discovery is warranted relating to that.

Again, $I$ can go further down --
THE COURT: Let me, if I could, I think Mr. Egan made the alternative argument, which was, Judge, look at the timeline, they sure have a lot of evidence. If they want to make the argument, he just made it to you.

Let's assume we get over the relevance hurdle for Valisure, $I$ determine that Valisure is relevant to the claims and defenses going forward. If the argument you want to make is that they knew their testing and data was inaccurate, they went forward anyway, they tried to hide that fact, they tried to influence other people to corroborate it, they tried to raise money from it, they were in cahoots with Plaintiffs'
lawyers, what -- so that is what you have so far, and now you want internal documents and internal communications and things like that. Mr. Egan's argument is that is disproportionate.

I will give you a chance to respond to that.
MR. OOT: We have pointers, your Honor. We don't have the evidence. We have the emails that point to the evidence. Mr. Egan's Exhibit 11, I believe is an attempt to, you know, generalize some of the issues there that he -- there is a -that around 12 percent of the revenue, not the investment, comes from Valisure -- comes from lawyers. You will see in Exhibit 11 that there is a list of investment vehicles and unnamed shell LLC's and high net worth individuals that we don't have an understanding of who those people are and how they relate to this litigation.

It is striking, your Honor, that Valisure can raise millions of dollars around this citizen petition and then the science later comes out that it is wrong and it is not something that the Defendants can work up.

I think you are getting to that proportionality factor, perhaps if we get through the relevance component of that, I am happy to talk about that, unless Ms. Stipes wants to take a break.

THE COURT: I do want to take a break in a second. If I understand your answer -- and I will let you expand upon that if you want to walk through the specific proportionality
factors.
If $I$ understand your answer, it is we have circumstantial evidence that we can argue from and try to draw inferences from. We don't have any direct evidence, and we believe that there is a likelihood that if we get the production that we are asking for it will contain better evidence to prove what we are trying to prove.

Is that fair?
MR. OOT: That is correct, your Honor. That is what we need to bring across the finish line the Valisure influence on science, including science that has been used on Science Day.

THE COURT: It is 2:40, let's take a ten minute break. We'll come back at 2:50 and continue on at that point.

We will be in recess for ten minutes.
(Thereupon, a short recess was taken.)
THE COURT: We are back on the record.
All right. Mr. Oot, I think I asked you this, but I may not have asked, I want to be sure. I will let you respond.

Your specific request is that I order Valisure to either $\log$ or produce the 50,000 -- is it the 50,000 documents or the 30,000 you talked about? Can you just clarify what you are asking for?

MR. OOT: It is the smaller set, your Honor, it is the 30,000 set, again, that contract attorneys and review that way
could be done probably a lot less expensively than it has been handled so far.

THE COURT: That is what you are asking, okay. You rejected Mr. Egan's proposal to give you declarations and things like that, you just want the documents.

MR. OOT: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. If you have any further argument you would like to make, and I will give Mr. Egan the last word. I am going to take this matter under advisement because $I$ have not had a chance to look at the underlying evidence that is cited, the timeline, and now that $I$ have had further clarification from the arguments, I need to go back and think about this further.

I am not going to rule today, but $I$ want to make sure everybody has a chance to make their record. Mr. Oot, I will let you finish any additional argument you want to make.

MR. OOT: I appreciate that, your Honor, and a couple of things to crystalize. One is, there is the underlying Valisure testing that has been used in multiple studies. There is also additional Valisure testing that has been used in other Ranitidine related studies. So, it is not just the citizen's petition. I want to clarify that and $I$ was hoping to get through that on the outline.

THE COURT: To the extent the argument you're making is other people who may be experts in this case or other
evidence in this case may have retained Valisure as a third party laboratory, so therefore Valisure's credibility, integrity, et cetera is in play even if we get beyond the original citizen's complaint and the original study, if that is the point you are making, I get that. I have heard that loud and clear.

MR. OOT: I appreciate that, your Honor. Secondly, the influence that I previously described of Valisure on the scientific community, so it is the FDA, there was influence on Dr. Braunstein related to the Kanter study that I pointed out. I want to be sure that we are not just talking about the silo of the Valisure citizen's petition, it is Valisure generally and the influence that they have had on science, the FDA, and the scientific community.

For example, we saw that David Light was emailing Dr. Braunstein and attempting to influence him to include or not include one thing or another. We don't know what other influence is out there because we don't have production from Valisure. We are relying on these bits and pieces from other third parties that has really helped us put this story together.

We just don't have the direct evidence showing the sort of influence, but for Valisure's money and input, the scientific papers that again still cite the Valisure research and testing would come out one way or another.

So, I think it is central to the case, your Honor. I don't think we can have the litigation get ahead of the science, as $I$ was stating earlier, but those are two clarifying points I just wanted to get out.

THE COURT: I appreciate that, and those are both clear to me. I hear you. That is one of the reasons I want to go back. You gave me 500 pages of exhibits, I am not criticizing you for that, $I$ appreciate it, $I$ just didn't have time to review them.

Now that I have seen your timeline and I understand your argument, I will go back and review them, mindful of Mr. Egan's view, which is that the timeline does not accurately reflect what is in that evidence. I always look to the underlying evidence. Thank you, Mr. Oot.

Let me allow Mr. Egan to make whatever final arguments he would like to make.

MR. EGAN: Thank you, your Honor. As you are looking through the timeline, $I$ will raise one example. Exhibit 35 is quoted as saying it is an email from Michael Bretholz to TIAA, possibly to solicit investments in Valisure, possibly. Pure speculation, doesn't say anything about investments in Valisure in it. Could it have been about that? Maybe. I don't know. I haven't looked at it.

To take an email and say this is possibly about an investment is the kind of stretching that they do that $I$ don't
think is ethically improper, but I would like your Honor to take a careful look at what they say and not just the summaries. I know you said you would do that. It goes to a lot of the underlying issues.

Getting back to the overall picture, Valisure's report, Valisure's study, Valisure in general, is background here. It is what you raised yourself, your Honor, they are not -- I take Mr. McGlamry's statement on its face that they are not using our report, not using us as an expert, we are not testifying as an expert, this is all background.

Mr. Oot said it well, he said that this is part of how we got here, and that is absolutely fine for background, but you don't need to get into all of the information that they are looking for from Valisure for background.

This is not the evidence that is going to be put on to present the Plaintiffs' case. If they want to challenge that, they can, that is not Valisure.

THE COURT: How do you respond, Mr. Egan, to Mr. Oot's argument that Valisure is somewhat derivative in a lot of these scenarios because investors $A$ and $B$ are going to publish a paper and they may have hired Valisure to conduct the underlying scientific research, and if there is a question that Valisure has a bias or a motive, why can't they be allowed to argue to a jury that Drs. A and B's study is also tainted because Valisure was the underlying laboratory?

MR. EGAN: I think what they mentioned was a 2021 report by Dr. Braunstein --

THE COURT: That is one example he is using, but we heard about that at Science Day. You are new to the case, but we have heard about that. Mr. Oot's point is maybe, likely, probable, possible that Valisure, they are a lab, they sell their services to people, and their services may come into play here. Why isn't that at least relevant --

MR. EGAN: I am not saying it hasn't happened, but I am unaware of, since the initial report -- analysis being done, report being prepared, and citizen petition being filed that we were engaged to do additional research for other people's reports. I am not saying it hasn't happened, but I thought I would know about it if it had.

If that is a supplemental that $I$ can let the Court know, would that be helpful to the Court?

THE COURT: It is your Motion to Quash, you can -- I have let the parties submit what they want to submit.

MR. EGAN: If we haven't done anything since the initial report, then $I$ think that goes to your point of they want to get into has Valisure provided additional information for which they want to challenge Valisure.

If it all gets back to the initial Valisure report upon which people have done subsequent work, go ahead and challenge the subsequent work of their experts or whatever they
are putting in, but they already have enough to say -- they have shown it in all of the exhibits you will read, that Valisure tested Ranitidine by heating it to a certain temperature, they think that doesn't represent the in-body temperature. They think that Valisure relied on reports that since have been rejected or retracted. That is all there, they have it all already.

Unless there is something new out there, and I don't know if there is or isn't, I don't think there is, $I$ don't think that we need to get into as deep a dive here as Mr. Oot is suggesting.

That is why I raised it and if it would be helpful to your Honor, I can supplement.

THE COURT: I think parties have burdens in cases like this. For the Court to say it would be helpful to me, unless it is clarifying something that has already been raised, I generally don't go there. I need to let the parties submit what they want to submit and either meet or defeat the burden that the law puts on them.

You have answered my question.
MR. EGAN: Let me finish up with the rest unless you have something else on that.

THE COURT: No.
MR. EGAN: Your Honor, I believe they have everything they need to challenge the science of Valisure's report given
that we're background. They have plenty of information. You will see it in their timeline and underlying documents that we have relationships with Plaintiffs' firms. We disagree that that is our primary focus or business, but they have enough. If they want to say, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, or your Honor, this whole thing started with Valisure, a company that is in cahoots with the Plaintiffs' Bar and has been influenced by the Plaintiffs' Bar, they have enough to say that without getting disbarred. They don't need to go any farther.

We are not in cahoots with, we have relationships with them, and they can explore that further. By why? It is background, it doesn't go to proving the Plaintiffs' case, it doesn't go to defending against it. We stand by our testing. The testing was done according to the methods that we thought were appropriate. Mr. Light can testify to that at his deposition.

He is speculating that millions of dollars was spent on publicity. I don't know think my client has millions of dollars to spend on publicity.

If they are saying that they want additional documents and if your Honor is inclined to do it, we are glad to log them. We have never refused a log. We have only gotten to the stage of what documents are they requesting and us saying that is too many to request. We certainly will log, that is not an
issue. No dispute there. We think that little -- little or no more is needed. That was your initial question, what is our ask.

We ask what we have provided so far be deemed to be sufficient and you quash the subpoena in its entirety. Otherwise, if they need a thousand more documents, we can focus on that, that is fine. If they want to take it from the 51,000 list, sobeit. If you are limiting it to 1,000, they can take if from either list. If they are asking for 29,000 , then let's shrink it down and get to the narrower list to choose from.

All of this, it appears to my client to be punitive. It looks as if, since we are not a testifying expert, since our report is not being used, that all of the past six months of dragging this out and going through all these negotiations, and all of the reports, and all of the review we have done, and then going through an exercise of preparing draft discovery, which was just completely rejected, even though we provided information, has been to warn Valisure off of trying to do investigations into pharmaceuticals.

I don't think that that is what these companies are doing. I don't think that is what Mr. Oot is trying to do here, I think that would be improper, but it feels punitive to my client. The reason it feels that way is, they have spent a ton of money and have spent a ton of time on this for a company
that is not a party and is not an expert.
Mr. Oot says he needs better evidence. He has plenty of evidence, you said you are going to review it yourself, to do what he needs to do for background information with regard to Valisure. If they want to take a deposition and want to take the documents they have so far and limited additional ones, that's fine.

If you want to take a look at our Exhibit 11, if you want us to admit that we have contracts with some Plaintiffs' attorneys, we can do that, whatever they need for the background. But 30,000 documents to review and log and produce won't happen between now and February 10th.

You can order it now to be 17 degrees here tomorrow, we can't do it. We can't get that done by then for two reasons. One is, using outside contract attorneys, there is a lot of sensitive documents here, there are some issues in the documents they requested that is privileged, protected, not subject to public disclosure, that we -- using outside attorneys may be very difficult to use for going through those documents.

Whatever number of documents we go through, we may have to use internal resources at our firm to do it, and that will take a much longer time than February -- two weeks in advance of February 10th to get those documents out.

We ask that if anything more is to be produced, for it
be a narrower list just for the proportionality for the case, and for the timing with regard to the upcoming deposition.

Finally, with regard to who pays for all of this, your Honor, we spent over $\$ 150,000$ in legal fees, which is just -had I known we would be here today, we would have filed this motion back in July or August, but we have been trying to work with the Defendants, and they have been absolutely fine to work with. Mr. Oot and the other folks have been very cordial, very polite. We have worked with Special Master Dodge, she is terrific. We tried to get through all of this, but we spent a ton of money.

At this point in time the equities -- when you look at who pays, you said that would be the last thing you're looking at, and if $I$ could briefly summarize our ask, I will do that now.

THE COURT: Please.

MR. EGAN: Revenue for Valisure in 2020 was about 700,000, they had more investments, a few million in investments that Mr. Oot raised, but the brand Defendants are in the hundreds of billions as far as revenue.

As $I$ said, we are not a party, we are not an expert, and we have cited to some cases -- they are trying to say that we are not a classic disinterested party because of our role in the citizen petition. Unlike in the Seroquel case where they had the Harris Company, which wound up splitting its fees,
which, if your Honor is inclined to split the fees -- we prefer to have them pay for it all, but a split is certainly appropriate under the law.

The Harris Company in that case asked for the subpoenaing party to pay for all of its costs, but the court said that the Harris Company was actually hired by the Defendant in that case, there was a contract with them. We haven't been hired by the Plaintiffs, we are not going to get reimbursed by the Plaintiffs for our work here. So, we are different than the cases that have been cited with regard to a classic disinterested party still having an interest in the case.

Have we gotten publicity, have we gotten some fund raising, have we had other benefits? Sure. We don't get any money from the outcome of this case, and we are not being paid by the Plaintiffs to do this, so there is a distinction. I think that the equities of the size of the companies, the scope of what the Defendants are asking for that they have control over -- they control the scope of what has been asked for, all of that, and the fact that we did do an initial search and an initial production, paid for it ourselves -- Valisure is not asking to be compensated for its initial round of production or our time in reviewing it.

This is a huge cost going forward. So, all of those equities, when you do the balance and tests for allocating
costs, strongly indicates that the Defendants should pay for all, but at least a significant portion, if not most of the costs incurred by Valisure, and those are two buckets.

One is the outside legal fees of about 165,000 since July. We are not asking for anything before that, that was our initial production, but when they went to what we perceive as the overbroad request, we ask them to pay for everything since then.

My client did an internal assessment and you will see how they did the calculation in the brief. They spent about $\$ 72,000$ internal time for which they are asking to be reimbursed.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Egan. Mr. Oot, you have not had a chance to be heard on the cost allocation issue. I want to give you a chance to respond.

MR. OOT: Sure, your Honor. The parties' resources here that Mr. Egan raised, it's important to note that Exhibit 37 focuses on the millions of dollars that Valisure raised. The Seroquel case that we both cited in our brief, that we come out differently on that position, just the amount of staffing that we see Valisure putting into the citizen petition and the seniority and fees there, hiring the class action attorney, Gregory Frank, hiring Tom Daschle's group, and I don't know how many time keepers to lobby the citizens petition, and then two different law forms objecting to the requests, both Mr. Glazier
and Mr. Egan's firm that were working on this case to object to our request.

So, look, we voluntarily agreed to pay half of the eDiscovery Technology fees so we could get this baseline reporting to see what is out there. We had nothing at the time. Right now, at this point, Valisure has produced 3100 pages, Mr. Bretholz has produced 72. By contrast, Dr. Braunstein has produced 11,400 and Dr. Mitch has produced 1700.

So, we are relying on these disparate sources to build our position, and the underlying fact that, again, the Valisure study is cited in a lot of different science articles where -prior to the FDA's ability to react to it. So we see the Kanter study I referenced, we see the Kim study, the Florian study, the White study, and then the Braunstein study, that we don't -- if we were to take Valisure out it would be very strange because it is cited in all of those cases.

So, I really just want to put forward the fact that Valisure and Mr. Bretholz participated in working up this litigation. If we take the citizen's petition out, if we take the science out, I still don't think we have an answer from Plaintiffs related to other testing. If all of the Valisure testing and the studies that rely on Valisure testing is out, I think it is difficult to do because of the influence that we saw with just, again, David Light and Dr. Braunstein on directing the science, the specific direction that aligns with

Valisure's flawed science.
Your Honor, I am happy to run through the proportionality factors. I know we haven't done that yet. I think it might be helpful for --

THE COURT: If you would like to. I think I saw it in your submission, but if you would like to do that, I am happy to hear you on it.

MR. OOT: No, that is great, it is in our submission. The one thing we haven't really discussed is the parties' relative access to the information. We went to the other places, we went to other third parties, and we got what we got. We don't have the information from the most central location, those that were advocating for their position before the FDA and, you know, I think it is very important to focus on the key source, the key players of where this information is coming from.

It has been over a year working with Mr. Egan, we have gotten to this point where we have a metadata report where we see bits and pieces of information that would be interesting, and we have done a very good job trying to narrow it down. We even offered to de-duplicate the two sets, the Bretholz set against the Valisure set, so nobody has to look at documents twice.

We are really just trying to get a look at the facts, your Honor, and get an understanding of the science, the
influence on the science, and there is this issue that the work that was done to promote it, but I can't think that anybody can take the position that this is background.

The science is central to this case, we saw it at Science Day. If we go back and look at the most important studies the Plaintiffs cited, some of them do cite Valisure, and the testing was relied upon in at least one of them.

I appreciate your time, your Honor, and hopefully we can resolve this, and I look forward to your opinion. We are at sort of a difficult situation at this point because we have Light's deposition coming up, as we pointed out in our summary. I think it is on February 10 th to 11th, so we would like this resolved as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: February 10th is the deposition of Mr . Light?

MR. OOT: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. I am not going to rule from the bench today. I have to read the other materials. I will try to get an order out very quickly.

MR. EGAN: One last thought, if I may.
THE COURT: Yes. Mr. McGlamry is raising his hand. Mr. Egan, let me hear from you.

MR. EGAN: If they will pay for it, we will do almost anything they want us -- if they give us the time and give us the money, we can do almost anything. We have been trying to
get this narrowed so it wouldn't be in front of you. We are at this position where, your Honor, if they will pay for it, we will do a much deeper dive or do whatever they want us to do, subject to our right to object to a privileged log, or whatever. If they will pay for it, we will do it. That is a big hurdle.

THE COURT: You are always free to continue to negotiate. All $I$ can do is rule on the legal issues that are presented to me. If you all want to find a solution that may be better for both of you than what you are going to get from me, I leave that to you. The special master is quite good at that. It wouldn't be any different than a case where the jury returns a verdict and then the parties reach settlement. Getting my ruling might influence further discussion.

MR. EGAN: Your Honor, we ask that your ruling include past fees that we have incurred and future fees, if you keep that in mind as you are applying whatever future work is to be done, that is our ask and we appreciate it.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. McGlamry, you turned on your camera and raised your hand. What would you like to add, sir?

MR. MCGLAMRY: Your Honor, I just want to clarify something. I think I heard earlier in the context, essentially, it is implied that Valisure did something for an expert for Plaintiffs and that they are not being named as an
expert, but they are being utilized by an expert. That is not the case. We are not relying upon them for doing any work for any of our experts. It is not like in some instance you have an expert or somebody that does something, and then an expert relies upon that. That is not the case.

The only other comment I would make, your Honor -- and I appreciate you taking this under advisement and looking, because we only got some of this stuff last night, and it looks like they have gone through a lot to piece things together.

We are getting fairly much maligned here, which I think is somewhat inappropriate and unnecessary. If you look into some of that you will find that the hand sanitizer litigation, that both the Plaintiffs and Defendants contacted Valisure, and the Defendants actually sent product to Valisure for testing, and that Defendant was represented by two of the law firms involved here on behalf of the Defendants, including one of BI's lawyers and the liaison for the generics.

I think that what Mr. Egan was saying earlier, I know they are trying to beat them over the head, but it is not what -- so, I am glad you are looking.

THE COURT: Look, you have accused them of giving people cancer for 40 years, they have accused you of colluding with the lab and ginning up a bogus lawsuit. I am sure the truth lies somewhere in the middle and we will just leave it at that.

While $I$ have everyone here -- Mr. Gilbert is still here and Ms. Sharpe is still here. I didn't address one issue which related to some of the attachments to some of these materials. I see Mr. Burstyn is here as well.

What I generally do, if any of the attachments that have been submitted to me with the PTO 32 materials, if they are marked confidential or highly confidential, I ask that the parties in the first instance review them and redact whatever can be redacted such that that designation can be removed by agreement of the parties.

If the parties can't reach an agreement and one party believes that the document needs to be filed under seal, I ask the party then file a motion to seal, but in the interim, $I$ hold all of those documents under seal, so that way I can review them before the hearing, $I$ can be fully informed.

The public will get their access that they are entitled to, but $I$ will not put something in the public record that then needs to be redacted or sealed later on.

There is a lot going on in this lawsuit, you will have a lot of important things to do, so I am not going to put a time limit on when I would ask you to submit either the redacted or motions to seal, but let's not lose track of it, and let's get that done on all submissions.

Mr. Gilbert, you raised your hand first.
MR. GILBERT: Thank you. Judge, this issue came up,
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as you recall, on January 5 th in connection with the email issue, and you gave the same direction to Sanofi's counsel that you gave today just now.

We are now 14 days later, and they have yet to provide a proposal with regard to what could be redacted to move this process along, and I think it would be helpful for the court to either set a deadline or advise the parties that if it takes more than $X, ~ I ~ a m ~ g o i n g ~ t o ~ u n s e a l ~ a l l ~ t h i s ~ s t u f f . ~ B e c a u s e, ~$ otherwise, we are going to be in a perpetual cycle of waiting for Sanofi to propose something they would like not to ever come to light.

THE COURT: Understood. That's fair. Mr. Oot, you had something you would like to say?

MR. OOT: Yes, your Honor. I would like to point out that a lot of the exhibits in our master demonstrative are referencing third-party documents, so if your entry -- maybe it is a submitted entry, I don't know how your Honor would do it, but it might be helpful to -- I will alert those third parties, but if we had something to point to, I think it might be helpful.

THE COURT: Okay. We will do a separate order relating to the PTO 32 submissions that will incorporate what I just said. As I think about it, I think Mr. Gilbert's point is well taken, so $I$ will set a deadline, bit it is not going to be next week or tomorrow. I know discovery is coming to an end,
all of you are rushing to get a lot done, but the public does have a right of access and I need to respect that. I will put a deadline in there, and that is without prejudice if any party, in good faith, can't comply with the deadline that $I$ set.

Thank you all very much. Let me excuse the parties in the Valisure matter. I will take that under advisement.

Let me turn finally to the last matter on the calendar today. Let me recognize counsel for Mr. Bretholz.

MR. BURSTYN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Sean Burstyn on behalf of non-party petitioner Michael Bretholz.

At the outset, I just wanted to welcome Mr. Bretholz, who has joined us today. This has been an exceedingly burdensome experience for him. He served as legal counsel to Valisure for many years, and I will explain why that is significant.

Before I jump in and do that, I want to advise the Court that although we have been communicating with counsel to GSK for the better part of five months, it was just a couple of hours before this hearing that $I$ was emailed a notice of -- a deposition notice that Valisure now intends to take Mr. Bretholz's deposition.

THE COURT: Valisure does or --

MR. BURSTYN: I am sorry, excuse me, GSK.

THE COURT: Before you get started, let me let counsel
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for GSK make their appearance.
MR. OOT: Thank you, your Honor, Patrick Oot for GSK. THE COURT: Mr. Burstyn, back to you. If you got a deposition notice earlier today, it is not before me, I am not going to get involved with that. Talk to counsel.

MR. BURSTYN: Right, I shall.
Our position is that GlaxoSmithKline's subpoena on Mr. Bretholz is really a case study in what Rule 45 prohibits. To set the table, we understand where Valisure fits or doesn't fit in the universe of this case, and I want to be clear that Mr. Bretholz is counsel to Valisure, he's a low single digit investor in what started off as a startup, and is still a startup, which $I$ don't think is terribly uncommon.

Our position and the request that we have is that the Court quash the subpoena in its entirety, or grant our request for protection and award reasonable fees. Rule 45 provides that the propounding party must take reasonable steps to avoid imposing an undue burden, and absent such steps, it falls upon the Court to impose an appropriate sanction and limitations if it does not quash the subpoena.

So, with that in mind, like Mr. Egan on behalf of Valisure said a few minutes ago, our position has always been tell us what you are really after and we will discuss how we get it to you. If it is extremely voluminous we will insist that you cover costs for fees and time. Mr. Bretholz is out
ten of thousands of dollars in fees, and similarly his own time given to this project.

I would also like to add that Mr. Bretholz is an individual, he is not a company that gets to expense these fees. He is not covered by insurance, these are not write offs, this is not investor money. He is a guy who did a favor for a friend who, I think, went to Yale with him and served as an attorney adviser to the company, and now he is getting banged out for tens of thousands of dollars of fees and perhaps tens of thousands of dollars more.

Our initial hit report on GSK's search terms yielded over 30,000 documents, which our vendor estimates converts to over 200,000 pages to be reviewed. As Mr. Egan put eloquently, the Court, of course, can't order that it be 80 degrees in Connecticut tomorrow, it would be impossible for us to carry on. Again, as the Court said at the top, the Court is not terribly interested in the self-serving posturing that lawyers do in the months before we get to the Court.

We are here -- my understanding is that I am here up against GSK's subpoena as it was served, and my objections to it and the Motion to Quash.

THE COURT: So, let me double back for a second.
You said you want to quash it in its entirety, or in the alternative, provide protection. What protection?

MR. BURSTYN: Sure. I think now may be a good time.

The protection is -- relates to, really, fees and costs. We will find people, we can't really use contract attorneys for some of the reasons that Mr. Egan alluded to. Again, our position -- I think, unfortunately, GSK and myself have perhaps been ships passing in the night. I am going to answer the question, but this is the context that is important.

I think GSK has viewed our position as just because Michael Bretholz went to law school, that does not mean every communication that he is on is privileged. I agree, but the fact of the matter is he is counsel to Valisure, and therefore has a duty to review those files for privilege.

He cannot waive the client's privilege. The client, Valisure, has gone through many documents and may be ordered to produce many more documents. If it is ordered to produce those documents, and if it withholds any on the basis of privilege or other protections, he will have to log those.

To put it perhaps colloquially, it makes no sense to have the lawyer go through the same exercise when the lawyer has to be at least as inclusive in the privilege assertions, if not even more cautious.

Ultimately, the protection that we are seeking, as it is laid out in the motion, is a de-duplication of Valisure's documents and log, and coverage for the fees, time, and costs that it will take to do that de-duplication.

Secondly, we raised the privilege issues, and the need
for de-duplication on essentially day one, perhaps day five into the process, in the first week, and we asked GSK, knowing what you know now, which is our view -- and I will get into it in more detail -- that 27 of the 29 requests for documents in the subpoena are duplicative, and in some cases verbatim duplicative, total copy, paste, will you change your position or do we need to move to quash.

We were told, well, maybe we can talk about covering costs, which is vendor costs, which pales in comparison to the fees, but they stood on the full breadth of the subpoena. So, we are here now on the full breadth of the subpoena, and I think if the Court is willing to entertain a compromise position going forward, then everything from now backwards ought to be compensated.

If anyone has to pay for taking a reasonable position five months into the process, as opposed to day one, I believe it should be the party that refused until five months in to take that position.

If I may share my screen, there is no better evidence here than the subpoena.

THE COURT: I have a copy here.
MR. BURSTYN: Okay. Can the Court see the --
THE COURT: The subpoena was filed at Docket Entry 2-1
in case number 21-82184.
MR. BURSTYN: Right. I will show the Court some
excerpts that $I$ think will illuminate what it is that we are up against here.

Our position has always been what are you really after? If it is highly voluminous, please pay us to get it. If not, we will try to get it to you. Here is the what is the ask. Throughout the document requests the ask is all communications, all documents, all the scientific data, all relationships between various persons.

Look at point two, for example: "Including" should not be construed as limiting the request in any way. So, every now and then we see itemized requests, but they are seeking the full breadth of everything in those document requests that the Court has in the subpoena.

The word "relating", which is used and sometimes appears to be a limiter, but it is really not, it includes alluding to, directly or indirectly mentioning, et cetera. I know these are boiler plate terms, but usually five months in they get narrowed a bit, and they haven't been.

The next slide, our position is that GSK is openly fishing for irrelevant information, because the subpoena, for many reasons -- one is, the subpoena is not limited to searches for Ranitidine.

For example, request number nine seeks all drafts of FDA petitions by Mr. Bretholz, including the documentation, comments, and edits of all drafts, but that is not limited to

Ranitidine.

Request number 12 seeks Valisure citizen petitions, not limited to the petition related to Ranitidine.

Request number 17, all funding that Mr. Bretholz has provided to Valisure irrespective of this case or Ranitidine. Request number 25 , the same.

They are asking the attorney for the client's business plan, and just to make an analogy, I represent real estate developers, the thought to me that someone would ask me for the blueprints and the engineer reports, when they have already asked the client and the client is working out a method to produce those, frankly, it concerns me.

There are a hundred or so lawyers here, the thought that someone would come after a lawyer -- and I will concede not everything that Mr. Bretholz did is privileged, not every email that he is on. Sometimes maybe he is scheduling lunch, or sometimes he is having conversations with third persons, that may not be privileged, but the burden does not end there. The burden ends in the review of all of those documents for privilege, 30 plus thousand documents at over 200,000 pages, is our current estimate, and then logging them, and that only invites the privilege log fight.

That in and of itself, I submit respectfully, your Honor, warrants an order quashing the subpoena, but it is compounded even further when Valisure, our position is
tangentially related to the ultimate issues in this case at best. I don't think the independence of the United States Legislature is really at issue in the case, and I know that is being taken under advisement, so $I$ won't go further. I will join in Valisure's position on those issues. But it is also compounded by the fact that Valisure itself has been subpoenaed for this information.

The next slide gets into some of the 59 combinations of search terms that Mr. Bretholz was asked by GSK to search for. At the beginning $I$ will say the subpoena has no date range whatsoever. We have not been given a counter proposal for a date range. We suggested some dates. I know we are not talking about the positions we took and did not end up agreeing on.

We are here now, the subpoena as served has no date range. We said, consistent with our good faith efforts to try to get this narrowed, to try to avoid being in front of your Honor, we said give us some search terms that will limit the scope of the subpoena, and unfortunately what we got reflects, I believe, no effort to narrow the scope of the subpoena.

Mr. Bretholz is an attorney. I believe for the majority of his 15 years since he graduated law school he has worked at law firms as an attorney, and when he has taken up opportunities to work for businesses in-house, businesses totally unrelated to this case, he was hired for his skills as
an attorney.
So, this attorney was asked, without any limiters, any date range whatsoever, to search for the word Plaintiff, to search for the words litigate, litigates, litigated, I won't go on and on, justice, lawsuit, and of course, Valisure. Search terms, if valid at all, should be used to limit the breadth of a search. I could have just handed over all my documents if $I$ was inclined to do that, but $I$ can't, of course, because $I$ have a duty to preserve my client's privilege, so I asked for the search terms to limit the scope.

Perhaps most emblematic of the over breadth and the failure under Rule $45(d)$ to limit the burden on Mr. Bretholz is GSK's request that we search for the words Adam Bretholz, Michael Bretholz's brother. Yes, I think he made or paid a thousand dollars. We have a hundred or so lawyers here. A thousand dollars is a bit of a pittance in the grand scheme of this case.

But the fact that they are asking for us to search for every communication that touches on my client's brother, to me again, your Honor, is inconsistent with the requirement that Rule 45 imposes upon GSK to limit the burden, or the next sentence of $45(d)$ is the court must impose an appropriate sanction that would include fees for failure to limit the burden over these last five months.

I will speak, if $I$ may, your Honor, for a few minutes
about the duplicative requests. As I said, 27 of the 29 requests served upon Mr. Bretholz are duplicative of Sanofi and BI's two separate subpoenas served upon Valisure. I will show the Court here just a small sample of the duplicative requests.

In the left column we have GSK's subpoena to Mr. Bretholz. In the interest of time, I will look at one of the shorter requests. That is in row number two, request number 16, all documents related to any funding that you or Valisure received or provided in connection with Ranitidine testing. Let's go to the next column, I think it is verbatim. I think they capitalized the letter $R$ in the request upon Mr . Bretholz for Ranitidine, and in the request to Valisure it is lower case. This repeats itself, this pattern repeats itself 27 times throughout the request.

Here, on this next image is a pdf that a helpful law clerk put together. We see that they seek as to Valisure a broader set. My cursor is over this request to Valisure seeking all communications or documents related to your testing of Ranitidine. In the left column, it is essentially the same request, they just added some names.

I can scroll down and carry on with any of these, and the Court will see, again here, number nine, request number nine as to Mr. Bretholz, all drafts of FDA petitions, again, not related to Ranitidine or limited to Ranitidine. In the column one over to Valisure, again all drafts of the petition,
including without limitation all comments and edits from parties outside of Valisure LLC.

Our ultimate position, your Honor, again, is such a duplicative subpoena served upon counsel to a nonparty -- we view ourselves as nonparties to a nonparty whose underlying science -- my client is not a scientist, but our client's science may be used by yet another scientist, I think those might be very good questions to ask to Mr. Braunstein.

They have a very thorough timeline. I have to say, and I will put it as mildly as I can, we completely disagree with the characterizations and representations that made their way into those timelines, and I think a review of that 400-page packet of source material will elucidate that total disagreement that we have, and I will leave it there.

As to those 400 pages, however, I think they speak to another thing, another point, which is this, circumstantial evidence is evidence. I believe that the subpoenas upon Valisure -- I won't speak for Valisure, they have Mr. Egan here. The subpoenas served upon Valisure and my client invite nothing more than a trial within a trial about issues, about information that is not probative of the ultimate issues in the case, as I heard Mr. McGlamry articulate it today.

Even if they are probative of the ultimate issues in the case -- and it sounds to me like no juror will find liability, or the absence of liability, based on the strength
or weakness of Valisure's science or perhaps on the strength or weakness of other scientists' studies. Even if they are probative, they are not proportional. I don't think the requests are proportional as to Valisure. I think they are even less proportional as to Mr. Bretholz.

Now, as to privilege -- and before I get there, I want to reiterate, your Honor, I am certain, because $I$ have heard it from Mr. Oot, that in a few minutes they will talk about Mr. Oot -- pardon me, Mr. Bretholz traveled to Washington D.C., smiled proudly outside of a Congress person' office. They will say that was not privileged, that he had communications with Mr. Braunstein, who was subpoenaed and was deposed, and those communications are not privileged.

Our position is not that all of Mr. Bretholz's communications are privileged. Our position is that he has met his burden of reviewing all those documents for privilege. I also submit that it simply doesn't stand to reason that Mr. Bretholz would have something in these 30,000 documents, that equate to over 200,000 pages, that is so important as to justify the burden of sifting through those. That is literally months and tens if not hundreds of thousands of dollars of work.

I cannot believe there is something so important in those documents to justify the burden; and $B$, that the information would be so important, yet only he would have it,
and one of the many other parties, third parties that have been subpoenaed, would not have it, that there is something so important that would justify going through that mountain of documents, that Mr. Bretholz would withhold it and keep it unto himself, and Valisure itself, which is subject to a subpoena, would not have it.

The last point on that analytical framework is this: If Mr. Bretholz does have such information, and I am personally not aware of any, it would be protected by the work product if it were that important, by the work product protection, if not outright privileged.

With that context, our next slide explains how their subpoena openly requests information that is patently privileged, confidential, or protected by the work product doctrine.

Request number 21, this is what they asked of an attorney. They asked for all documents related to your counsel or Valisure LLC's involvement or potential involvement in any litigation related to Ranitidine. Respectfully, they might as well have asked that we hand over all of our work product, and the answer is, we are not going to do that. I believe legally we cannot do that.

The next request asks for communications between Mr. Bretholz and Mr. Gregory A. Frank of Frank LLP, an attorney who Mr. Oot said a few minutes ago was counsel to Valisure. They
asked for documents sufficient to show all relationships with any law firm or lawyer regarding Valisure LLC and the Ranitidine petition or any other Valisure citizen petition, and they asked for communications with lawyers regarding Valisure LLC testing for impurities or carcinogenicity in a Ranitidine petition or any other Valisure citizen petition.

Your Honor, if there is anything limiting or narrow or any contours to this subpoena, I don't know what they are, but they certainly are not limited to non-privileged, non-work product, non-confidential communications, and they are not limited to communications that fall beyond the scope of Ranitidine. They are seeking everything.

The next point, your Honor, that we have to make is that, as far as cost and fees are concerned going forward, we would ask that if the Court is going to force -- I am not looking for sympathy. I am very proud to say that as a solo practitioner and Mr. Bretholz as an individual and does not have an army behind him, I think we have been doing a decent job at keeping apace, but for context, we are two individuals, we do not have an army to go through all of this.

Every dollar that we are out is a dollar out of Mr . Bretholz's pocket, so if the Court is inclined to say that we do have to go through all of this, that would require us to hire third parties. Legally that would even be advisable, and there are reasons it would not be, because a lot of this
information is confidential and sensitive, but we would ask that the financial resources be paid up front.

We have an issue with a vendor, which I know Mr. Oot will dispute, and $I$ will handle it gingerly because it is not a personal attack at all, but a vendor did send out an invoice with a two-week turnaround time, and I asked yesterday that -the bill was due to be paid last week. I asked yesterday, has it been paid, and he said no.

If Mr . Oot responded to me saying he needs more time, that is fine. It wasn't communicated to the vendor, so now I am in a tough spot, because I asked these people to work -actually it was work over a holiday weekend to get a search term report. Now they came to me and said, hey, are we getting paid? I do not want to be in that position, especially where I am not the one seeking these fees.

Mr. Oot has been nothing but civil. I think procedurally we have all been good together. Substantively, I do think that this process has been punitive, and the explanation for why GSK has refused to cover the fees and costs that probably would have been less if we reached an agreement five months ago is this: If your client, Michael Bretholz, wants to be involved representing a company that drums up litigation, a characterization I dispute, then he ought to suffer the consequences.

I think that is an inappropriate position to take, and

I don't think it is what Rule 45 contemplates at all. Mr. Bretholz did not ask to be here, and he has always said he will comply, he simply needs some cover because he is going significantly out-of-pocket.

Now, here is some content that $I$ shared at the top to make sure I didn't lose it, so I won't go through that again except to say a couple of points, your Honor, in response to what we heard today.

There is a characterization about millions of dollars being spent on lobbyists. If those characterizations are supported by evidence, I don't know what that evidence is. I am highly doubtful that it exists. To the extent that that argument was made to justify exposing Mr. Bretholz to this significant burden, I think the Court should not entertain that argument.

Mr. Bretholz did not -- first of all, I can represent to the Court nobody from Valisure -- Valisure and its personnel did not spend millions of dollars on lobbying. That is not an accurate representation. Whatever Valisure did spend, if it spent anything, and I don't know, that was not spent by Michael Bretholz.

There was a comment made that Valisure had to pay counsel to assert its rights as to the overbroad subpoena, that was used as an example of, oh, they have resources. I think that turns the analysis on its head.

The fact that Michael Bretholz has had to hire counsel and be out a significant sum of money does not indicate that he ought to suffer the consequences. It is really a regressive position to take, that just because you assert your rights, that means now you have to pay for the assertion of those rights.

The conclusion of that is that you should just completely fold and give over everything you can, but again I reiterate, your Honor, I would love to if I could, I cannot. My client has professional obligations to his client that require him to sift through those documents.

I know I have taken a good amount of time from the Court and I will pause and ask for a couple minutes, and $I$ will be concise, to respond after opposing counsel states his position.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, very helpful.

Mr. Oot, let me give you an opportunity to respond. What exactly is it that GSK is asking me to order? Keep it as short as you can.

You are on mute, Mr. Oot.

MR. OOT: I apologize, your Honor. We are seeking the Court to order Mr. Bretholz to produce, again, relevant information responsive to our requests or a privilege log for those documents.

Special Master Dodge can probably provide additional
feedback to the meet and confers. We served search terms back in October, I will represent to the Court, and we requested search term hit reports for those search terms, and we didn't get those until the case was transferred down here.

I will get more into detail about that shortly.
I really want to start with the representation that Mr. Bretholz is serving in a solely legal role for Valisure. The Defendants dispute that. I think the documents that we have seen in the productions from Mr. -- Dr. Braunstein, from Dr. Mitch, and others reflect that Mr. Bretholz is providing legal advice in -- I haven't seen it yet, I guess that is the main point.

THE COURT: If I could, what is it you think he is doing? What is the evidence you are trying to find here? What do you think Mr. Bretholz is doing in furtherance of the conspiracy that you are trying to prove?

MR. OOT: Your Honor, I believe that Mr. Bretholz is fulfilling several roles based on the documents. One, there is a -- the lobbying efforts that we previously discussed, that is kind of first and foremost. Mr. Bretholz has been involved in the development of the citizen petition. We see communications with Dr. Braunstein where Mr. Bretholz is copied on.

He is also involved in fund raising and putting together the materials that are going out to high net worth individuals. For example, he will communicate with people on
his Macquarie account, Macquarie is an asset management firm where Mr. Bretholz is a senior executive, and then pivot to his gmail.

So, we want the underlying documents that show the financial relationships supporting Valisure, as opposed to what has been produced so far from Valisure itself. We would like to see those communications. We think we are entitled to them because it shows the scientific bias and the financial influence that Valisure has. I won't go through that again, your Honor, but --

THE COURT: You believe, and you have evidence from other sources, that Mr . Bretholz is involved in lobbying on behalf of Valisure, that he is involved in development of the citizens petitions, that he has been in communications with Dr. Braunstein, and that he was involved in marketing to high net worth individuals as possible investors.

Am I correct?
MR. OOT: Correct, your Honor, that is what we have found so far.

THE COURT: All right. Please continue.
MR. OOT: We just haven't seen an evidentiary basis for how Mr. Bretholz is acting as a lawyer for Valisure, and nevertheless, it doesn't shield somebody from discovery. Just because somebody is an attorney, doesn't necessarily mean de facto that they don't have to fulfill their discovery
obligations in the case.

So, all we are asking, again, is they produce a log of the information. To unseat the burden associated with that we came up with a bunch of solutions. For example, one solution we spoke about with Special Master Dodge was, after the key word search terms, after the agreed upon key word search terms, that we could technologically de-duplicate that information from what Valisure had provided to us, again, limiting the burden that Mr. Bretholz would have to take to review those materials, and they could do that without actually sharing the documents.

THE COURT: Let me stop you, though. As I said before, I am not here to negotiate, folks. Just to be clear where we are, you are presenting me with an extreme binary choice, either I am going to order everything produced or I am going to order nothing produced, because that is the two choices I have been presented with.

If you two want to negotiate something in the middle, which $I$ strongly recommend that you do, then do it. But don't spend my time this afternoon negotiating through me. I am done with that.

You came to me to rule. I am going to rule by giving one or the other of you what you have asked me to give you. You can continue, but $I$ don't want to hear any more about prior negotiations, I don't care. Tell me why you should get
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everything you have asked for from Mr. Bretholz.

MR. OOT: Yes, your Honor. The reason I was referencing that is because Mr. Burstyn referenced the parties' efforts to prevent burden on Mr. Bretholz, and those are strategies that we deployed in conjunction with --

THE COURT: Are you offering that now? I asked you what you wanted me to order. You didn't say you should order us to pay for de-duplication, you should order us to hire this person or that person. You said to me, order him to give us everything we have asked for, period, hard stop.

Are you asking me to order something different?
MR. OOT: Your Honor, everything that we previously offered is still on the table.

THE COURT: No, it is not. When I asked you five minutes ago, what is your ask, that is what you told me. I don't know what is on the table between you and Mr. Burstyn, and frankly, I don't care. If you wanted to negotiate this, the two of you should have negotiated this.

You have come to me, you have asked me to make a ruling. I am going to pick one option or the other. If you want to expand on what your option is that you are presenting to me, I will hear you on that.

I asked you and you said, order him to give me everything I have asked for, hard stop, and Mr. Burstyn said, order us to not have to give him anything, zero, nada, hard
stop.
MR. OOT: Understood, your Honor. I will make a recommendation, your Honor, if that's okay, that we delay your order and perhaps we can work with Special Master Dodge again.

THE COURT: No, no. You have come to me for an order. This matter has been pending, the original subpoena in this case was served August 4 th of last year --

MR. BURSTYN: August --
THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Burstyn, I am speaking.
It was served five months ago. You litigated this in New York, you litigated the transfer, you are now litigating it in front of me, and that is fine. You have the right to litigate for as long as you want to litigate, but there comes a point when this has to come to an end. It is going to come to an end, $I$ am going to rule.

I am not going to get an order out today, I may not get an order out tomorrow, but if you all want to resolve this, you better resolve it, or otherwise $I$ will just rule. Tell me why I should give you what you asked for.

MR. OOT: Your Honor, what $I$ am asking for, let me clarify that, $I$ am asking that they give us information that Mr. Bretholz has in his custody that has not been produced by another third party that --

THE COURT: How do I write an order that says that? MR. OOT: That Mr. Bretholz should produce --

THE COURT: How is he supposed to identify what other people haven't produced? How is he supposed to know what is not privileged? How is he supposed to do it, search terms? Is he supposed to look at everything anyway and then decide whether people haven't produced? I have to write an order when this hearing is over. What do you want my order to say? Dictate me my order.

MR. OOT: Sure, your Honor. There are
technological methodologies to de-duplicate information without actually looking at the materials themselves. You can use what is called a hash value to de-duplicate one set from another to minimize the burden on Mr. Bretholz and Mr. Bretholz's counsel.

How that would work is, one of the main reasons we thought it was a good idea for Valisure to go first, is to identify the scope of production for Valisure and then, obviously, if Mr. Bretholz has a copy or cc or bcc in those materials, he wouldn't have to reproduce or log that.

To the extent that Mr. Bretholz is having Zantac or Valisure related communications with other third parties, we think that they are relevant and we think that they should be produced and logged.

That is the offer that is on the table. We are seeking unique information in the custody of Mr. Bretholz that is not privileged, that can be de-duplicated technologically from the productions of other third parties, including

Valisure.
THE COURT: Again what is my order supposed to say? I order Mr. Bretholz to coordinate with Valisure's counsel to de-duplicate the data technologically and then produce what, anything that Valisure is not going to produce?

MR. OOT: Any unique information, your Honor.
THE COURT: That is a far cry from ordering him to give me everything I have asked for or log it.

MR. OOT: I apologize, your Honor, that is what we are asking for. We are asking for unique information that Mr. Bretholz has that we haven't received from other sources, or can't receive from other sources. He is communicating with high net worth individuals, he is communicating with influential people, like people --

THE COURT: Are you willing to pay for the de-duplication of the information that Mr. Bretholz has and that Valisure has?

MR. OOT: I don't have authorization for that, your Honor, but $I$ would say that if we could follow the same process technologically that we paid for the discovery costs and those costs are reasonable, we would do so.

I think that that has really been the struggle for us, your Honor, is we -- there is a difference in how we have been dealing with Mr. Bretholz than how we have been dealing with Mr. Egan.

Mr. Egan has provided us with hit reports, provided us with metadata reports, so we were able to cull down the information from what we actually requested. That is why we are here, and we would be willing to again follow the same process that we agreed with Mr. Burstyn.

Related to the invoice, we received that invoice over the holiday break --

THE COURT: I am not concerned about the invoice, that is between you two. If I order GlaxoSmithKline to pay for something -- I think $I$ read in the paper this weekend Glaxo is talking about selling some division to Unilever for tens of billions of dollars. I think Glaxo is good for the money, so I am not worried about it. That has nothing to do with me.

Mr. Burstyn -- let me pause for a second -- Mr. Oot has changed his demand. His demand is now that you get together with Mr. Egan, you de-duplicate the data, see what is left, and then produce or log whatever Valisure is not going to produce.

MR. BURSTYN: May I address the Court?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. BURSTYN: Thank you. Your Honor, this happens often where parties will draw lines in the sand for months and months and --

THE COURT: Again, I don't care how we got here. Do you want that deal or not?
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MR. BURSTYN: If we will be covered for the tens of thousands of dollars we had to pay to get to this position that we should have gotten to on day one, that is the only extent to which I am getting into the history, then we would take that deal, but we had to pay to get to what is now a more or less reasonable position. I don't think we should have to pay for that. I think it is highly prejudicial to my client.

THE COURT: Okay, no problem. Okay, let me go back to Mr. Oot and let him finish his argument then.

Mr. Oot, back to you.
MR. OOT: Your Honor, to be clear, the brand Defendants will cover the technological costs associated with the de-duplication, and the process in one of the reports that Mr. Egan provided to us that we requested back in October; and then secondly, the prior work, we had to go through great pains to get to this point to get jurisdiction over this subpoena.

So, I don't think our client should be responsible for attorney's fees for filing motions to object to the subpoenas when we could have had this discussion a long time ago.

Turning back to -- just touching on a couple issues, your Honor, and $I$ will be very brief.

On the confidentiality issue, we have PTO 26 that addresses trade secret or any other issue for confidential information outside of privilege. The privilege log would cover the privilege. The issue related that these are
duplicative of Valisure's request -- or brand Defendants' requests to Valisure, that is turning back to the point where Mr. Bretholz is going to have unique information in response to those requests where there isn't a Valisure person copied on those requests.

Mr. Bretholz is using his personal gmail account, he is not using a Valisure email address, so he is the sole person that has custody of some information where he is communicating with third parties. The only thing that we have seen is Mr. Bretholz acting in a business role on communications with Dr. Braunstein and others that indicate that there is a lot of relevant information there.

So, I think, obviously, we don't have to rehash the relevance issue that we discussed related to Valisure and how it all ties up to science, and I won't rehash that here, but I will really kind of run through the overall burden of this.

Mr. Bretholz isn't really a disinterested party, as we discussed with Valisure. There was a business around building this litigation, there was a business around the citizen's petition, there was a business around the overall science for this that Mr. Bretholz participated in.

The materials that we cited, the Seroquel opinion that Mr. Egan and $I$ both relied on in our papers, we think that that is important, too.

Also, you know, Mr. Burstyn referenced the parties'
resources. He said -- Mr. Bretholz engaged in this conduct, he is a senior executive at one of the largest asset managing firms in the world, and at least from our research, we have seen that he, in 2016, recovered $\$ 1.6$ million in a litigation. So, the issue here mostly, your Honor, is that his position, as we have seen in the timeline, he is a key player throughout the litigation, and that is why we sent the request to Mr . Bretholz, and that is why we are taking a deposition of Mr. Bretholz, too.

We are hoping to cut through this, get to the information, get to the facts related to the underlying campaign that led to the science, that led to the citizen petition, and the lobbying campaign, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, counsel. Very well argued.

I would strongly, strongly, strongly encourage the two of you to meet with the special master in the next 48 hours and try to work this out. I fully expect to get an order out probably by the end of Friday. Like I said, the choice you have given me is not a win, it is a big, big loss for one of you. So, maybe you want to try to negotiate something in the middle, but if not, $I$ will issue my order and you will have to.

Thank you, everybody, very well argued by all parties. I will excuse everyone and we will be in recess. Have a good afternoon.
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|  | 1180 [1] $2 / 5$ | 2929 [1] 1/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. BURSTYN: [12] 60/5 | 11th [1] 80/12 | 29th [2] 56/13 61/3 |
| 60/12 85/9 85/23 86/5 87/24 | $\begin{array}{llll}12 & \text { [4] 19/15 20/8 20/14 91/2 }\end{array}$ | 2:40 [1] 65/13 |
| 89/21 89/24 106/7 109/18 | 12 percent [1] 64/9 | 2:50 [1] 65/14 |
| 109/20 109/25 | 13 [1] 19/3 | 2nd [2] 57/7 59/4 |
| MR. EGAN: [23] 38/18 38/21 | $14 \text { [7] } 18 / 10 \quad 18 / 15 \quad 18 / 15$ | 3 |
| 39/20 $40 / 6$ 41/1 $43 / 4 \quad 50 / 6$ | 23/9 28/6 28/8 84/4 | 30 [19] 3/21 18/24 19/6 |
| 50/10 51/5 51/17 52/1 52/12 | 14th [3] 12/25 32/5 61/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 12 & 19 / 16 & 23 / 3 & 23 / 4 & 24 / 1\end{array}$ |
| 57/16 $68 / 16$ 69/25 $70 / 8 \quad 70 / 18$ | 15 [2] 17/25 92/22 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 24/18 } & 24 / 23 & 27 / 10 & 28 / 18\end{array}$ |
| 71/20 71/23 75/16 80/19 | 1550 [1] $2 / 8$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 28 / 20 & 34 / 13 & 34 / 20 & 35 / 21 & 38 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 80/22 81/14. ${ }^{\text {mR }}$ / $15 / 20$ | 1560 [1] 1/13 | 50/9 91/20 |
| MR. GILBERT: [10] 15/20 <br> 17/9 17/15 22/17 27/8 29/6 | 15th [2] 60/19 60/23 | 30,000 [6] 53/21 65/22 65/25 |
| $30 / 24 \quad 31 / 17 \quad 35 / 3 \quad 83 / 24$ | 16 [3] 21/11 30/8 94/8 | 74/11 87/12 96/18 |
| MR. McGLAMRY: [8] 43/13 | 16-page [1] 39/9 | 300 [1] 1/20 |
| 43/19 $44 / 6 \quad 44 / 9 \quad 45 / 10 \quad 45 / 13$ | 1600 [2] 2/5 50/12 | 30309 [1] 2/5 |
| 46/12 81/21 | 165,000 [1] 77/4 | 30326 [1] 1/21 |
| MR. OOT: [43] 38/25 39/23 | 17 [1] 91/4 | 305-384-7270 [1] 1/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}42 / 10 & 45 / 15 & 45 / 18 & 46 / 20 & 47 / 6\end{array}$ | 17 degrees [1] 74/13 | 30th [3] 13/21 57/5 61/19 |
| 47/22 48/10 53/16 55/3 55/7 | 1700 [1] 78/8 | 3100 [1] 78/6 |
| 55/14 55/17 57/19 58/1 60/15 | 17th [1] 59/18 | 31st [4] 20/19 22/10 28/7 |
| 60/18 64/4 65/8 65/23 66/5 |  | 30/24 [12] 4/20 17/3 17/19 18/8 |
| 66/16 67/6 77/15 $79 / 7$ 80/15 |  | $\begin{array}{lllll} 18 / 23 & 19 / 23 & 20 / 4 & 20 / 7 & 29 / 10 \end{array}$ |
| 84/13 86/1 101/20 102/16 | 19th [4] 13/17 57/2 58/23 | $33 / 16 \quad 83 / 6 \quad 84 / 22$ |
| 103/17 103/20 105/1 105/11 | 59/13 | 33131 [1] 2/9 |
| 106/1 106/19 106/24 107/7 | 1st [4] 18/17 21/8 56/19 | 33134 [1] 1/17 |
| 108/5 108/8 108/17 110/10 | 1st/3 $59 / 4$ | 3391 [1] 1/20 |
| MR. SHORTNACY: [9] 4/14 5/3 |  | 3434 [1] 2/14 |
| 8/4 10/3 10/10 10/18 11/8 | 2 | 35 [1] 68/18 |
| 12/1 15/14 | 2-1 [1] 89/23 | 37 [1] 77/18 |
| MR. STANLEY: [7] 4/10 4/25 | 20-02924 [1] 3/3 |  |
| 5/18 7/5 7/19 12/18 14/24 | 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG | 4 |
| MS. SHARPE: [13] 15/22 16/2 | 1/3 | 40 [1] 82/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}  \\ 28 / 12 & 28 / 16 & 29 / 11 & 33 / 19 \end{array}$ | 200,000 [3] 87/13 91/20 | 400 [1] 95/15 |
| $36 / 14 \quad 38 / 13$ | 96/19 | 400-page [1] 95/12 |
| THE COURT: [121] | 20001 [1] 2/2 | 4000 [1] 1/25 |
|  | 2006 [3] 7/21 7/22 9/8 | 404-523-7706 [1] 1/21 |
| \$ | 2016 [5] 7/22 10/5 10/13 | 404-572-4600 [1] 2/6 |
| \$1.6 [1] 112/4 | $57 / 6 ~ 112 / 4$ 2018 [1] 55/19 | 45 [6] 86/8 86/16 93/12 93/21 93/22 100/1 |
| \$1.6 million [1] 112/4 | 2018 [1] $55 / 19$ <br> 2019 [1] $32 / 19$ | $\begin{array}{\|ccc\|} 93 / 21 & 93 / 22 & 100 / 1 \\ 455 & {[3]} & 13 / 1 \end{array} 13 / 8 \quad 1:$ |
| \$150,000 [1] 75/4 | $\text { 202-942-5000 [1] } 2 / 3$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} 450 \\ 457 & {[1]} & 13 / 21 \end{array}\right.$ |
| \$3.7 [1] 61/13 | $\begin{array}{llll} \begin{array}{lll} 202-942-5000 & {[1]} & 2 / 3 \\ 2020 & {[3]} & 32 / 20 \\ 26 / 22 & 75 / 17 \end{array} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lc} 457 \\ 4600[1] & 13 / 21 \\ 4 / 2 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| \$3.7 million [1] 61/13 | $2021 \text { [14] } 12 / 25 \quad 18 / 6 \quad 18 / 15$ | 48 [1] 112/17 |
| \$4.3 [1] 59/13 | 2021/17  <br> $18 / 17$ $18 / 18$ <br> $18 / 22$ $19 / 3$ | $496 \text { [1] } 39 / 11$ |
| \$4.3 million [1] 59/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 21 / 7 & 21 / 8 & 42 / 16 & 45 / 19 & 47 / 1 \end{array}$ | 4th [5] 19/24 20/3 56/21 |
| \$72,000 [1] 77/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 21 / 7 & 21 / 8 & 42 / 16 & 45 / 19 & 47 / 1 \\ 70 / 1 & & & & \end{array}$ | 4th [5] 19/24 20/3 56/21 $62 / 2106 / 7$ |
| / | 2022 [2] 1/5 113/6 | 5 |
| /s [1] 113/7 | 20th [1] 61/9 |  |
| 0 | 21-82184 [2] 3/5 89/24 | 50,000 [4] 51/23 53/20 65/21 |
| 02108 [1] 2/11 | 215-994-4000 [1] 1/25 | 65/21 |
| 02924 [1] 3/3 | 22 [1] 113/6 | 500 [1] 68/7 |
|  | 23 [1] 12/25 | 5000 [1] 2/3 |
| 1 | 23rd [1] 58/10 | 51,000 [3] 50/22 52/25 53/16 |
| 1,000 [1] 73/8 | 24 [1] 32/8 | 51,000 list [1] 73/8 |
| 10,000 [2] 51/23 53/16 | 25 [1] 91/6 | 54 [4] 17/24 21/6 21/11 23/1 |
| 10.30 [1] 63/5 | 250 [1] 8/9 | 561-803-3434 [1] 2/14 |
| 100,000 [1] 53/19 | 26 [5] 18/18 18/22 38/8 63/7 | 57 [1] 62/18 |
| 10th [4] 74/12 74/24 80/12 | 110/22 | 59 [1] 92/8 |
| $80 / 14$ | 26th [1] 31/2 | 5945 [1] 2/12 |
| 11 [5] 21/3 39/13 64/7 64/11 | 27 [3] 89/4 94/1 94/14 | 5th [5] 20/1 20/16 21/9 |
| 74/8 | 2800 [1] 1/16 | 21/21 84/1 |
| 11,400 [1] 78/8 | $\text { 28th [1] } 21 / 16$ | 6 |
| 1100 [1] 1/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 29,000 [2] } & 53 / 1 & 73 / 9\end{array}$ | 601 [1] 2/2 |
| 1111 [1] 2/8 | 2925 [1] 1/12 | 617-557-5945 [1] 2/12 |


| 6 | 107/10 109/3 | agree [3] 7/12 8/13 88/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6th [3] 59/20 62/5 62/5 | Adam [2] 56/7 93/13 <br> add [3] 43/21 81/20 87/3 | $\begin{array}{\|rrrl} \hline \text { agreed }[8] & 7 / 11 & 15 / 5 & 18 / 6 \\ 18 / 8 & 23 / 9 & 78 / 3 & 104 / 6 \end{array} 109 / 5$ |
| 7 | added [1] 94/20 | agreeing [1] 92/1 |
| 700,000 [1] 75/18 | addition [1] 35/16 <br> additional [19] 15/10 25 | agreement [10] 18/3 18/5 <br> 18/7 19/17 21/6 21/9 35/7 |
| 713-230-8523 [1] 1/14 | $25 / 10 \quad 25 / 19 \quad 28 / 14 \quad 34 / 21 \quad 35 / 1$ | $83 / 10 \text { 83/11 99/20 }$ |
| 72 [1] 78/7 | 37/5 37/14 37/15 52/6 56/2 | ahead [7] 16/2 $42 / 9$ 54/11 |
| 7270 [1] 1/18 | 66/16 66/20 70/12 70/21 | 55/23 62/10 68/2 70/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}7706[1] & 1 / 21 \\ 77098[1] & 1 / 13\end{array}$ | 72/21 74/6 101/25 | aid [6] 39/16 39/17 41/1 |
| 77098 [1] 1/13 | address [8] 3/16 31/15 47/11 | 41/17 41/18 60/10 |
| 8 | 49/18 53/6 83/2 109/19 111/7 | air [1] 21/15 |
| 80 [1] 87/14 | addressed [2] 4/5 15/5 | alert [1] 84/1 |
| 82184 [2] 3/5 89/24 | addresses [1] 110/23 | aligns [1] 78/25 |
| 8523 [1] 1/14 | addressing [1] 4/1 | all [101] 3/1 6/16 6/23 |
| 8th [2] 57/11 58/2 | quacy [1] 24/10 | $\begin{array}{llll}8 / 9 & 9 / 2 & 9 / 2 & 10 / 6 \\ 10 / 6 & 10 / 20\end{array}$ |
| 9 | admission [1] 27/11 | $\begin{array}{lllllllll}19 / 4 & 19 / 18 & 20 / 13 & 20 / 17 & 20 / 25\end{array}$ |
| 9th [2] 59/24 61/7 | admit [1] 74/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 20 & 25 / 5 & 27 / 24 & 31 / 25 & 33 / 11\end{array}$ |
|  | admitted [1] 45/7 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}34 / 7 & 35 / 25 & 37 / 16 & 37 / 24 & 38 / 18\end{array}$ |
| A | adopt [1] 34/17 | $40 / 2$ 40/13 $40 / 20$ 45/1 45 |
| ability [2] 29/3 78/12 | advance [3] 23/9 28/21 <br> adversarial [1] 27/17 | $\begin{array}{llrl} 47 / 24 & 52 / 20 & 53 / 5 & 54 / 19 \end{array} \mathbf{5 6 / 4}$ |
| able [5] 7/25 37/11 52/23 56/23 109/2 | advice [1] 102/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll}71 / 2 & 71 / 6 & 71 / 7 & 73 / 12 & 73 / 14\end{array}$ |
| about [63] 4/23 6/6 8/17 | advice in [1] 102/11 | 73/15 73/16 73/16 75/3 75/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 17 & 12 / 21 & 14 / 2 & 18 / 13 & 19 / 10\end{array}$ | advisable [1] 98/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}76 / 2 & 76 / 5 & 76 / 19 & 76 / 24 & 77 / 2\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 21 & 20 / 3 & 20 / 25 ~ 23 / 2 ~ & 23 / 6\end{array}$ | advise [2] 84/7 85/17 | 78/16 78/21 81/8 81/9 83/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 24/25 } & 27 / 1 & 27 / 18 & 27 / 21 & 27 / 24\end{array}$ | advisement [4] 66/10 82 | 83/23 84/8 85/1 85/6 90/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 13 & 33 / 24 & 34 / 4 & 35 / 13 & 35 / 17\end{array}$ | 85/7 92/4 | 90/7 90/7 90/7 90/23 90/25 |
| 46/7 48/21 49/4 50/12 50/14 | adviser [1] 87/8 | 91/4 91/19 93/6 93/7 94/8 |
| 51/24 55/21 57/13 58/11 59/5 | advising [1] 57/12 | 94/18 94/23 94/25 95/1 $96 / 14$ |
| 59/11 $59 / 18$ 59/19 64/21 | advocate [2] 41/21 41/21 | 96/16 97/17 97/20 98/1 $98 / 20$ |
| 65/22 66/13 67/11 68/21 | advocating [1] 79/13 | 98/23 99/5 99/17 100/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}68 / 22 & 68 / 24 & 70 / 4 & 70 / 5 & 70 / 14\end{array}$ | affecting [1] 57/15 | 100/16 103/20 104/2 106/17 |
| 75/17 $77 / 4 \quad 77 / 10 \quad 84 / 23$ 89/8 | affiliates [2] 9/11 9/12 | 111/15 112/14 112/23 |
| 92/13 94/1 95/20 95/20 96/8 | affirmative [4] 13/1 1 | allocating [1] 76/25 |
| 100/9 102/5 104/5 104/24 | 13/17 13/21 | allocation [2] 12/14 77/14 |
| 109/8 109/11 109/13 | ront [1] | allow [9] 4/9 5/23 7/14 |
| above [2] 5/15 113/4 | after [11] 18/18 20/15 53/9 56/3 59/3 86/23 90/4 91/14 | 17/15 17/20 21/25 25/21 27/8 68/15 |
| absence [1] 95/25 | 101/14 104/5 104/6 | allowed [2] |
| absent [1] 86/18 | afternoon [17] 3/1 3/14 4/11 | allowing <br> [1] <br> 50/21 |
| absolutely [3] 45/11 69/12 | 4/13 4/15 15/17 15/19 15/21 | alluded [1] $88 / 3$ |
|  | 15/23 22/21 38/22 38/24 39/1 | alluding [1] 90/16 |
| $\text { access [5] } 16 / 23 \text { 22/1 79/10 }$ | 39/3 85/10 104/20 112/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { almost [5] } & 33 / 10 & 48 / 15 & 48 / 24\end{array}$ |
| 83/16 85/2 | again [56] 7/16 9/24 16/12 | 80/23 80/25 |
| accordance [1] 22/5 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 17 & 22 / 21 & 25 / 21 & 29 / 2 & 37 / 1\end{array}$ | alone [2] 26/15 46/23 |
|  | $\begin{array}{lllll}40 / 12 & 46 / 15 & 46 / 22 & 49 / 2 & 49 / 15\end{array}$ | along [4] 24/23 34/25 39/13 |
| account <br> [2] 103/1 111/6 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}52 / 21 & 54 / 19 & 55 / 23 & 56 / 2 & 56 / 6\end{array}$ | 84/6 |
| accurate <br> [3] <br> 41/5 56/20 | 57/5 57/10 $57 / 15$ 58/8 58/13 | already [14] 8/9 9/23 17/9 |
| $100 / 19$ | 58/20 $59 / 1 \begin{array}{llll} & 59 / 9 & 59 / 18 & 60 / 23\end{array}$ | 17/12 20/22 $21 / 8 \quad 22 / 16$ 36/8 |
| accurately | 60/23 61/3 61/9 61/10 61/25 | 39/20 50/18 71/1 71/7 71/16 |
| accurately describe [1] 41/9 | 62/18 63/14 65/25 67/24 | 91/10 |
| accused [2] 82/21 82/22 | 78/10 78/24 87/16 88/3 93/20 | also [35] $2 / 7$ 4/23 9/5 9/17 |
| accusing [1] 41/10 | 94/22 94/23 94/25 95/3 100/6 | $\begin{array}{llll}12 / 6 & 13 / 8 & 13 / 20 & 17 / 3 \\ 17 / 7\end{array}$ |
| acknowledgment [1] 19/18 | 101/8 101/22 103/9 104/2 | 22/2 $34 / 134 / 15$ 39/9 39/15 |
| across [2] 48/17 65/10 | 104/8 106/4 108/2 109/4 | 42/20 $47 / 23$ 48/17 49/6 49/16 |
| act [1] 16/15 | 109/24 | 51/16 51/19 52/2 54/3 54/7 |
| acting [3] 51/15 103/22 | against [5] 6/1 72/14 79/22 | 54/12 57/4 58/16 62/22 66/20 |
| 111/10 | 87/20 90/2 | 69/24 87/3 92/5 96/17 102/23 |
| action [5] 16/21 42/21 57/3 | agent [1] 5/9 | 111/25 |
| 58/3 77/22 | agents [1] 6/1 | alternative [5] 13/23 49/24 |
| actively [2] 59/20 59/24 | Agneshwar [2] 11/2 31/24 | 49/25 63/16 87/24 |
| acts [1] 13/1 | Agneshwar's [3] 32/13 33/3 34/18 | Alternatively [1] 62/24 |
| actually [13] 38/17 42/16 | ago [8] 21/12 25/4 | although [1] 85/18 <br> always [9] 6/4 30/10 31/3 |
| 45/24 $45 / 25 \quad 47 / 1$ 47/3 54/21 | $97 / 25 \text { 99/21 105/15 106/10 }$ | 32/24 68/13 81/7 86/22 90/3 |
| 76/6 82/14 99/12 104/10 | 110/19 | 100/2 |



| A | 99/16 99/17 99/18 99/20 | Boehringer [7] 3/18 4/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| aware... [1] 97/9 | $\begin{array}{llll} 102 / 20 & 103 / 6 & 103 / 14 & 104 / 17 \\ 106 / 6 & 106 / 22 & 108 / 22 & 108 / 23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 4 / 16 & 4 / 22 & 5 / 8 & 5 / 12 & 5 / 20 \\ \text { bogus [1] } & 82 / 23 & \end{array}$ |
| away [1] 47/13 | $108 / 24$ | boiler <br> [1] <br> 90/1 |
| B | been nothing [1] 99/16 | bolster [1] |
| B's [1] 69/24 | before [40] 1/9 10/23 16/1 | Boston [2] |
| back [36] 4/4 6/19 6/23 7/2 | /2 19/15 20/4 20/5 | th [11] 29/15 38 |
| 9/8 9/9 9/13 12/17 17/7 | 20/15 20/23 20/24 21/2 21/16 | $41 / 20 \quad 42 / 1$ |
| 18/15 20/10 26/24 27/7 30/14 | 27/13 28/2 28/6 28/15 30/23 | bottle [8] 6/4 6/6 6/8 7/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 40 / 3 & 40 / 14 & 46 / 6 & 54 / 21 & 57 \\ 65 / 14 & 65 / 17 & 66 / 13 & 68 / 7 & 6 \end{array}$ | 31/24 33/22 33/22 34/3 34/14 | 7/8 7/23 8/2 14/16 |
| 69/5 70/23 75/6 80/5 86/3 | $34 / 20$ 61/9 77/5 79/13 83/15 | bottle dryer [1] 6/8 |
| 87/22 102/1 110/8 110/10 | 85/17 85/20 85/25 86/4 87/18 | bottled [1] 5/21 |
| 110/14 110/20 111/2 |  | les [9] 5/10 |
| backed [1] 61/5 | begin [2] 19/16 50/12 | $5 / 22$ $5 / 22$ $5 / 22$ $6 / 3$ $6 / 3$ <br> $14 / 20$     |
| background [12] 44/8 50/16 | beginning [3] 23/14 $92 / 10$ | bottling [1] 3/19 <br> bottom [2] 28/4 28/12 |
| 53/2 69/6 69/10 69/12 69/14 | begins [1] 16/1 | bought [2] 7/25 44/25 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { 72/1 } & 72 / 13 & 74 / 4 & 74 / 11 & 80 / 3\end{array}$ | behalf [15] 4/12 $4 / 13$ 15/22 | Boulevard [1] 1/ |
| backwards [1] 89/13 |  | brand [4] 39/7 75/19 110/1 |
|  | 31/24 43/15 60/7 82/16 85/11 | 111/1 |
|  | 86/21 103/13 | Braunstein [27] 42/16 45 |
| [1] | behavior [1] 47/17 | 45/25 46/18 46/21 46/25 47/1 |
| bank [1] 59/7 | behind [3] 53/9 61/3 98/18 | 47/8 47/13 54/13 54/18 57/12 |
| Bar [2] 72/7 72/8 | being [20] 3/6 6/17 19/13 | 59/18 61/4 61/5 67/10 67/16 |
| based [19] $14 / 11$ 19/14 $21 / 8$ | 32/13 35/8 42/5 56/23 57/18 | 70/2 78/8 78/14 78/24 95/8 |
| 21/11 24/7 29/16 31/20 32/1 | 59/15 $60 / 9 \quad 70 / 10$ 70/11 $70 / 11$ | 96/12 102/9 102/22 103/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}32 / 3 & 32 / 3 & 32 / 5 & 32 / 13 & 33 / 2\end{array}$ | 73/14 $76 / 15$ 81/25 $82 / 1$ 92/4 | 111/11 |
| 33/3 45/8 57/22 62/13 95/25 | 92/17 100/10 | breadth [5] 89/10 |
| 102/18 | believe [23] 6/2 6/16 8/14 | 90/12 93/6 |
| baseline [1] | 8/19 11/16 16/16 31/19 32/22 | break [5] 55/10 64/ |
| bases [1] 32/25 | 37/4 39/15 $42 / 3$ 58/19 64/7 | 65/13 109/7 |
| basically [1] 9/4 | 65/5 71/24 89/16 92/20 92/21 | breaking [1] 55/12 |
| basis [2] 88/15 103/21 | 95/17 96/23 97/21 102/17 | Bretholz [77] 3/5 3/11 3/25 |
| bcc [1] 107/16 |  | 2360 |
| be [174] | belong [1] 11/12 |  |
| BEACH [3] 1/2 1/5 $2 / 14$ | bench [1] 80/18 | 86/11 86/25 87/3 88/8 90/24 |
| Beach/Ft [1] 2/14 | benefit [2] 37/25 38/9 | 91/4 91/15 92/9 92/21 93/12 |
| bear [1] 13/16 | benefits [1] 76/14 | 93/13 94/2 94/6 94/12 94/23 |
| beat [1] 82/19 | benzyne [4] 51/4 51/6 51/13 | 96/5 96/9 96/18 97/4 97/8 |
| because [59] 6/1 8/19 11/5 | 53/25 [4] 51/4 51/6 51/13 | 97/24 98/17 99/21 100/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 12 & 11 / 20 & 11 / 22 & 12 / 3 & 15 / 4\end{array}$ |  | $100 / 13 \text { 100/16 100/21 101/1 }$ |
| 19/25 $21 / 23$ 24/14 $28 / 9$ 28/13 | $\text { bet [2] } 28 / 9 \quad 28 / 11$ | $101 / 22 \quad 102 / 7 \quad 102 / 10 \quad 102 / 15$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}29 / 20 & 30 / 15 & 31 / 23 & 35 / 23\end{array}$ | better [6] 65/6 74/2 81/10 | $102 / 17 \text { 102/20 102/22 103/2 }$ |
| 36/16 $40 / 15$ 40/18 $40 / 22$ | 85/19 89/19 106/18 | 103/12 103/22 104/9 105/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 22 & 44 / 11 & 44 / 17 & 47 / 2 & 49 / 21\end{array}$ | between [9] $32 / 16 \quad 34 / 8 \quad 35 / 14$ | 105/4 106/22 106/25 107/12 |
| 54/13 55/23 56/5 56/10 56/15 | 54/21 74/12 90/8 97/23 | $16 \quad 10$ |
| 57/14 $59 / 25$ 61/15 $62 / 10$ | 105/16 109/9 | $108 / 11 \text { 108/16 108/24 111/3 }$ |
| 62/12 $66 / 10$ 67/18 $69 / 20$ |  |  |
| 69/25 75/23 78/16 78/23 | beyond [6] 5/15 6/11 6/12 $46 / 17 \text { 67/3 98/11 }$ | 111/6 111/10 111/17 111/21 $\text { 112/1 112/8 } 112 / 9$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}80 / 10 & 82 / 8 & 84 / 8 & 88 / 7 & 90 / 20\end{array}$ | BI [15] $7 / 12$ 8/9 9/8 $10 / 5$ | Bretholz did [1] 100/1 |
| 93/8 96/7 98/25 99/4 99/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 20 & 10 / 22 & 13 / 2 & 13 / 6 & 13 / 9\end{array}$ | Bretholz's [7] 56/7 59/5 |
| $100 / 3 ~ 101 / 4 ~ 103 / 8 ~ 103 / 24 ~$ $104 / 16$ 105/3 | $\text { 13/19 } 14 / 4 \text { 14/13 } 14 / 20 \quad 15 / 6$ | 85/22 93/14 96/14 98/22 |
| 104/16 105/3 |  |  |
| becomes [1] 9/13 |  |  |
| been [70] 7/25 9/10 9/11 | $82 / 17 \quad 94 / 3$ | Brickell [1] 2/8 |
| 15/12 18/16 20/22 20/25 | bias [6] 42/3 42/7 52/24 | brief [4] 50/13 77/10 77/19 |
| 21/11 22/16 23/10 23/12 25/2 26/5 27/12 $29 / 19 \quad 30 / 10 \quad 31 / 9$ | 61/15 69/23 103/8 | 110/21 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 5 & 27 / 12 & 29 / 19 & 30 / 10 & 31 / 9 \\ 33 / 9 & 33 / 15 & 34 / 25 & 35 / 2 & 35 / 6\end{array}$ | big [3] 81/6 112/20 112/20 | briefly [4] 40/7 41/2 60/7 |
| $43 / 6$ 50/13 $52 / 5$ 53/17 54/23 | bill [1] 99/7 | 75/14 |
| 54/23 65/11 66/1 66/19 66/20 | billions [2] 75/20 109/12 | bring [1] 65/10 |
| 68/22 71/6 71/16 72/8 73/19 | binary [1] 104/14 | broad [1] 30/9 |
| 75/6 75/7 75/8 76/8 76/10 | bit [8] 24/13 30/7 52/23 | broader [1] 94/17 |
| 76/19 79/17 80/25 83/6 85/13 | 60/4 60/14 84/24 90/18 93/16 |  |
| 85/18 86/22 88/5 90/3 90/18 | bits [2] 67/19 79/19 <br> blueprints [1] 91/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { brother [4] } \\ & 93 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 92/6 92/11 97/1 98/18 99/8 | body [1] 71/4 | brother-in-law [1] 58/17 |


| B | can't [17] 7/8 23/11 23/11 | chemical [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| brought [3] 23/4 46/15 46/15 | 27/3 39/16 48/16 61/14 69/23 | chief [1] 61/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Brown [16] } & 19 / 11 & 19 / 18 & 19 / 22\end{array}$ | 74/14 74/14 80/2 | choice [4] 11/2 |
| 20/17 21/18 $21 / 25$ 22/8 $22 / 14$ | cancer [3] 42/2 43/13 82/22 | choices [3] 11/24 28/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 26 / 10 & 27 / 10 & 28 / 1 & 28 / 17 & 29 / 22 \\ 31 / 21 & 32 / 11 & 35 / 20 & & \end{array}$ | cannister [1] 6/7 | 104/17 |
| Brown's [5] 20/2 20/6 21/2 | ```cannot [5] 45/7 88/12 96/23 97/22 101/9``` | choose [1] $73 / 10$ <br> chosen [1] $35 / 23$ |
| 28/6 29/1 | capability [1] 14 | chromatography [2] |
| buckets [1] | capitalized [1] | 47/4 |
| build [1] 78/9 | carcinogenicity [1] 98/5 | Cira [1] |
| building [2] 54/10 111/18 | care [5] 10/5 40/20 104/25 <br> 105/17 109/24 | \|circuit [1] 36/17 |
| built [2] 59/22 60/1 | careful [2] 35/4 69/2 | circumstantial [2] 65/ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { bunch [3] } 30 / 13 & 52 / 3 & 104 / 4\end{array}$ | carefully [1] 39/17 | 95/16 |
| burden [22] $6 / 16$ 7/14 9/18 | carry [2] 87/15 94/21 | cite [3] 46/21 67/24 80/ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}12 / 16 & 37 / 21 & 37 / 25 & 71 / 18 \\ 86 / 18 & 91 / 18 & 91 / 19 & 93 / 12\end{array}$ | carve [1] 51/4 | cited [10] 35/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 86/18 } & 91 / 18 & 91 / 19 & 93 / 12 \\ 93 / 21 & 93 / 24 & 96 / 16 & 96 / 20\end{array}$ | case [57] $1 / 3$ 3/3 $3 / 4$ 3/6 | 75/22 76/10 77/19 78/11 |
| 96/24 100/14 104/3 104/9 | 3/6 3/9 5/24 6/15 8/13 11/3 | 78/16 80/6 111/22 |
| 105/4 107/12 111/16 | 11/16 12/1 25/8 30/9 32/24 | cites [1] 62/5 |
| burdens [1] 71/14 | 33/6 37/20 41/11 42/19 43/6 | citing [1] $40 /$ |
| burdensome [3] 7/4 33/5 | 44/15 $52 / 15$ 53/3 $53 / 4 \quad 58 / 18$ | citizen [23] 46/8 49/9 51/7 |
| 85/14 | 66/25 67/1 68/1 69/16 70/4 | 51/9 52/16 54/5 54/6 54/8 |
| BURSTYN [14] $2 / 7$ 2/7 60/7 |  | 54/17 $56 / 13$ 58/14 60/3 62/20 |
| 60/8 83/4 85/11 86/3 105/3 | 76/12 $76 / 15$ 77/19 78/1 80/4 | 63/4 64/16 $70 / 11$ 75/24 77/21 |
| 105/16 105/24 106/9 109/5 | 81/12 82/2 82/5 86/8 86/10 | 91/2 98/3 98/6 102/21 112/12 |
| 109/14 111/25 | 89/24 91/5 92/1 92/3 92/25 | citizen's [12] 42/22 43/25 |
| business [18] 9/9 10/5 10/6 | 93/17 $94 / 13$ 95/22 95/24 | 46/16 56/3 57/7 59/3 62/13 |
| 10/7 10/7 21/2 21/16 28/2 | 102/4 104/1 106/7 | 66/21 67/4 67/12 78/19 |
| 30/22 51/9 52/20 61/20 72/4 | cases [6] 48/18 71/14 75/22 | 111/19 |
| 91/7 111/10 111/18 111/19 | 76/10 78/16 89/5 | citizens [2] 77/24 103/14 |
| 111/20 | category [4] 26/6 | civil [1] 99/ |
| businesses [2] 92/24 92/24 | 1/15 | claim [1] 43/13 |
| butcher [1] 4 | sation | claimed [2] 10/24 13/18 |
| button [2] 9/7 9/25 | cause [1] | claiming [1] 62/24 |
| by Dr [1] 70/2 | [2] | laims [6] 6/15 12 44/6 61/4 63/20 |
| C | cc [1] 107/16 | clarification [1] 66/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { cahoots [4] } \\ & 72 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | ```central [4] 5/24 68/1 79/12``` | $\begin{array}{\|ccccc\|} \hline \text { clarify }[7] & 7 / 4 & 37 / 16 & 46 / 4 \\ 65 / 22 & 66 / 22 & 81 / 22 & 106 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| alculation | Centre | clarifying [3] 22/19 68/3 |
| calendar [1] 85/8 | CEO [2] 58/18 59/7 <br> certain [6] 5/9 16/21 44/9 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { 71/16 } \\ \text { clarity [1] } & 6 / 20 \end{array}$ |
| called [3] 39/10 52/8 107/11 | certain [6] 5/9 16/21 44/9 $48 / 1 \quad 71 / 3 \quad 96 / 7$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l} \text { clarity [1] } \\ \text { class [2] } \end{array}\right. \text { 57/3 } 77 / 22 \end{array}$ |
| came [7] 47/8 52/9 56/24 <br> 83/25 99/13 104/4 104/22 | certainly [8] 23/13 34/3 | classic [2] 75/23 76/1 |
| /25 99/13 104/4 | 34/20 38/3 41/6 72/25 76/2 | clear [26] 4/1 4/17 10/2 |
| campaign [12] 48/12 58/3 | 98/9 | 15/3 17/21 20/1 22/13 25/ |
| 58/4 58/22 60/24 61/1 61/11 | certification [1] 63/6 | 29/19 29/24 32/25 33/8 33/10 |
| 61/13 61/16 62/16 112/12 | certification requirement [1] | 35/9 $38 / 7$ 40/11 $40 / 11144 / 17$ |
| 112/13 | 63/6 | $\begin{array}{llll}46 / 5 & 53 / 12 & 58 / 15 & 67 / 6 \\ 68 / 6\end{array}$ |
| can [80] 3/9 5/16 6/18 9/15 | certify [2] 63/8 cetera [2] 67/3 | 86/10 104/13 110/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}11 / 1 & 11 / 2 & 11 / 20 & 12 / 9 \\ 14 / 9 & 14 / 5\end{array}$ | CFR [1] 63/5 | $36 / 4$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 9 & 17 / 5 & 21 / 1 & 22 / 9 & 23 / 24\end{array}$ | chair [1] 59/7 | clerk [1] 94/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}24 / 5 & 26 / 24 & 31 / 8 & 31 / 22\end{array} 32 / 12$ | challenge [6] $42 / 6$ 50/15 | client [18] 50/11 51/7 51/8 |
| $3 / 2 \quad 38 / 5 \quad 41 / 12 \quad 41 / 20 \quad 43 / 3$ | 69/16 70/22 70/25 71/25 | 53/6 72/19 73/12 $73 / 24 \quad 77 / 9$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}43 / 7 & 43 / 9 & 45 / 14 & 46 / 21 & 47 / 18\end{array}$ | challenges [1] 9/9 | 88/12 91/11 91/11 95/6 95/19 |
| 47/18 $47 / 19$ 48/7 49/10 57/21 | challenging [2] 56/4 63/2 | 99/21 101/10 101/10 110/7 |
| 60/4 61/22 62/8 63/2 63/3 | chance [7] 39/3 40/15 64/4 | 110/17 |
| 63/14 64/15 64/18 65/3 65/22 | $66 / 10$ $66 / 15$ $77 / 14$ $77 / 15$ <br> change $[3]$ $33 / 12$ $33 / 12$ $89 / 6$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { client's [5] } \\ 93 / 19 \text { 95/6 } \end{array}$ |
| 68/2 69/17 70/15 70/17 71/13 | changed <br> [4] <br> 25/16 33/21 | clients [1] 48/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}72 / 12 & 72 / 16 & 73 / 6 & 73 / 8 & 74 / 10\end{array}$ | changed [4] 25/16 33/21 $33 / 21 \quad 109 / 15$ | closed [1] 61/3 |
| 74/13 80/2 80/9 80/25 81/8 | characterization [2] 99/23 | $\text { co [4] } 10 / 10 \quad 10 / 18 \quad 10 / 25$ |
| $83 / 983 / 9 ~ 83 / 14 ~ 83 / 15 ~ 89 / 8 ~$ $89 / 22 ~ 94 / 2195 / 10100 / 16$ | 100/9 | 11/6 |
| 89/22 94/21 95/10 100/16 | characterizations [3] 41/13 | co-defendant [4] 10/10 10/18 |
| 101/8 101/19 101/25 104/24 | 95/11 100/10 [3] | 10/25 11/6 |
| 106/4 107/10 107/24 | CHC [2] 9/8 10/2 | cofounder [1] 61/20 |


| C | concise [1] 10 | ts [1] 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { coincidentally [3] } \\ & 59 / 1161 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | concluded [2] 42/2 113/1 <br> conclusion [1] 101/7 | coordinate [1] 108/3 <br> coordinated [1] 58/21 |
| Cole [2] 2/10 38/23 | conclusively [1] 62/3 <br> conduct [6] 22/15 44/9 48/12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { copied [2] } \begin{array}{llll} 102 / 22 & 111 \\ \text { copy [5] } & 4 / 21 & 34 / 9 & 89 \end{array}, ~ \end{aligned}$ |
| colleague $36 / 19$ [3] 18/20 35/14 | 48/13 69/21 112/1 | 89/21 107/16 |
| colleagues [4] 16/22 32/18 | conducted [6] 20/8 20/9 22/5 | cordial [1] |
| 36/1 57/13 | 24/4 24/8 26/16 | correct [18] |
| colloquially | conducting [4] 20/9 26/1 | $32 / 2543 / 543 / 2044 / 744$ |
| colluding [1] | 38/9 38/10 | 45/10 45/12 46/24 46/25 50/8 |
| column [4] 94/5 94/1 | conference [6] 16/4 16 | 65/9 66/6 80/16 103/17 |
| 94/25 [4] | 24/2 25/13 33/23 | 103/18 113/3 |
| combinations | conferring [1] | correctly [1] |
| come [15] 4/8 30/14 44/22 | confers [1] | correspondence |
| 45/4 54/19 65/14 67/25 70/7 | confidential [12] | corroborate [1] 63/ |
| 77/19 84/11 91/14 105/19 | 44/23 45/2 45/3 45/4 83/ | cost [14] 7/10 7/24 7/ |
| 106/5 106/14 106/14 | 83/7 97/14 98/10 99/1 110/23 | $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 9 & 12 / 12 & 12 / 14 & 14 / 22 & 37 / 21\end{array}$ |
| comes [7] 32/14 45/5 59/14 | confirm <br> [1] <br> 47/4 | 98/14 |
| 64/10 64/10 64/17 106/13 | confirmed [1] 50/15 | costs [14] 37/24 53 |
| coming [5] 55/22 58/9 79/1 | confirming [1] 46/1 | 77/1 77/3 86/25 88/1 88/23 |
| 80/11 84/25 | conformity [2] | 89/9 89/9 99/19 108/20 |
| comment [2] 82/6 100/22 | Congress [3] 48/1 58/25 | 108/21 110/12 |
| comments [4] 29/17 52/6 | 96/10 [3] | ould [34] |
| 90/25 95/1 | Congressman [1] | 13/19 14/4 17/22 23/17 28/3 |
| committed [1] 40/19 | conjunction [1] | 28/4 $34 / 6 \quad 37 / 20 \quad 42 / 18 \quad 45 / 8$ |
| Committee [1] 61/10 | Connecticut [1] 87/15 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { 45/8 } & 47 / 11 & 50 / 4 & 54 / 25 & 55 / 15\end{array}$ |
| communicate [2] $41 / 23$ 102/25 | connection [5] 14/19 20/21 | 56/9 57/24 62/23 63/15 66/ |
| communicated [1] 99/10 | 27/13 84/1 94/9 | 68/22 75/14 78/4 84/5 93/7 |
| communicating [5] 62 | connector [1] | 101/9 102/13 104/7 104/10 |
| 85/18 108/12 108/13 111 | connectors [1] 54/2 | 108/19 110/19 |
| communication [5] 37/19 | consequences [2] 99/24 | counsel [19] 38/20 38/24 |
| 51/21 60/20 88/9 93/19 | $\text { consider [1] } 33 / 18$ | counsel $84 / 2 \quad 85 / 9 \quad 85 / 14 \quad 85 / 18 \quad 85 / 2$ |
| communications [21] 18/24 | considerable [1] 54/9 | 86/5 86/11 88/10 95/4 97/ |
| 32/16 $35 / 11$ 35/13 $36 / 6$ 52/21 | consideration [1] 41/14 | $97 / 25100 / 23101 / 1 \quad 101 / 14$ |
| 64/2 90/7 94/18 96/11 96/13 | considered [4] 33/22 | 107/12 108/3 112/14 |
| 96/15 97/23 98/4 98/10 98/11 | $41 / 1941 / 20$ | countenance [1] 27/14 |
| 102/21 103/7 103/14 107/19 | consistent [1] 92/1 | counter [1] 92/11 |
| 111/10 | conspiracy [2] 47/22 102/1 | country [1] 48/17 |
| community [4] 61/8 63/12 | conspiratorial [1] 47/17 | couple [10] 8/7 17/4 26/1 |
|  | construed [1] 90/10 | 36/15 37/16 66/17 85/19 |
| companies [2] company [11] | consumer [2] 10/4 10/1 | 100/7 101/13 110/20 |
| company [11] 10/16 $21 / 4$ | contacted [1] 82/13 | course [8] 9/8 21/3 24/8 |
| $36 / 21 ~ 72 / 7 \quad 73 / 25 ~ 75 / 25$ $76 / 6 \quad 87 / 4 \quad 87 / 8 \quad 99 / 22$ | contain [2] 25/14 65/6 | 24/18 34/20 87/14 93/5 93/8 |
| 76/6 87/4 87/8 | contains [1] 47/1 | COURT [52] 1/1 $2 / 13$ 4/3 5/17 |
| compared [1] 37/23 | contemplates [1] 100/ |  |
| comparison [1] 89/9 | contemplating [1] 29/16 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 22 / 5 & 25 / 17 & 25 / 21 & 27 / 13 & 27 / 14\end{array}$ |
| compel [1] 21/2 | content [4] 57/9 57/18 63/9 | 27/23 30/14 32/2 32/22 32/24 |
| compensated [2] 76/22 | 100/5 [4] | 33/7 41/6 41/7 50/13 50/20 |
| complaint [7] 12/20 12/25 | context [4] 81/23 88/6 97/12 | 70/15 $70 / 16 \quad 71 / 1$ |
| 44/11 46/8 48/16 48/17 67/4 | context [4] 88/19 | 85/18 86/15 86/19 87/14 |
| complaints [1] 44/14 | continually [2] 57/15 59/2 | $\begin{array}{llll} 85 / 18 & 86 / 15 & 86 / 19 & 87 / 14 \\ 87 / 16 & 87 / 16 & 87 / 18 & 89 / 12 \end{array}$ |
| completed [1] 45/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { continue [9] } & 23 / 20 & 30 / 2 & 30 / 2\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}89 / 22 & 89 / 25 & 90 / 13 & 93 / 22 & 94 / 4\end{array}$ |
| completely [3] 73/18 95/10 | 57/19 60/14 65/14 81/7 | 94/22 98/15 98/22 100/14 |
|  | 103/20 104/24 | 100/17 101/13 101/22 102/2 |
| mplied [1] | continued [1] 60/2 | 109/19 113/8 |
|  | continues [1] 59/16 | Court's [1] |
| component [2] 45/23 64/20 composition [1] 8/24 | continuing [3] 23/20 24/16 | cover [5] 86/25 99/19 100/3 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { composition [1] } & 8 / 24 & \\ \text { compounded [2] } & 91 / 25 & 92 / 6\end{array}$ |  | 110/12 110/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { compounded [2] } & 91 / 25 & 92 / 6 \\ \text { comprehend [1] } & 27 / 18 & \end{array}$ | contours [1] 98/8 | cover costs [1] 86/2 |
| comprehend [1] $27 / 18$ <br> compromise [4] $7 / 14$ | contract [4] 65/25 74/15 | coverage [1] 88/23 |
| compromise $8 / 10 \quad 89 / 12$ | 76/7 88/2 | covered [2] 87/5 110/1 |
| ncede [1] 91/14 | contracts [1] | covering [1] 89/8 |
| concern [1] 59/19 | contradict [2] 59/21 60/1 | reate [1] 12/16 |
| concerned [2] 98/14 109/8 | contrast [1] 78/7 | edibility [1] |
| concerns [2] 16/4 91/12 | control [3] 13/22 76/1 | critical [1] 42/19 |
| oncession [1] 45/17 | conversations [1] 91/17 | riticized [1] 60/2 |
|  | conversations [1] 91/17 | criticizes [1] 59/4 |


| C | December 14 [1] 18/15 | $31 / 8 \quad 31 / 11 \quad 32 / 6 \quad 32 / 17$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| criticizing [1] 68/8 | December 14th [1] 32/5 | 46/22 47/3 49/5 50/7 50/9 |
| cross [3] 3/6 3/9 42/21 | December 15th [1] 60/19 | $72 / 17$ 74/5 75/2 80 |
| cry [1] 108/7 | December 29th [1] 61/3 | 85/21 85/22 86/4 112/8 |
| crystal [1] 35/9 | December 30th [1] 61 | depositions [8] 18/1 18/ <br> 18/10 18/11 18/12 18/21 |
| crystalize [1] 66/18 | December 9th [1] 59/2 | $23 / 10 \quad 24 / 18$ |
| cull [2] 50/1 109/2 | decent [1] 98/18 | Depot [1] 9/6 |
| culled [1] 53/21 | deceptively [1] 9/15 | deprive [1] 22/2 |
| Cummings [2] 55/4 55/15 | Dechert [1] 1/23 | derivative [1] 69/19 |
| current [1] cursor [1] cul/21 | decide [2] 27/4 107/4 | describe [1] 41/9 |
| cursor [1] 94/17 <br> custodial [11] 17/ | decision [2] 8/22 41/15 | described [3] 34/3 46/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 23 / 2 & 23 / 5 & 25 / 8 & 25 / 10 & 25 / 19\end{array}$ | decisions [1] 12/3 | 67/8 |
| $34 / 19$ 35/1 36/23 51/25 | declaration [11] 19/23 | desiccant [18] 3/18 4/8 5 |
| custodian [2] 23/3 36/23 | 20/6 24/1 24/6 24/7 27/12 | 6/6 6/7 7/3 7/8 7/9 7/23 |
| custody [3] 106/22 107/23 | 8/19 31/22 $33 / 23$ 34/1 | 7/24 7/24 8/22 11/23 12/8 |
| 111/8 | declarations [2] 50/5 66/4 | 12/9 14/3 14/8 14/17 |
| cut [1] 112/10 | deemed [1] 73/ | desiccants [5] 5/13 5/21 6/3 |
| cycle [1] 84/9 | [1] 71/10 |  |
| D | defeat [1] | 13/24 |
| D.C | defendant [7] 10/10 10/18 | designate [1] 62/2 |
| damage [1] | 10/25 11/6 31/19 76/7 82/1 | designated [2] 35/6 |
| damages [1] 13/18 | DEFENDANTS [20] 1/22 7/7 | designation [2] 35/7 83/ |
| Daschle's [3] 47/25 58/4 | 17/24 38/18 38/25 39/8 41/ | designed [1] 51/ |
| 77/23 | $42 / 3$ 44/13 50/21 64/18 75/ | designee [7] 18/25 |
| data [9] 44/1 48/7 51/25 | 75/19 76/18 77/1 82/13 82/14 | 19/12 19/16 27/11 35/21 |
| 61/8 63/8 63/22 90/7 108/4 | 82/16 102/8 110/12 | 35/21 |
| 109/16 | Defendants' [2] 12/24 111/ | designing [1] |
| date [7] 19/11 29/4 92/10 | defending [1] 72/14 | espite [1] 6/1 |
| 92/12 92/15 93/3 113/6 | defense [5] 6/15 13/1 13/8 | detail [2] 89/4 102/5 |
| dates [1] 92/12 | 13/21 | determination |
| Daubert [1] 43/18 | [1] 13 | determine [2] 26/25 63/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { David [5] 54/17 58/17 58/18 } \\ & 67 / 1578 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { defenses [5] } & 12 / 2 \\ 48 / 22 & 48 / 22 \end{array}$ | ```determined [1] 62/3 develop [6] 33/17 38/4 38/5``` |
| day [23] 11/7 20/4 20/23 | degradation [4] 6/2 6/9 14/5 | 38/6 42/25 49/18 |
| 21/2 21/2 21/16 22/2 27/15 | 14/7 | developers [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 2 & 28 / 2 & 30 / 12 & 42 / 15 & 45 / 21\end{array}$ | degradation if [1] 14/5 | developing [1] 57/8 |
|  | degrees [2] 74/13 87/14 | development [4] 50/4 |
| 80/5 89/1 89/1 89/16 110/3 | delay [2] 57/12 106/3 | 21 103/13 |
| days [14] 17/25 18/2 18/10 | delays [1] 36/ | develops [1] |
| 18/16 19/15 20/24 21/12 23/9 | delimiter [2] 51/3 53/16 | diabetes [1] 51/15 |
| 28/6 28/8 30/22 31/3 31/4 | demand [2] 109/15 109/15 | Dictate [1] |
| 84/4 | demonstrate [1] 31/9 | dictated [1] 29/24 |
| de [16] 1/16 37/13 79/21 | demonstrative [7] 39/16 | did [50] 4/18 4/24 |
| 88/22 88/24 89/1 103/24 | 39/17 41/1 41/16 41/18 60/10 | 14/20 17/2 17/8 17/10 17/11 |
| 104/7 105/8 107/9 107/11 | 84/15 | 23/13 24/5 26/18 31/16 33/2 |
| 107/24 108/4 108/16 109/ | demonstratives [1] 54/20 | 33/14 36/7 37/2 37/11 38/4 |
| 110/13 | denied [2] 21/25 36/9 | 39/3 39/9 39/17 39/19 39/1 |
| de-duplicate [6] 79/21 | density [1] 5/22 | 39/22 40/1 40/23 40/24 42/13 |
| 107/9 107/11 108/4 109/16 | deny [1] 56/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}44 / 14 & 45 / 5 & 45 / 6 & 46 / 17 & 50 / 11\end{array}$ |
| de-duplicated [1] 107/24 | department [7] 18/14 20/10 | 50/23 51/13 55/17 62/2 76/20 |
| de-duplication [5] 88/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 18 & 35 / 18 & 36 / 2 & 36 / 3 & 36 / 3\end{array}$ | 77/9 77/10 81/24 87/6 91/15 |
| 88/24 89/1 105/8 110/13 | depend [1] 10/19 | 92/13 99/5 100/2 100/16 |
| de-duplication of [1] 108/16 | depends [1] 8/23 | 100/18 100/19 |
| deadline [4] 84/7 84/24 85/3 | deployed [1] 105/5 | didn't [17] 10/13 10/25 |
| 85/4 | deposed [8] 20/10 35/14 | 11/10 11/22 12/4 21/22 $26 / 9$ |
| deal [4] 3/22 4/5 109/25 | 35/16 36/2 36/8 37/20 38/5 | $30 / 15$ 35/21 37/6 39/11 51/17 |
| 110/5 | 96/12 | 68/8 83/2 100/6 102/3 105/7 |
| dealer [1] | deposition [59] 3/22 18/1 | difference [1] 108/23 |
| dealing [3] | 18/15 19/2 19/8 19/13 19/15 | different [9] 6/17 9/2 32/14 |
| 108/24 | 19/20 20/24 20/24 21/3 21/16 | 44/16 76/10 77/25 78/11 |
| deceive [1] $41 / 5$ | 22/2 22/10 23/7 23/13 23/15 | 81/12 105/11 |
| December [13] 18/15 18/17 | 23/21 24/10 24/19 24/20 | differently [1] 77/20 |
| 19/10 20/11 21/8 23/11 23/14 | 25/24 27/16 27/17 27/19 | difficult [8] 9/14 9/15 11/5 |
| 32/5 59/24 60/19 60/23 61/3 | 27/21 28/2 28/6 28/7 28/11 | 7/22 42/18 74/19 78/23 |
| 61/19 | 28/18 28/19 28/20 28/21 29/5 $30 / 3$ 30/13 30/23 30/23 31/6 | $80 / 10$ |


| D | $53 / 25 \text { 83/12 90/6 } 90$ | doubtful |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| digit [1] 86/11 | documentation [1] documents [81] | down [15] 8/1 34/12 45 |
| direct [7] 14/19 35/10 $36 / 2$ | $\begin{array}{cccll}\text { documents } \\ 18 / 16 & 18 / 20 & 18 / 24 & 19 / 5 & 19 / 13\end{array}$ | 62/23 63/14 73/10 79/20 |
| 56/23 57/7 65/4 67/22 | 19/17 19/18 19/22 $20 / 20$ | 94/21 102/4 109/2 |
| directing [1] 78/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 21 / 11 & 22 / 15 & 22 / 16 & 23 / 9 & 24 / 3\end{array}$ | Dr [17] 46/25 56/24 57/12 |
| direction [3] 48/2 78/25 | 25/1 25/4 25/6 26/4 35/5 | 59/18 61/4 62/2 67/10 67/15 |
| directly [6] 16/20 43/10 | 41/4 41/8 41/9 50/3 50/6 | 70/2 78/7 78/8 78/24 102/9 |
| 57/8 57/20 57/25 90/16 | 50/12 50/24 51/23 52/3 52/ | 102/10 102/22 103/14 111/10 |
| disagree [5] 41/8 41/12 | $52 / 15$ 52/16 52/18 53/18 | aft [1] 73/ |
| 57/17 72/3 95/10 | 9 53/21 56/7 62/20 62/20 | drafted [1] 7/19 |
| disagreeing [1] 24/14 | $\begin{array}{llll} 64 / 2 & 65 / 21 & 66 / 5 & 72 / 2 \\ 72 / 24 & 73 / 6 & 74 / 6 & 74 / 11 \end{array}$ | drafts [4] 90/23 90/25 94/23 |
| disagreement [1] 95/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll}74 / 17 & 74 / 20 & 74 / 21 & 74 / 24\end{array}$ | dragging |
| disappear [1] 45/14 | 79/22 $83 / 14$ 84/16 $87 / 12$ | draw [4] $38 / 3$ 45/7 65/3 |
| disappeared [1] 27/25 | 88/13 88/14 88/15 88/23 89/4 | 109/22 |
| disbarred [1] 72/9 | 90/7 91/19 91/20 93/7 94/8 | Drs [1] 69/24 |
| discern [1] $12 / 11$ | 94/18 96/16 96/18 96/24 97/4 | drug [9] $6 / 1$ |
| disclose [1] 63/8 | 97/17 98/1 101/11 101/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}7 / 7 & 14 / 15 & 14 / 16 & 44 / 23 & 51 / 14\end{array}$ |
| disclosed [2] 19/11 43/ | 102/8 102/18 103/4 104/11 | drugs [5] 5/11 5/20 6/21 |
| disclosing [1] | Dodge [4] 75/9 101/25 104/5 | 6/23 44/25 |
|  | 106 / 4 | drums [1] 99/22 |
| $14 / 9 \text { 16/4 16/7 21/6 22/6 }$ | does [18] 4/3 6/5 12/16 $23 / 5$ | dryer [1] 6/8 |
| 24/2 24/23 25/13 26/19 33/11 | 24/3 40/23 41/7 50/20 68/12 | drying [1] |
| 33/23 34/2 42/5 48/21 50/2 | 82/4 85/1 85/23 86/20 88/8 | due [3] 14/5 21 |
| 61/18 63/12 73/17 84/25 | 1/18 97/8 98/17 101/2 | duplicate [6] 79/21 104 |
| 103/23 103/25 108/20 | does or [1] 85/23 | 107/9 107/11 108/4 109/16 |
| discuss [3] 17/5 59/8 86/23 | doesn't [16] 8/20 11/12 22 | duplicated [1] |
| discussed [5] 6/14 79/9 | 33/16 35/23 40/17 45/9 50/25 | duplication [6] 88/22 88 |
| 102/19 111/14 111/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}68 / 21 & 71 / 4 & 72 / 13 & 72 / 14 & 86 / 9\end{array}$ | 89/1 105/8 108/16 110/13 |
| discussion [5] 3/11 33/25 | 6/17 103/23 103/24 | duplicative [7] 89/5 89/6 |
| 34/1 81/14 110/19 | dog [2] 43/2 43/ | 94/1 94/2 94/4 95/4 111/1 |
| discussions [1] 32/16 | doing [8] 9/24 23/25 | during [9] 5/11 7/21 21 |
| disinterested [3] 75/23 | 73/22 82/2 98/18 102/14 | 22/14 24/10 26/3 26/10 32/5 |
| 76/11 111/17 | 102/15 | 35 |
| disparate [1] 78/9 | dollar [2] 98/21 98/ | duty [5] 6/16 8/15 14/4 |
| disproportionate [1] 64/3 | dollars [17] |  |
| dispute [7] 4/25 24/13 26/19 |  | E |
| 73/1 99/4 99/23 102/8 | 93/16 96/21 100/9 100/18 | each [6] 4/17 9/22 12/3 33/9 |
| distinction [1] 76/16 | 109/12 110/2 | 40/14 40/21 |
| DISTRICT [2] 1/1 1/1 | don't [80] 3/1 8/12 $10 / 11$ | earlier [6] 30/19 40/11 68/3 |
| dive [2] 71/10 81/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 10/12 } & 11 / 1 & 11 / 4 & 12 / 10 & 14 / 14\end{array}$ | 81/23 82/18 86/4 |
| divested [2] 9/8 10/5 | 16/10 16/16 21/23 22/24 30/6 | early [2] 23/10 30/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { division [2] } & 1 / 2 & 109 / 11 \\ \text { do [85] } & 3 / 19 & 4 / 2 & 7 / 12\end{array}$ |  | easily [1] 28/4 |
| do [85] 3/19 4/2 $7 / 12$ 7/17 | $40 / 13 \quad 40 / 20 \quad 40 / 20 \quad 41 / 2 \quad 41 / 5$ | easy [2] 9/6 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}8 / 12 & 9 / 3 \\ 12 / 4 & 10 / 20 ~ 10 / 23 ~ 11 / 20 ~\end{array}$ | $43 / 2 \quad 43 / 3 \quad 43 / 3 \quad 44 / 19$ | economic [2] 42/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 4 & 12 / 13 & 14 / 12 & 14 / 21 & 14 / 22 \\ 16 / 16 & 16 / 25 & 22 / 25 & 26 / 9 & 29 / 3\end{array}$ | $46 / 11 \quad 51 / 10 \quad 54 / 12 \quad 55 / 1$ | eDiscovery <br> [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 16 & 16 / 25 & 22 / 25 & 26 / 9 & 29 / 3 \\ 36 / 23 & 40 / 19 & 40 / 20 & 43 / 24\end{array}$ | $55 / 1455 / 2056 / 6 \text { 60/18 61/18 }$ | edits [2] 90/25 95/1 |
| 36/23 40/19 40/20 43/24 | $63 / 10 \text { 64/5 64/13 65/4 67/17 }$ | educate [4] 19/1 19/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}45 / 22 & 45 / 22 & 48 / 6 & 49 / 23 & 52 / 17\end{array}$ | $67 / 18 \quad 67 / 22 \quad 68 / 268 / 22 \quad 68 / 25$ | $20 / 19$ |
| 52/18 $52 / 19$ 52/21 $53 / 5$ 55/6 | $69 / 13 \text { 71/8 71/9 71/9 71/17 }$ | educated [1] |
| 64/23 68/25 69/3 69/18 70/12 | $72 / 9 \quad 72 / 19 \quad 73 / 21 \quad 73 / 22 \quad 76 / 14$ | effectively [1] 41 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}72 / 22 & 73 / 19 & 73 / 22 & 74 / 4 & 74 / 4\end{array}$ | $77 / 23 \quad 78 / 15 \quad 78 / 20 \quad 79 / 12$ | efficient <br> [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}74 / 10 & 74 / 14 & 74 / 22 & 75 / 14\end{array}$ | 84/17 $86 / 13$ 92/2 96/3 98/8 | effort [3] 53/7 59/14 92/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}76 / 16 & 76 / 20 & 76 / 25 & 78 / 23 & 79 / 6\end{array}$ | 100/1 100/11 100/20 103/25 | efforts [5] 12/10 18/1 92/16 |
| 80/6 80/23 80/25 81/3 81/3 | 104/19 104/24 104/25 105/16 | 102/19 105/4 |
| 81/3 81/5 81/8 83/5 83/20 | 105/17 108/18 109/24 110/6 |  |
| 84/17 84/21 85/17 87/18 | 110/17 111/13 | $40 / 25 \quad 43 / 1 \quad 49 / 20 \quad 54 / 2 \quad 54 / 21$ |
| 88/24 89/7 93/8 97/21 97/22 | done [17] 11/21 28/9 50/19 | 63/15 $66 / 9 \quad 68 / 15 \quad 69 / 18 \quad 77 / 13$ |
| 98/20 98/23 99/14 99/18 | 66/1 $70 / 10 \quad 70 / 19$ 70/24 $72 / 15$ | 77/17 79/17 80/22 82/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}102 / 15 & 104 / 10 & 104 / 19 & 104 / 19 \\ 106 / 24 & 107 / 3 & 107 / 6 & 108 / 21\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}73 / 16 & 74 / 14 & 79 / 3 & 79 / 20 & 80 / 2\end{array}$ | 86/21 87/13 88/3 95/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 106 / 24 ~ 107 / 3 ~ 107 / 6 ~ 108 / 21 \\ & 109 / 13 ~ 109 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | 81/18 83/23 85/1 104/20 | 108/25 109/1 109/16 110/14 |
|  | door [1] 25/4 | 111/23 |
|  | doors [1] 61/4 | Egan's [8] 53/23 54/6 62/19 |
| doctrine [1] 97/ | dose [1] 5/21 | 64/3 64/7 66/4 68/12 78/1 |
|  | double [1] 87/22 | either [9] 4/24 24/19 49/24 |
| document [7] 21/8 $39 / 7$ 39/9 | doubt [1] 16/24 | 65/21 71/18 73/9 83/21 84/7 |


| E | essentially [4] 42/10 81/24 | expand [2] 64/24 105/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| either... [1] 104/15 | es | expect [1] 112/18 |
| electronically [2] 39/10 | estate [1] 91/8 | expectation $[1]$ expense [1] $87 / 4$ |
| 51/25 | estimate [1] 91/2 | expensively [1] 66/1 |
| else [10] 11/6 28/22 31/14 | estimates [1] 87/12 | experience [1] 85/14 |
|  | et [2] 67/3 90/16 | expert [25] 9/21 19/12 27/12 |
| 57/13 71/22 | etc [3] 40/24 | 27/14 28/19 28/20 |
| elsewhere [1] | ethically [1] 69/1 | 44/4 49/11 $49 / 13$ 49/13 53/10 |
| elucidate [1] 95/13 | eve [1] 23/20 | 53/12 56/18 69/9 69/10 73/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { email [17] } & 15 / 18 & 16 / 6 & 17 / 7\end{array}$ | even [15] 9/3 9/5 9/14 23/20 | $74 / 1$ 75/21 81/25 82/1 82/1 |
| 27/13 27/25 34/8 37/2 37/18 | 29/3 37/14 67/3 73/18 79/21) | 82/4 82/4 |
| 40/18 51/24 52/10 61/21 | $88 / 20$ $98 / 24$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { expertise [1] } 46 / 16 \\ \text { experts [6] } & 43 / 18 & 43 / 23 & 49 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| 68/19 68/24 84/1 91/16 111/7 | ever [2] 48/8 84/10 | 66/25 70/25 82/3 |
| emailed [1] 85/20 <br> emailing [1] 67/15 | every [8] 7/2 11/6 48/7 88/8 | explain [3] 44/8 45/5 85/15 |
| $\text { emails [38] } 3 / 21 \text { 16/23 } 17 / 4$ | 90/10 91/15 93/19 98/21 | explains [1] 97/12 |
| 18/5 21/5 21/20 22/3 25/10 | everybody [4] 15/17 47/19 | explanation [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 25/14 } & 25 / 19 & 27 / 22 \quad 27 / 24\end{array}$ | 66/15 112/23 | explore [2] 50/21 72/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 21 & 32 / 22 & 33 / 14 & 34 / 1 & 34 / 3\end{array}$ | everyone [2] | expose [1] 49/1 |
| 34/6 34/19 34/21 35/10 35/22 | everything [19] 3/13 17/13 | exposing [1] 100/13 |
| 35/23 36/18 36/20 36/25 37/5 | 17/19 48/5 52/7 71/24 77/7 | expressed [1] 16/4 |
| 37/11 $38 / 2$ 40/13 $40 / 14$ 40/20 | 89/13 90/12 91/15 98/12 | extensive [1] 25/18 |
| 40/21 52/2 52/3 54/21 59/18 | 01/8 104/15 105/1 105/10 | extent [11] 14/25 15/6 20/8 |
| 64/6 | 105/12 105/24 107/4 108/8 | 20/21 22/16 41/7 50/20 66/2 |
| emblematic | evidence [31] 14/2 14/6 | 100/12 107/18 110/3 |
| Emery [11] 4/2 4/4 49/5 | 26/25 37/10 41/17 41/19 | extra [1] 15/8 |
| 49/16 56/17 56/19 58/10 | 43/12 50/1 50/14 54/22 63/17 | extraordinary [1] 36/ |
| 58/10 60/2 60/19 60/20 | 64/6 64/6 65/3 65/4 65/7 | extreme [1] 104/ |
| Emery's [1] 56/14 | 66/11 67/1 $67 / 22$ 68/13 68/14 | extremely [2] 49/11 86/24 |
| emphasize [2] 11/14 51/8 | $95 / 17 \text { 100/11 } 100 / 11 \quad 1$ | F |
| employee [5] 18/4 34/8 34/9 34/11 43/22 | 103/11 | face [3] 9/6 9/25 69/8 |
| employees | evidentiary [1] 103/21 | facie [1] |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { employees } \\ 30 / 22 \quad 32 / 1 \end{gathered}$ | exact [1] 34/3 | fact [21] 9/7 9/20 10/15 |
| encourage [1] 112/16 | exactly [4] 6/24 7/4 48/2 | 12/4 14/20 23/19 25/7 26/23 |
| end [7] 32/20 84/25 91/18 | 101/18 [10] 6/24 15/2 67/15 | 27/19 $30 / 4 \quad 34 / 13$ 44/12 $56 / 9$ |
| 92/13 106/14 106/15 112/19 | example [10] 6/24 15/2 67/15 | 63/23 76/20 78/10 78/17 |
| ends [2] 47/3 91/19 | 8/18 70/3 90/9 90/23 100/24 | 88/10 92/6 93/18 101/1 |
| energy [1] 59/15 | 02/25 104/ | facto [1] 103 |
| enforce [1] 51/12 | examples [1] 6/24 | factor [1] 64/20 |
| engaged [3] 47/16 70/12 | exceedingly [1] 85/13 | factors [3] 38/8 65/1 79/3 |
| 112/1 [3] | except [3] 21/24 50/18 100/7 | facts [6] 33/12 33/21 40/4 |
| engineer [1] | excerpts [1] 90/1 | 48/14 79/24 |
| enough [4] 3 | exchanged [1] 36/19 | factual [2] 41/17 50/ |
| 72/8 | exchanges [1] 34/8 | failure [3] 62/6 93/12 93/ |
| enter [1] | excipients [1] 8/25 | fair [4] 21/5 22/4 65/8 |
| entered [3] 18/5 | exclude [2] 56/4 58/10 | 84/12 |
| entertain [3] 31/10 89/12 | excluded [1] 54/1 | fairly [1] 82/10 |
|  | excuse [4] 85/6 85/24 106/9 | faith [4] 17/22 21/14 85/ |
| entire [2] 9/8 10/6 |  | fall [2] |
| entirely [2] 50/17 62/4 | exemplar [8] 7/7 9/17 9/19 | falls [1] 86/18 |
| entirety [3] 73/5 86/15 | expor $12 / 11$ $14 / 15$ <br> $14 / 19$ $14 / 25$  | false [2] 59/22 60/1 |
|  | exercise [4] 15/10 38/1 | falsify [2] 47/20 48/6 |
| $103 / 7$ | 73/17 88/18 | far [9] 64/1 66/2 73/4 74/6 |
|  | exhibit [10] 18/7 57/24 | 75/20 98/14 103/6 103/19 |
|  | 57/25 57/25 62/18 64/7 64/11 | 108/7 |
| equate [1] | 68/18 74/8 77/1 | farther [1] 72/1 |
| equitable [1] 22/ | exhibits [14] 32/5 32/7 | favor [2] 41/6 87/6 |
| equities [3] 75/12 | 32/12 32/15 35/25 39/11 | FDA [20] 48/1 56/16 57/15 |
| 76/25 [3] | 39/13 39/24 40/2 40/10 57/20 | 58/3 59/1 59/4 59/10 59/18 |
| error [1] | 68/7 71/2 84/15 | 60/22 61/1 61/17 62/5 63/4 |
| Eshoo [1] 58/24 | exist [2] 9/12 26/ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}63 / 11 & 63 / 11 & 67 / 9 & 67 / 13 & 79 / 13\end{array}$ |
| especially [1] 99/14 | existed [1] 21/8 | 90/24 94/23 |
| ESQ $[8]$ $1 / 11$ $1 / 15$ $1 / 19$ $1 / 22$ <br> $2 / 1$ $2 / 4$ $2 / 7$ $2 / 10$   | existence [1] 20/3 existing [1] 13/4 | FDA's [3] 59/19 59/25 78/12 <br> feared [1] 59/25 |


| F | 79/1 | further [13] 31/16 39/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| February [6] $50 / 8$ $74 / 12$ <br> $74 / 23$ $74 / 24$ $80 / 12$ <br> $80 / 14$   | flaws [2] 56/24 $57 / 6$ [1] 56/24 flaws in [1] | $50 / 2$ 50/21 59/16 63/14 66/8 66/12 66/13 72/12 81/14 |
| February 10th [3] 74/12 | Florian [1] 78/13 | 91/25 92/4 |
| $80 / 1280 / 14$ | FLORIDA [2] 1/1 58/19 | furtherance [1] 102/15 |
| Federal [2] 59/8 113/7 | fluid [1] 47/7 | future [2] 81/16 81/17 |
| feedback [1] 102/1 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { focus [4] } & 12 / 6 & 72 / 4\end{array}$ | G |
| feels [2] 73/23 | 79/14 | GA [2] 1/ |
| $77 / 4 \quad 77 / 22 \quad 78 / 481 / 16 \quad 81 / 16$ | focused [1] 50/23 | game [1] 10/2 |
| 86/16 86/25 87/1 $87 / 5$ 87/9 | focuses [1] 77/18 | garbage [1] |
| 88/1 88/23 89/10 93/23 98/14 | focusing [1] 11/15 | Garcia [1] |
| 99/15 99/19 110/18 | fold [1] 101/8 | gas [1] 47/ |
| fees and [1] 87/9 | follow [3] 63/1 108/19 109/4 | gave [5] 16/14 3 |
| fell [1] 19/10 | followed [2] 16/13 24/17 | $84 / 2 \quad 84 / 3$ |
| female [2] 35/14 36/19 | followup [2] $26 / 1$ 60/24 | general [2] |
| Ferguson [1] $1 / 15$ few [8] 22/23 $22 / 24 \quad 23 / 13$ | force [1] 98/15 | generalize [1] |
| 75/18 86/22 93/25 96/8 97/2 | forced [1] 27/18 | generally [6] 13/ |
| field [1] 13/14 | forcefully [1] | 54/16 67/1 |
| fight [3] 43/2 43/8 91/22 | foregoing [1] 113/3 | generated [1] 5 |
| figure [1] 12/14 | foremost [1] 102 | generic [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { file }[4] \\ 83 / 13 \end{array} \quad 23 / 5 \quad 36 / 23 \quad 48 / 16$ | form [2] 5/21 | gentleman [10] 18/13 |
| filed [12] 3/9 12/25 19/23 | form that [1] 5/21 | 32/4 32/17 35/14 35/16 35/ |
| 49/9 50/13 51/10 56/13 58/14 | formal [2] 18/21 29 | $36 / 1$ 36/3 36/8 |
| 70/11 75/5 83/12 89/23 | formation [1] 6/2 | gentleman's [1] |
| files [9] 17/25 18/2 23/2 | formed [1] | gentlemen [ |
| 25/8 25/10 $35 / 1$ 52/1 $58 / 17$ | forms [1] | $10 / 24 \quad 11 / 21 \quad 12 / 13 \quad 2$ |
| 88/11 $\begin{aligned} & \text { filing [3] } 48 / 13 \text { 59/3 110/18 }\end{aligned}$ | formulating [1] 13/ | 28/3 28/12 31/8 40/9 46/6 |
| filing [3] final [3] | formulation [3] 9/1 12/4 | 47/10 48/10 52/23 53/4 53/5 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { final [3] } & \text { 9/16 } & 27 / 8 & 68 / 15 \\ \text { finalizing [1] } & 29 / 2 & \end{array}$ | 12/14 | 55/8 60/17 62/9 63/19 64/20 |
| finalizing [1] 29/2 | formulations [1] 9/2 | 65/5 66/22 67/3 67/5 68/2 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { final] } \\ 85 / 8 \end{gathered}$ | forth [5] 17/7 18/22 22/8 | 68/4 69/13 $70 / 21 \quad 71 / 10 \quad 73 / 10$ |
| Finance [1] | 40/14 54/21 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}74 / 14 & 74 / 24 & 75 / 10 & 76 / 8 & 76 / 14\end{array}$ |
| financial [3] 99/2 | fortune [2] | $78 / 4$ 79/24 79/25 80/ |
| 103/8 | forward [12] 18/18 26/19 | 81/10 83/16 83/23 85/1 85/25 |
| find [11] 7/25 11/5 14/12 | $44 / 20$ 58/5 63/3 63/21 63/21 | 86/5 86/24 87/18 89/3 90/4 |
| 15/10 37/17 38/8 81/9 82/12 | $76 / 24$ 78/17 80/9 89/13 98/14 | 90/5 90/18 92/17 96/6 99/12 |
| 88/2 95/24 102/14 | found [7] 4/2 13/1 25/11 | 102/4 102/5 104/25 106/16 |
| finding [2] 37/21 38/7 | 37/23 37/24 58/25 103/19 | 106/17 109/15 110/2 110/5 |
| findings [2] 61/23 61/24 | four [4] 3/16 16/21 31/4 | 110/16 110/16 112/10 112/1 |
| fine [8] 40/6 53/10 69/12 | $4 / 4$ | 112/1 |
| 73/7 74/7 75/7 99/10 106/12 | frame [2] 17/20 36/1 <br> framework [1] 97/7 | gets [4] 8/1 70/23 87/4 92/8 getting [10] 54/11 55/23 |
| finish [5] 23/14 65/10 66/16 | framing <br> [1] <br> 9/14 | 64/19 69/5 72/9 81/14 82/10 |
| 71/21 110/9 | Frank [5] 54/7 54/7 77/23 | 87/8 99/13 110/4 |
| finished [1] 5/21 | Frank $97 / 24$ | GILBERT [40] $1 / 15$ 1/16 $15 / 19$ |
| firm [7] 51/11 54/6 62/19 74/22 78/1 98/2 103/1 | frankly [3] 21/7 91/12 | 15/22 16/10 16/14 16/16 |
| firms [5] 62/17 72/3 82/16 | 105/17 free [3] 38/3 38/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 16 / 25 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 14 & 17 / 17 & 22 / 12 \\ 22 / 24 & 23 / 1 & 23 / 3 & 26 / 2 & 26 / 24 \end{array}$ |
| 92/23 112/3 | Friday [2] 21/15 112/19 | $\begin{array}{llll}27 / 7 & 28 / 5 & 28 / 14 & 28 / 22 ~ 29 / 1\end{array}$ |
| first [28] 3/17 3/19 4/7 8/9 | friend [1] 87/7 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 29 / 18 & 30 / 10 & 30 / 24 & 31 / 2 & 31 / 7\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 9 & 17 / 15 & 17 / 24 & 18 / 10 \\ 18 / 18 / 11\end{array}$ | front [5] 40/16 81/1 $92 / 17$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 16 & 33 / 24 & 34 / 3 & 35 / 3 & 36 / 14\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 18 / 12 & 19 / 11 & 20 / 2 & 23 / 1 & 23 / 9 \\ 27 / 16 & 29 / 1 & 29 / 9 & 37 / 16 & 45 / 19 \end{array}$ | 99/2 106/12 | 36/16 $36 / 25$ 37/11 $37 / 19$ 38/2 |
| 27/16 29/1 29/9 37/16 45/19 <br> 55/18 57/11 58/17 83/8 83/24 | frustrated [1] 11/10 | 43/9 83/1 83/24 |
| $89 / 2 \quad 100 / 16 \quad 102 / 20 \quad 107 / 14$ | Ft [1] 2/14 | Gilbert's [1] 84/2 |
| fishing [1] 90/20 | fulfill [1] 103/25 | gin [1] 47/17 |
| fit [1] 86/9 | fulfilling [1] 102/18 | gingerly [1] |
| fits [1] 86/9 | full [5] 7/18 49/24 89/10 | ginned [1] 48/23 |
| five [12] 16/19 30/22 55/9 | 89/11 90/12 | ginning [1] 82/23 |
| 85/19 89/1 89/16 89/17 90/17 | fully [9] $24 / 21$ 29/4 41/4 | give [22] 11/3 28/5 28/7 |
| 93/24 99/21 105/14 106/10 | 41/8 42/9 42/24 49/17 83/15 | 28/11 31/2 33/16 64/4 66/ |
| FL [4] $1 / 5 \quad 1 / 17 \quad 2 / 9 \quad 2 / 14$ flaw [1] 61/8 | function [2] 13/25 51/9 | $101 / 8 \quad 101 / 17 \quad 104 / 23 \quad 105 / 9$ |
| flawed [4] 49/8 49/8 49/16 | fund [3] 55/21 76/13 102/23 | 105/23 105/25 106/19 106/21 |
| flawed [4] 49/8 49/8 49/16 | funding [3] 56/23 91/4 94/8 | 108/8 |


| G |
| :---: |
| given [8] $24 / 15$ 36/12 $45 / 17$ |
| 53/2 71/25 87/2 92/11 112/20 |
| giving [2] 82/21 104/22 |
| glad [2] 72/22 82/20 |
| Glaxo [2] 109/10 109/12 |
| GlaxoSmithKline [1] 109/9 |
| GlaxoSmithKline's [1] 86/7 |
| Glazier [1] 77/25 |
| glitch [1] 30/16 |
| gmail [2] 103/3 111/6 |
| go [40] 6/22 7/2 9/8 12/17 |
| 16/2 17/15 26/24 27/7 37/25 |
| 38/1 39/4 40/1 42/9 53/9 |
| 55/11 55/13 57/10 57/24 |
| 63/14 66/12 68/7 68/11 70/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}71 / 17 & 72 / 9 & 72 / 13 & 72 / 14 & 74 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 80/5 88/18 92/4 93/4 94/10 |
| 98/20 98/23 100/6 103/9 |
| 107/14 110/8 110/15 |

go further [1] 63/14
goal [1] 6/4
goes [6] 6/14 8/2 $12 / 22$ 14/2 69/3 70/20
going [77] $3 / 7$ 9/9 11/4 12/10 14/11 16/15 16/16 16/25 19/12 23/20 26/19 26/22 27/22 28/11 30/19 $30 / 20$ 31/1 31/15 37/13 37/22 37/23 40/22 43/17 43/18 $\begin{array}{llllll} & 43 / 23 & 44 / 3 & 44 / 5 & 44 / 19 & 45 / 1\end{array}$ 45/3 $45 / 4 \quad 45 / 18 \quad 46 / 2 \quad 47 / 5$ 48/8 49/17 $53 / 4$ 53/7 $56 / 1$ 56/3 63/21 66/9 66/14 69/15 69/20 73/15 73/17 74/3 74/19 76/8 76/24 80/17 81/10 83/19 83/20 84/8 84/9 84/24 86/5 88/5 89/13 97/3 97/21 98/14 98/15 100/3 102/24 104/15 104/16 104/22 105/20 106/14 106/15 106/16 108/5 109/17 111/3
gone [4] 25/4 34/23 82/9 88/13
good [31] $3 / 1 \quad 4 / 11 \quad 4 / 13 \quad 4 / 15$ 15/11 15/16 15/18 15/21 $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 23 & 17 / 22 & 21 / 14 & 22 / 21\end{array}$ 38/22 38/24 39/1 $39 / 3 \quad 42 / 12$ 55/12 63/9 79/20 81/11 85/4 85/10 87/25 92/16 95/8 99/17 101/12 107/14 109/12 112/24
Google [1] 51/19
got [12] 11/22 21/22 39/5 40/17 51/2 69/12 79/11 79/11 82/8 86/3 92/19 109/24
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { gotten [6] } & 34 / 23 & 72 / 23 & 76 / 13\end{array}$ 76/13 79/18 110/3
graduated [1] 92/22
grand [1] 93/16
grant [1] 86/15
great [5] 7/14 17/14 55/4 79/8 110/15
Gregory [4] 54/7 54/7 77/23 97/24
grounds [3] 14/12 42/7 54/4 group [3] 47/25 58/4 77/23 GSK [17] 3/5 38/18 $39 / 2$ 39/9
$39 / 15$ 85/19 85/24 86/1 86/2 88/4 88/7 89/2 90/19 92/9 93/21 99/19 101/18
GSK's [4] 87/11 87/20 $93 / 13$ 94/5
guardrails [1] 63/5
guess [1] 102/11
guy [1] 87/6

## H

had [49] 10/24 12/9 14/17 14/21 15/4 20/8 20/15 21/25 25/10 25/18 26/17 28/14 29/18 $33 / 2234 / 2 \quad 34 / 12 \quad 34 / 14$ 34/21 36/22 40/5 40/15 44/22 46/9 49/3 53/23 54/4 54/6 57/24 58/9 66/10 66/12 67/13 70/14 75/5 75/18 75/25 76/14 77/14 78/5 84/13 84/19 96/11 100/22 101/1 104/8 110/2 110/5 110/15 110/19
hadn't [1] 33/15
half [4] $4 / 21 \quad 31 / 3 \quad 31 / 4 \quad 78 / 3$
hand [5] 80/21 81/20 82/12 83/24 97/20
handed [1] 93/7
handle [1] 99/4
handled [2] 50/4 66/2
hands [1] 30/13
handwritten [1] 29/23
happen [2] 44/14 74/12
happened [6] 44/12 44/13
45/2 60/21 70/9 70/13
happening [1] 62/11
happens [1] 109/21
happily [1] 34/17
happy [5] 25/20 33/17 64/21 79/2 79/6
hard [4] 62/8 105/10 105/24 105/25
harm [3] 6/9 13/24 26/23
Harris [3] 75/25 76/4 76/6
has [93] 4/3 5/12 6/15 8/9
8/18 $14 / 4 \quad 14 / 15 \quad 14 / 19 \quad 15 / 12$ 22/5 23/4 23/12 24/8 25/1 25/3 25/9 25/16 26/16 27/12 $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 3 & 29 / 15 & 30 / 2 & 30 / 5 & 30 / 9\end{array}$ 32/24 34/14 34/25 41/25 52/5 52/6 53/4 54/9 65/11 66/1 66/15 66/19 66/20 67/20 69/23 70/21 71/16 72/7 72/19 73/19 74/2 $76 / 19 \quad 78 / 6 \quad 78 / 7$ 78/8 78/8 79/17 79/22 85/13 85/13 86/22 88/7 88/11 88/13 88/19 89/15 90/3 90/13 91/4 92/6 92/10 92/15 92/22 92/23 96/15 99/7 99/16 99/18 99/19 100/2 101/1 101/10 102/20 103/6 103/9 103/14 106/6 106/14 106/22 106/22 107/16 108/11 108/16 108/17 108/22 109/1 109/13 109/15 111/8
has met [1] 96/15
hash [1] 107/11
hasn't [3] 33/21 70/9 70/13
have [261]
haven't [16] 12/21 21/13
21/24 33/21 35/2 68/23 70/19

76/8 79/3 79/9 90/18 102/11 103/21 107/2 107/5 108/11
having [10] 10/23 31/9 35/17 37/14 37/25 41/10 52/18 76/11 91/17 107/18
Haystack [1] 52/9
HDP [5] 5/22 5/22 6/3 6/6 7/8
he [85] 16/15 16/16 23/1 28/14 28/23 28/24 29/19 $\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 25 & 34 / 4 & 34 / 5 & 35 / 17 & 36 / 18\end{array}$ 36/20 37/4 37/5 38/3 $38 / 4$ $\begin{array}{lllllllll}38 / 4 & 38 / 5 & 38 / 5 & 44 / 25 & 52 / 5\end{array}$ 52/6 56/8 56/9 59/6 59/25 62/3 63/18 64/8 68/16 69/11 $\begin{array}{lllll}70 / 3 & 72 / 18 & 74 / 2 & 74 / 2 & 74 / 4\end{array}$ 85/14 87/4 87/5 87/6 87/8 88/9 88/10 88/12 88/16 91/16 91/16 91/17 92/22 92/22 92/23 92/25 93/14 96/11 96/15 96/25 99/8 99/9 99/23
100/2 100/2 100/3 100/3 101/2 102/13 102/23 102/25 103/13 103/14 103/15 107/1 107/2 107/3 107/4 107/17 108/12 108/13 111/6 111/7 111/8 112/1 112/1 112/4 112/6
he's [1] $86 / 11$
head [3] 48/1 82/19 100/25
health [1] 10/5
hear [10] $33 / 8 \quad 33 / 18 \quad 40 / 25$ 48/8 48/12 68/6 79/7 80/22 104/24 105/22
heard [14] 20/3 29/22 31/16 31/18 37/15 53/2 67/5 70/4 70/5 77/14 81/23 95/22 96/7 100/8
hearing [16] $1 / 9 \quad 3 / 7 \quad 3 / 9 \quad 4 / 6$ 4/19 20/5 20/15 21/21 21/23 29/1 35/19 46/14 83/15 85/20 107/6 113/1
hearings [1] 3/15
heat [1] 5/25
heating [2] 56/21 71/3
help [1] 36/17
helped [1] 67/20
helpful [14] 40/4 46/4 54/25 55/2 55/3 70/16 71/12 71/15 79/4 84/6 84/18 84/20 94/15 101/16
her [30] 18/20 22/1 22/1 23/13 23/15 24/7 24/10 24/16 24/16 25/11 25/22 26/11 26/12 27/11 27/11 27/15 27/16 28/2 28/7 28/10 28/10 28/19 30/4 30/12 30/13 30/21 31/21 34/14 34/20 36/24
here [74] 7/14 16/7 16/19 18/5 18/22 19/21 21/15 23/5 24/13 24/15 25/5 25/15 26/19 27/20 29/6 33/22 34/8 34/24 $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 2 & 37 / 10 & 40 / 15 & 40 / 17 & 41 / 25\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll} & 42 / 5 & 42 / 10 & 45 / 18 & 48 / 19\end{array} 48 / 21$ 53/4 53/8 55/18 56/6 56/14 57/11 57/18 69/7 69/12 70/8 $\begin{array}{lllll}71 / 10 & 73 / 23 & 74 / 13 & 74 / 16 & 75 / 5\end{array}$ $76 / 9$ 77/17 82/10 82/16 83/1


## I

intended [3] 13/25 15/1 41/5
intending [1] 43/11
intends [1] 85/21
interaction [1] 6/10
interest [3] 50/20 76/11 94/6
interested [1] 87/17
interesting [1] 79/19
interfere [2] 59/21 59/25
interim [1] 83/13
internal [7] 61/20 61/21 64/2 64/2 74/22 77/9 77/11
internet [1] 58/25
interrogatories [2] 8/10 50/5
interrogatory [12] 3/17 4/8 4/22 5/13 6/12 7/11 7/19 $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 13 & 14 / 14 & 14 / 24 & 15 / 8 & 15 / 11\end{array}$
interrogatory and [1] 15/11
interrupting [1] 29/7
intervening [1] 25/17
interview [2] 26/16 30/15
interviewed [3] 20/17 21/18 26/24
interviews [17] 20/9 20/18 20/21 22/15 22/16 24/4 24/5 24/8 26/3 26/4 26/10 27/6 28/24 29/14 30/4 30/6 30/21
introduce [3] 44/4 44/5 45/1
investigate [1] 34/22
investigation [6] 24/9 25/11
26/13 34/14 34/21 59/25
investigations [1] 73/20
investment [4] 59/7 64/9
64/11 68/25
investments [5] 59/13 68/20 68/21 75/18 75/19
investor [2] 86/12 87/6
investors [3] 52/18 69/20 103/16
invite [1] 95/19
invites [1] 91/22
invoice [4] 99/5 109/6 109/6 109/8
invoice over [1] 109/6
involve [1] 36/8
involved [12] 12/15 51/7 59/12 59/20 82/16 86/5 99/22 102/20 102/23 103/12 103/13 103/15
involvement [6] 36/22 37/6 57/2 57/7 97/18 97/18
involving [3] 37/19 56/17 57/11
irrelevant [2] 9/4 90/20
irrespective [1] 91/5
is [669]
is a [1] 64/8
isn't [7] 9/7 9/25 11/25 70/8 71/9 111/4 111/17
issue [44] 3/20 $3 / 22 \quad 3 / 23$ 4/8 4/20 5/7 8/11 13/3 13/7 $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 11 & 15 / 4 & 15 / 5 & 15 / 12 & 15 / 14\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 18 & 15 / 18 & 16 / 19 & 18 / 5 & 18 / 22\end{array}$ 23/23 25/5 27/3 28/12 29/18 31/12 34/15 36/24 37/1 53/23
$\begin{array}{lllll}54 / 1 & 73 / 1 & 77 / 14 & 80 / 1 & 83 / 2\end{array}$ 83/25 84/2 92/3 99/3 110/22 110/23 110/25 111/14 112/5 112/22
issued [1] 38/17
issues [21] 3/10 8/13 11/16 16/6 21/4 27/13 34/22 37/20 47/12 52/15 64/8 69/4 74/16 81/8 88/25 92/1 92/5 95/20 95/21 95/23 110/20
issuing [1] 13/11
it [361]
it to [1] 56/16
it's [2] 8/23 77/17
itemized [1] 90/11
its [28] 9/5 9/8 9/24 $12 / 12$ $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 14 & 18 / 4 & 19 / 23 & 20 / 3 & 20 / 4\end{array}$ 20/10 44/1 56/15 56/20 56/25 58/9 58/11 62/6 63/10 69/8 73/5 75/25 76/5 76/22 86/15 87/23 100/17 100/23 100/25
itself [7] 9/18 91/23 92/6 94/13 94/13 97/5 103/6

## $J$

Jamie [1] 19/11
January [16] $1 / 5$ 19/24 $20 / 1$ 20/3 20/16 20/19 21/11 21/16 21/21 22/10 28/7 30/24 31/2 61/7 84/1 113/6
January 16 [1] 21/11
January 26th [1] 31/2
January 28th [1] 21/16
January 31st [4] 20/19 22/10
28/7 30/24
January 4th [2] 19/24 20/3
January 5th [4] 20/1 20/16
21/21 84/1
January 9th [1] 61/7
job [2] 79/20 98/19
Joffe [2] 49/3 49/7
John [3] 44/23 44/24 44/25
join [1] 92/5
joined [2] 38/18 85/13
joint [1] 39/6
judge [20] 1/10 $4 / 2$ 4/11 $5 / 1$ 5/19 6/13 12/19 14/25 19/25 24/12 27/9 28/10 29/7 29/15 35/4 35/20 40/22 45/6 63/16 83/25
July [5] 19/3 61/12 62/5 75/6 77/5
July 13 [1] 19/3
July 14th [1] 61/12
July 6th [1] 62/5
jump [2] 18/18 85/17
jumping [7] 6/11 56/6 56/21 57/5 58/8 58/23 61/7
June [3] 18/18 18/22 61/9
June 20th [1] 61/9
June 26 [2] 18/18 18/22
junior [1] 40/5
junk [1] 62/1
jurisdiction [2] 4/3 110/16 juror [1] 95/24
jury [8] 11/21 45/6 48/8
48/12 48/20 69/24 72/5 81/12
just [72] 8/1 8/7 8/19 14/15
$\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 1 & 15 / 3 & 16 / 3 & 17 / 2 & 19 / 25\end{array}$ 22/12 $24 / 15$ 25/21 $26 / 6$ 26/16 30/16 40/23 43/21 45/5 46/5 47/4 49/15 49/18 50/16 51/10 53/2 53/2 53/7 54/17 55/20 56/6 56/10 58/6 60/7 61/14 61/15 62/18 63/1 63/9 63/18 65/22 66/5 66/21 67/11 67/22 68/4 68/8 69/2 73/18 75/1 $\begin{array}{lllll}75 / 4 & 77 / 20 & 78 / 17 & 78 / 24 & 79 / 24\end{array}$ 81/22 82/24 84/3 84/23 85/12 85/19 88/7 91/8 93/7 94/4 94/20 101/4 101/7 103/21 103/23 104/13 106/18 110/20 justice [1] 93/5
justify [4] 96/20 96/24 97/3
100/13

## K

Kanter [3] 54/18 67/10 78/13
Kaye [1] 2/1
keep [5] 3/13 6/8 81/16 97/4 101/18
keepers [1] 77/24
keeping [1] 98/19
key [6] 59/12 79/14 79/15
104/5 104/6 112/6
Kherkher [1] 1/12
Kim [1] 78/13
kind [6] 9/19 58/15 63/7 68/25 102/20 111/16
King [1] 2/4
knew [5] 49/8 56/15 56/20 58/11 63/22
knocked [2] 51/13 51/16
know [51] 6/13 8/6 10/11 10/12 10/20 12/10 14/5 14/6 $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 15 & 16 / 19 & 16 / 19 & 21 / 22\end{array}$ 21/23 24/12 25/7 31/3 37/9 43/23 46/10 46/11 47/25 49/15 54/5 55/21 62/1 64/7 67/17 68/22 69/3 70/14 70/16 $\begin{array}{lllll}71 / 9 & 72 / 19 & 77 / 23 & 79 / 3 & 79 / 14\end{array}$ 82/18 84/17 84/25 89/3 90/17 92/3 92/12 98/8 99/3 100/11 100/20 101/12 105/16 107/2 111/25
knowing [1] 89/2
knowledge [6] 10/15 13/14 42/20 49/3 57/6 58/9
known [2] 13/6 75/5
knows [2] 23/3 61/17
Kopelowitz [1] 1/15

## L

lab [4] 51/11 59/19 70/6 82/23
laboratory [5] 46/9 46/10 46/23 67/2 69/25
ladies [1] 72/5
laid [1] 88/22
large [3] 36/20 57/23 59/7 largest [1] 112/2
last [26] 3/24 16/4 16/7
16/11 16/15 18/13 20/1 22/2
$\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 2 & 25 / 13 & 25 / 17 & 31 / 25 & 33 / 23\end{array}$
34/2 34/14 35/19 36/9 66/9
75/13 80/20 82/8 85/8 93/24

| L | Light's [2] 58/17 80 | longer [5] 9/11 10/16 $46 / 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| last... [3] 97/7 99/7 106/7 | like [35] 5/19 9/6 | 56/1 74/23 |
| later [5] 28/8 53/7 64/17 83/18 84/4 | 48/15 49/17 50/14 50/17 | ook [22] 10/1 34/6 35/10 <br> 37/25 48/7 57/25 63/16 66/10 |
|  | 54/11 63/1 63/7 64/3 66/5 | 68/13 69/2 $74 / 8$ 75/12 78/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { latest [1] } \\ \text { latter [1] } & 3 / 6\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll}66 / 8 & 68 / 16 & 69 / 1 & 71 / 14 & 79 / 5\end{array}$ | 79/22 79/24 80/5 80/9 82/11 |
| law [11] $2 / 7$ 58/17 71/19 | 79/6 80/12 81/20 82/3 82/9 | 82/21 90/9 94/6 107/4 |
| 76/3 77/25 82/16 88/8 92/22 | 84/10 84/13 84/14 86/21 87/3 | looked [1] 68/23 |
| 92/23 94/15 98/2 | likelihood [3] 37/22 37/23 | ooking [12] 5/18 7/10 37/22 $49 / 22 \quad 55 / 18 \quad 68 / 17 \quad 69 / 14$ |
| lawsuit [3] 82/23 83/19 93/5 | likelihood [3] 65/5 | 75/13 82/7 82/20 98/16 |
| lawsuits [1] 47/17 | likely [3] 37/25 38/9 70/5 | 107/10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lawyer [5] } 88 / 18 \text { 88/18 91/14 } \\ & 98 / 2103 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | limit [8] 51/4 83/21 92/18 | $\text { looks [4] 49/23 50/14 } 73 / 13$ |
| lawyers [12] 11/2 40/21 | limitation [1] 95/1 | lose [2] |
| 47/16 47/18 61/23 64/1 64/10 | limitations [1] 86/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { loss [4] } & 24 / 13 & 42 / 20 & 42 / 22\end{array}$ |
|  | limited [12] 36/12 36/12 | $\begin{array}{r} 10 s s \\ 112 / 20 \end{array}$ |
| LCMS [1] $47 / 2$ | 49/25 50/2 52/10 74/6 90/21 | lot [18] 4/18 39/4 40/13 |
| leads [1] 6/2 | 90/25 91/3 94/24 98/9 98/11 | 44/21 58/5 63/17 66/1 69/4 |
| learn [1] 56/24 | limiter [1] 90/15 | 69/19 74/16 78/11 82/9 83/19 |
| $18 / 10 \quad 35 / 17 \quad 36 / 3 \quad 57 / 18$ | limiters [1] 93/2 | 83/20 84/15 85/1 98/25 |
| 77/2 80/7 88/19 112/3 | limiting [4] 73/8 90/10 98/7 | 111/11 |
| leave [4] 8/11 81/11 | 04/8 | loud [1] |
| 95/14 | line [2] 50/22 65/10 | love [1] |
| led [4] 33/2 46/8 112/12 | lines [1] 109/22 | low [1] 86 |
| 112/12 | liquid [2] 45/22 45/22 | lower [1] 94/13 |
| leeway [1] | list [14] 36/5 50/22 50 | lunch [1] 91/16 |
| left [5] 13/22 36/21 94/5 | 24 64/11 | M |
| 94/19 109/17 |  | MA [1] |
| legal [18] 20/11 34/12 35/12 | literally [1] 96/20 | machine [1] 58/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 14 & 35 / 18 & 36 / 3 & 36 / 5 & 37 / 4\end{array}$ | litigants [1] 27/24 | Macquarie [2] 103/1 103/1 |
|  | litigate [3] 93/4 106/13 | made [18] 6/15 9/10 9/11 |
| 77/4 81/8 85/14 102/7 102/11 | 106/13 | 12/9 20/18 22/24 25/2 33/10 |
| legally [2] 97/21 98/24 | litigated [3] 93/4 106/10 | 40/11 53/12 60/9 63/10 63/15 |
| Legislature [1] 92/3 | 106/11 | 63/18 93/14 95/11 100/13 |
| lengthy [1] 39/10 | litigates [1] 93/4 | 100/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Leon [1] } & 1 / 16 & & \\ \text { less [5] } & 55 / 8 & 66 / 1 & 96 / 5\end{array}$ | litigating [2] 49/12 106/11 | MAGISTRATE [1] 1/10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { less }[5] \quad 55 / 8 \quad 66 / 1 \quad 96 / 5 \\ & 99 / 20110 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | litigation [35] 1/5 3/4 38/1 | main [2] 102/12 107/13 |
| lessen [2] 6/9 14/4 | 40/12 42/14 42/18 43/23 | maintain [1] 3/12 |
| let [55] 3/1 4/7 4/9 5/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}47 / 21 & 48 / 13 & 48 / 14 & 48 / 23\end{array}$ | majority [1] 92/22 |
| 6/19 6/20 8/3 8/4 12/17 17/2 | $54 / 10$ 54/10 $54 / 22$ 55/23 | make [34] 4/9 4/17 8/20 9/16 |
| 17/15 18/18 19/25 22/23 | 18 57/16 58/5 59/10 59 | $\begin{array}{llll}11 / 24 & 12 / 8 & 15 / 4 & 17 / 21 \\ 318 / 1\end{array}$ |
| 25/25 $27 / 7 \quad 33 / 18 \quad 35 / 9 \quad 37 / 16$ | 61/2 61/14 61/25 62/9 62/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 23 & 36 / 1 & 38 / 21 & 40 / 10 & 47 / 18\end{array}$ |
| 38/20 39/4 40/10 42/8 42/24 | 63/3 64/14 68/2 78/19 82/13 | 47/18 47/19 48/7 57/21 60/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}47 / 11 & 48 / 3 & 49 / 17 & 49 / 20 & 49 / 20\end{array}$ | 97/19 99/23 111/19 112/4 | 63/18 63/21 66/8 66/14 $66 / 15$ |
| 53/14 57/19 60/11 60/12 | little | 66/16 68/15 68/16 82/6 86/1 |
| 63/15 64/24 65/19 66/16 | little [7] 24/13 30/7 52/23 | 91/8 98/13 100/6 105/19 |
| 68/15 70/15 70/18 71/17 | 60/14 73/1 73/1 | 106/2 |
| 71/21 80/22 85/6 85/8 85/9 | living [1] 3 | makes [1] 88/17 |
| 85/25 85/25 87/22 101/17 | LLC [3] 95/2 98/2 98/5 | making [6] 12/20 32/1 41/15 |
| 104/12 106/20 109/14 110/8 | LLC's [2] 64/12 97/1 | 52/12 66/24 6 |
| $110 / 9$ (6) |  | maligned [1] 82/10 |
| let's [6] 63/19 65/13 73/10 | 2/10 97/24 | manage [1] 30 |
| 83/22 83/23 94/10 | lobby [1] 77/24 | management [1] 103/ |
| letter [3] 46/24 51/19 94/11 | lobbying [10] 47/25 58/ <br> 60/24 60/25 61/11 62/15 | managing [1] 112/2 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { level } \\ 54 / 5 \end{array} \text { [4] } 42 / 8 \quad 42 / 10 \quad 42 / 11$ | 100/18 102/19 103/12 112/13 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { manifest } \\ \text { manufacture [4] 13/2 } & 13 /\end{array}$ |
| Liabilities [1] 3/4 | lobbyists [1] 100/10 | 13/7 14/20 |
| liability [4] 1/5 13/5 95/25 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { location [1] } & 79 / 12 \\ \text { log [17] } & 53 / 1 & 63 / 1 & 65 / 21\end{array}$ | manufactured [1] 13/15 <br> manufacturing [2] 5/9 13/10 |
| 95/25 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}72 / 22 & 72 / 23 & 72 / 25 & 74 / 11 & 81 / 4\end{array}$ | many [10] 15/7 25/4 61/23 |
| liaison [1] | 88/16 88/23 91/22 101/23 | 72/25 77/24 85/15 88/13 |
| s [1] 82 | 104/2 107/17 108/8 109/17 | 88/14 90/21 97/1 |
| light [14] 5/23 5/25 54/1 | 110/24 | March [1] 56/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 59 / 24 & 61 / 9 & 67 / 15 & 72 / 16 & 78 / 24 \\ 80 / 15 & 84 / 11 \end{array}$ | logged [2] 62/21 107/21 <br> logging [1] 91/21 | March 29th [1] 56/13 <br> marked [3] 17/4 32/5 83/7 <br> marketed [1] 58/21 |


| M | 104/12 104/14 104/20 104/22 | misunderstood [1] 29/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| marketing [8] 13/2 13/5 13/7 | 104/23 104/25 105/7 105/9 | Mitch [4] 57/6 62/2 78/ |
| 13/10 48/12 58/20 62/16 | $105 / 22 \quad 105 / 23 \quad 106 / 5 \quad 106 / 9$ | Mitch's [1] 56/25 |
| 103/15 | 106/12 106/18 106/20 107/7 | mode [1] 55/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { marks [1] } 57 / 21 \\ \text { mass [2] } & 45 / 23 \quad 47 / 4 \end{array}$ | 108/8 109/13 109/14 110/8 | model [1] 62/12 |
| Massachusetts [1] 2/2 | 12/20 | moisture [6] 5/23 5/25 6/4 |
| master [12] 39/11 41/23 | mean [5] 10/13 11/10 55/14 <br> 88/8 103/24 | $10 \quad 11 / 2214$ |
| 44/11 $48 / 16$ 57/24 75/9 81/11 | meaningful [1] 36 | molecular [1] 8/ moment [1] 15/25 |
| 84/15 101/25 104/5 106/4 | means [2] 41/17 101/5 | money [16] $47 / 18$ 47/18 $47 / 19$ |
|  | meant [1] 10/14 | 54/9 55/22 58/5 59/12 63/25 |
| material [4] 4/19 57/1 63/10 95/13 | measured [1] | 67/23 73/25 75/11 76/15 |
| materials [25] 4/24 5/6 23/6 | media [1] 58/22 | $80 / 25$ 87/6 101/2 109/12 |
| 23/15 24/14 24/19 25/23 | meet [3] 71/18 102/1 112 | months [15] 18/19 23/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}26 / 12 & 27 / 1 & 28 / 25 & 28 / 25 & 29 / 3\end{array}$ | meeting [2] 18/19 59/8 | 23/16 73/14 85/19 87/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 30 / 13 & 31 / 10 & 33 / 14 & 39 / 4 & 49 / 13\end{array}$ | meetings [4] 29/11 35/12 | 89/16 89/17 90/17 93/24 |
| 80/18 83/4 83/6 102/24 | $35 / 17$ 57/14 embers [2] | 21 99/21 106/10 109/22 |
| 104/10 107/10 107/17 111/22 | memo [2] 29/23 49 | months and [1] 109/23 |
| math [1] 8/1 <br> matter [25] | memorialization [3] 29/20 | more [27] 5/15 9/24 11/12 |
| matter    <br> $4 / 5$ $4 / 6$ $4 / 7$ $6 / 5$ | 29/21 30/21 | 13/16 18/3 23/16 34/10 35/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 22 & 38 / 13 & 38 / 16 & 40 / 17\end{array}$ | memorializations [1] 30/6 | 38/7 40/2 42/9 49/25 50/23 |
| 40/23 41/22 41/24 42/20 45/9 | memorialized [1] 29/21 | 73/2 73/6 74/25 75/18 84/8 |
| 51/1 66/9 85/7 85/8 88/10 | memos [1] 29/11 | 87/10 88/14 88/20 89/4 95/20 |
| 106/6 113/4 | mentioned [4] 26/17 45/3 | 99/9 102/5 104/24 110/5 |
| matter which [1] 51/1 | 45/20 70/1 | Moreover [1] 18/18 |
| matters [2] 3/16 9/22 | mentioning | ning [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { may [48] } & 3 / 11 & 9 / 10 & 9 / 11 & 9 / 12\end{array}$ | mentions [1] | most [7] 10/6 27/21 |
| 9/16 9/20 10/14 10/15 14/25 | merits [1] | 77/2 79/12 80/5 931 |
| 15/24 17/16 18/6 21/7 21/9 | ssage [1] 61/20 | mostly [1] |
| 28/13 28/16 29/21 35/22 | messaging [1] 20/12 | motion [9] 31/10 39/8 |
| 36/15 45/15 45/16 52/5 52/23 | met [2] 20/1 96/15 | 49/21 70/17 75/6 83/13 87/2 |
| 57/7 57/11 57/17 58/2 58/8 | tadata [3] 53/20 79/18 | 88/22 |
| 58/10 62/2 $62 / 5 \quad 65 / 19 \quad 66 / 25$ |  |  |
| 67/1 $69 / 21 \quad 70 / 7 \quad 74 / 19 \quad 74 / 21$ | method [4] 56/15 58/11 | $69 / 23$ |
| 80/20 81/9 87/25 88/13 89/19 | $91 / 11$ | mountain [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 91 / 18 ~ 93 / 25 ~ 95 / 7 ~ 106 / 16 \\ & 109 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | methodologies [1] 107/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { move [6] } & 15 / 13 & 17 / 5 & 38 / 12\end{array}$ |
| maybe [10] | methodology [4] 49/8 49/1 | 63/3 84/5 89 |
| 46/6 68/22 70/5 84/16 | /20 56/20 | Mr [221] |
| 91/16 112/21 | methods [4] 13/9 59/19 62/7 | Mr. [2] 31/2 111/23 |
| McGLAMRY [13] 1/19 1/19 43/9 | 72/15 | Mr. Egan [1] 111/23 |
|  | Miami [2] 1/17 2/9 | Mr. Gilbert [1] 31/2 |
| 50/15 53/12 80/21 81/19 | MICHAEL [14] 1/19 $2 / 4$ 3/25 | Ms [6] 17/11 29/22 30/1 37 |
| 95/22 | 4/15 56/7 58/23 59/5 68/19 | 60/5 64/ |
| McGlamry's [1] 69/8 | 85/11 88/8 93/14 99/2 | Ms. [30] |
| md [1] 1/3 | 100/20 101/1 | 9/18 19/22 20/2 20/6 20/17 |
| MDL [2] 3/6 3/8 | middle [3] 82/24 104/18 | 21/2 21/18 21/25 22/8 22/14 |
| me [112] $4 / 4$ 4/7 $4 / 9$ 5/16 | 112/22 | 22/20 25/25 26/10 27/10 28/1 |
| 5/17 6/19 6/20 7/4 7/16 7/17 | might [10] 16/5 33/17 34/2 | 28/6 28/17 29/8 $29 / 11$ 31/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}7 / 18 & 8 / 3 & 10 / 23 & 11 / 4 & 12 / 17\end{array}$ | 37/18 79/4 81/14 84/18 84/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 21 & 32 / 11 & 33 / 9 & 33 / 18 & 35 / 20\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 16 & 16 / 15 & 16 / 17 & 17 / 2 & 17 / 15\end{array}$ | 95/8 97/19 | 55/11 83/2 |
| 17/20 18/18 19/25 22/13 | Mike [1] 43/14 | Ms. Brown [14] 19/18 19/22 |
| 22/23 25/25 26/6 26/21 26/22 | mildly [1] 95/10 | 20/17 21/18 21/25 22/8 $22 / 14$ |
| 27/2 27/3 27/7 29/7 29/19 | million [4] 59/13 61/13 | 26/10 27/10 $28 / 1$ 28/17 31/21 |
| $30 / 1$ 30/4 33/18 35/9 37/16 | 18 112/4 | 32/11 35/20 |
| 38/20 39/4 40/10 40/16 40/16 | $\begin{array}{cccc}\text { millions [8] } & 62 / 14 & 62 / 15 \\ 64 / 16 & 72 / 18 & 72 / 19 & 77 / 18\end{array}$ | Ms. Brown's [5] 20/2 20/6 21/2 28/6 29/11 |
| 40/18 $40 / 23$ 41/16 $41 / 24$ | 100/9 100/18 | Ms. Sharpe [10] 11/2 15/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}44 / 21 & 47 / 11 & 48 / 3 & 49 / 20 & 49 / 20\end{array}$ | mind [2] 81/17 86/21 | 18/19 22/20 25/25 29/8 31/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}49 / 23 & 49 / 23 & 51 / 8 & 51 / 12 & 53 / 14 \\ 54 / 12 & 55 / 3 & 63 / 15 & 68 / 6 & 68 / 7\end{array}$ | mindful [1] 68/11 | 33/9 33/18 83/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}54 / 12 & 55 / 3 & 63 / 15 & 68 / 6 & 68 / 7 \\ 68 / 15 & 71 / 15 & 71 / 21 & 80 / 22 & 81 / 9\end{array}$ | minimize [2] 7/13 107/1 | Ms. Stipes [1] 55/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 68 / 15 & 71 / 15 & 71 / 21 & 80 / 22 & 81 / 9 \\ 81 / 11 & 83 / 6 & 85 / 6 & 85 / 8 & 85 / 9 \end{array}$ | minute [2] 30/3 65/13 | much [13] 14/10 15/16 33/16 |
| 85/24 85/25 86/4 87/22 91/9 | minutes [8] 55/9 65/15 86/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 12 & 38 / 15 & 42 / 9 & 53 / 14 & 74 / 23\end{array}$ |
| 91/9 91/12 93/19 95/24 96/9 | /25 96/8 97/25 101/13 | 82/10 85/6 101/16 |
| 99/9 99/13 101/17 101/18 | misleading [2] 59/22 60/2 | multiple [4] 6/24 56/2 62/16 |


| M | 71/23 73/1 $73 / 1$ 79/8 $88 / 17$ | 29/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| multiple... [1] 66/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}89 / 19 & 92 / 10 & 92 / 15 & 92 / 20 \\ 95 / 24 & 99 / 8 & 105 / 14 & 106 / 5\end{array}$ | obligations [2] 101/10 104/1 obviously [3] 50/18 107/16 |
| must [2] 86/17 93/22 | $106 / 5 \quad 110 / 8$ | $111 / 13$ |
| mute [1] 101/20 | nobody [2] 79/22 100/17 | occur [3] 14/4 14/5 30/23 |
| my $\left.\begin{array}{cccccl}{[40]} & 3 / 10 & 3 / 15 & 7 / 1 & 9 / 21 \\ 15 / 12 & 16 / 14 & 26 / 11 & 31 / 12\end{array}\right)$ | non [10] 3/21 18/9 36/24 | occurred [2] 30/5 30/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 12 & 16 / 14 & 26 / 11 & 31 / 12 \\ 31 / 17 & 37 / 13 & 38 / 7 & 38 / 10 & 40 / 15\end{array}$ | 37/1 43/7 50/5 85/11 98/9 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 17 & 37 / 13 & 38 / 7 & 38 / 10 & 40 / 15 \\ 45 / 15 & 50 / 11 & 51 / 7 & 51 / 8 & 53 / 6\end{array}$ | 98/9 98/10 | 59/18 102/2 110/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}71 / 20 & 72 / 19 & 73 / 12 & 73 / 24\end{array} 77 / 9$ | non-confidential [1] 98/10 | October 17th [1] 59/18 |
| 81/14 87/19 87/20 89/19 93/7 | non-issue [2] 36/24 37/1 | October 19th [1] |
| 93/9 93/19 94/17 95/6 95/19 | non-objected [1] 18/9 | off [4] 51/20 58/24 73/19 |
| 101/10 104/20 107/6 107/7 | non-party [1] 85/11 non-preservation [1] 3/2 | $86 \text { / } 12$ <br> offer [2] 26/18 107/22 |
| 108/2 110/7 112/22 | non-preservation [1] 3/2 non-production [1] 50/5 | offer [2] 26/18 107/22 <br> offered [4] 7/7 21/15 79 |
| myself [1] 88/4 | non-testifying [1] 43/7 | $105 / 13$ |
| N | non-work [1] 98/9 | offering |
| nada [1] 105/25 | noncustodial [1] 51/25 | office [1] 96 |
| name [2] 14/16 16/9 | none [1] 19/ | officer [3] 44/24 45/2 61/21 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { named [1] } & 81 / 25\end{array}$ | nonemployee [1] 23/4 <br> nonlegal [1] 59/6 | Official [2] 2/13 113/ <br> offs [1] 87/6 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { names [7] } 20 / 16 \text { 22/14 } \quad 26 / 2 \\ 26 / 18 \\ 26 / 22 \end{gathered} 31 / 13 \quad 94 / 20$ | nonparties [1] 95/5 | often [2] 6/14 109/2 |
| narrative [2] 59/22 60/1 | nonparty [2] 95/4 | oh [1] 100 |
| narrow [7] 9/3 9/14 18/20 | [1] 31/1 | okay [14] 10/17 16/2 44/3 |
| 40/4 79/20 92/20 98/7 | north [1] 8/9 | 45/13 46/20 47/10 47/14 66/3 |
| narrowed [5] 8/19 9/5 81/1 | not [240] <br> note [2] 3/5 77/1 | 110/8 110/8 |
| 90/18 92/17 | $\text { notes [20] } 20 / 18 \quad 22 / 1 \quad 22 / 14$ | on all [1] |
| narrower [3] 8/20 73/10 75/1 narrowing [1] 27/7 | $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { notes } \\ 23 / 17 & 24 / 4 & 24 / 6 & 26 / 3 & 26 / 9\end{array}$ | once [2] 10/23 62/3 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { narrowing } \\ \text { NDMA [2] } & 6 / 2 & 62 / 4\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}26 / 10 & 26 / 13 & 26 / 14 & 26 / 15 & 27 / 5\end{array}$ | one [63] 2/11 3/7 |
| NE [1] 1/20 | 28/24 $29 / 11$ 29/14 $29 / 19$ | 3/13 5/24 9/16 10/8 12/4 |
| necessarily [4] 8/13 37/17 | 29/20 29/23 30/4 | 12/6 15/25 20/4 21/2 21/1 |
| 41/4 103/24 | nothing [16] 25/16 26/7 27/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 24 & 24 / 15 & 24 / 17 & 28 / 2 & 29 / 10\end{array}$ |
| cessary [2] | 27/19 31/14 33/21 34/10 | 29/22 30/21 34/8 34/15 35/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { need [18] } & 14 / 15 & 32 / 25 & 32 / 25\end{array}$ | 34/25 52/17 52/19 52/21 78/5 | $36 / 3 \quad 36 / 16$ 41/22 $45 / 21$ 46/3 |
| 40/16 46/6 55/13 65/10 66/12 | 95/20 99/16 104/16 109/13 | 49/6 49/24 61/6 66/18 67/17 |
| 69/13 71/10 71/17 71/25 72/9 | notice [4] 32/8 85/20 85/21 | 67/25 68/6 68/18 70/3 74/15 |
| 73/6 74/10 85/2 88/25 89/7 | 86 | 77/4 79/9 80/7 80/20 82/17 |
| needed [2] 34/22 73/2 | noticed [1] 39/ | 83/2 83/11 89/1 89/16 90/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { needs [7] } & 53 / 3 & 74 / 2 & 74 / 4\end{array}$ | noun [1] 42/1 | 94/6 94/25 97/1 99/15 102/18 |
| 83/12 83/18 99/9 100/3 | November [1] 59/20 | 104/4 104/23 105/20 107/11 |
| egotiate [6] 40/15 81/8 | November 6th [1] 59/20 | 107/13 110/3 110/13 112/2 |
| 104/13 104/18 105/17 112/21 | novo [1] 37/13 | 112/20 |
| negotiated [2] 18/4 105/18 | now [37] 8/17 8/18 9/15 11 | ones [1] |
| negotiating [1] 104/20 | 23/20 28/22 $28 / 23$ 33/10 | ongoing [2] 23/25 32/16 |
| negotiations [2] 73/15 | 40/12 50/15 56/17 64/1 66/11 | onion [1] 9 |
| 104/25 | 84/3 84/4 85/21 87/8 87/25 | 27/10 50/2 50/25 51/4 72/23 |
| net [4] 64/12 102/24 103/15 | 89/3 89/11 89/13 90/11 92/15 | 82/6 82/8 91/21 96/25 110/3 |
| 108/13 | 96/6 99/10 99/13 100/5 101/5 | 111/9 |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { never } \\ 72 / 23}}{[4]} \quad 40 / 14 \quad 48 / 8 \quad 48 / 20$ | 105/6 106/11 109/15 110/5 | Oот [38] 1/22 39/1 39/22 |
|  | null [1] 26/6 | 41/10 $42 / 8$ 45/17 $47 / 11$ 52/4 |
| $\text { new [6] } 33 / 12 \text { 33/22 } 59 / 1$ | number [15] 3/3 3/5 36/12 | 53/10 53/15 55/7 57/19 60/6 |
| 70/4 71/8 106/11 | 53/22 74/21 89/24 90/23 91/2 | 60/11 60/14 65/18 $66 / 15$ |
| newsletter [1] 51 | 91/4 91/6 94/7 94/7 94/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}68 / 14 & 69 / 11 & 71 / 10 & 73 / 22 & 74 / 2\end{array}$ |
| newsletters [1] 51/19 | 94/22 97/16 | 75/8 75/19 77/13 84/12 86/2 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { next [21] } & 15 / 13 & 15 / 18 & 38 / 12\end{array}$ | numerous [1] 62/6 | 96/8 96/9 97/25 99/3 99/9 |
| 38/16 43/24 56/6 56/12 56/24 | NW [1] 2/2 | 99/16 101/17 101/20 109/14 |
| 57/2 58/13 59/3 84/25 90/19 | 0 | 110/9 110/10 |
| 92/8 93/21 94/10 94/15 97/12 |  | Oot's [2] 69/18 70/5 <br> openly [2] 90/19 97/13 |
| 97/23 98/13 112/17 | object [3] 78/1 81/4 110/18 <br> objected [2] 18/9 19/5 | openly [2] 90/19 97/13 <br> operate [1] 30/11 |
| night [3] 21/23 82/8 88/5 <br> nine [3] 90/23 94/22 94/23 | objecting [5] 6/22 15/6 | operative [1] 32/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { no [39] } & 1 / 3 & 5 / 1 & 5 / 4 & 5 / 13\end{array}$ | 53/18 54/4 77/25 | opinion [2] 80/9 111/2 |
| 9/11 9/20 10/15 16/24 17/10 | objection [7] 7/2 11/8 14/11 41/3 52/11 52/13 53/15 | opinions [1] 44/2 <br> opportunities [1] 92/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 13 & 19 / 13 & 24 / 4 & 24 / 22 & 25 / 12\end{array}$ | objections [2] 40/24 87/20 | opportunity [4] 22/3 24/9 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 23 & 34 / 11 & 34 / 15 & 36 / 22 & 37 / 4\end{array}$ | obligated [1] 17/24 | opportunity [4] 22/3 24/9 $32 / 24 \quad 101 / 17$ |
| 39/21 43/8 43/15 46/2 56/1 | obligation [3] 23/21 24/22 | opposed [2] 89/16 103/5 |


| 0 | 64/17 67/10 67/18 67/25 68/4 | /6 17/5 33/16 37/15 39/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| opposing [1] 101/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}71 / 8 & 73 / 15 & 74 / 24 & 77 / 20 & 78 / 5 \\ 78 / 15 & 78 / 19 & 78 / 20 & 78 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 41 / 23 & 54 / 23 & 67 / 20 & 70 / 18 & \\ 71 / 14 & 71 / 17 & 79 / 11 & 81 / 13 & 83 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| opposition [2] 39/8 39/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}80 / 11 & 80 / 19 & 84 / 14 & 86 / 25 & 87 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 83 / 8 \\ 85 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| option [2] 105/20 105/21 | 88/22 91/11 98/21 98/21 99/5 | 95/2 97/1 97/1 98/24 107/19 |
| or influence [1] 52/24 order [50] 5/17 5/19 7 | 100/4 101/2 102/24 106/16 | 107/25 109/22 111/9 112/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}7 / 18 & 7 / 21 & 12 / 13 & 14 / 13 & 14 / 23\end{array}$ | 106/17 112/18 112/18 | parties' [4] 77/16 79 |
| 18/25 19/6 22/7 22/13 26/22 | out-of-pocket [1] 100/4 | 105/3 111/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 27/1 } & 27 / 3 \quad 27 / 3 ~ 30 / 20 ~ 31 / 1 ~\end{array}$ | outcome [2] $42 / 4$ $76 / 15$  <br> outline [6] $22 / 1$ $28 / 1$ $28 / 6$ | ```partners [2] 54/6 62/19 party [22] 3/23 3/24 4/24``` |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 31 / 17 & 50 / 2 & 65 / 20 & 74 / 13 & 80 / 19 \\ 84 / 21 & 87 / 14 & 91 / 24 & 101 / 18 \end{array}$ | 28/23 29/13 66/23 | 10/25 24/22 38/16 $46 / 9$ 67/2 |
| 101/22 104/15 104/16 105/ | outlined [1] 16/7 | 74/1 75/21 75/23 76/5 76/1 |
| 105/7 105/8 105/9 105/11 | outright [1] 97/11 | 83/11 83/13 84/16 85/4 85/11 |
| 105/23 105/25 106/4 106/5 | outset [1] 85/12 | 86/17 89/17 106/23 111/17 |
| 106/16 106/17 106/24 107/5 | utside [10] 8/17 9/21 43/1 | passing [1] 88/5 |
| 107/6 107/7 108/2 108/3 |  | $\mathrm{p}$ |
| 109/9 112/18 112/22 | outweighed [1] |  |
| ordered [3] 32/22 88/13 | outweighs [1] $38 / 9$ | patently [1] 9 |
| 8 | over [26] 21/3 23/12 24/8 | PATRICK [3] 1/22 39/1 86/2 |
|  | 30/13 49/12 58/14 63/19 75/4 | pattern [1] 94/13 |
| organized [1] 58/21 | 76/19 79/17 82/19 87/12 | Pauline [2] 2/13 113/7 |
| $106 / 6$ | 87/13 91/20 93/7 93/11 93/24 | pause [2] 101/13 109/14 |
| Ostrow [1] 1/15 | 94/17 94/25 96/19 97/20 | paused [1] |
| OTC [1] 8/14 | 99/12 101/8 107/6 109/6 | pay [18] 76/2 76/5 77/1 77/7 |
| other [72] 3/9 4/24 5/20 |  | $78 / 3$ 80/23 81/2 81/5 89/15 |
| 6/21 6/23 8/18 9/11 11/17 |  | $100 / 22101 / 5105 / 8$ |
| 12/6 14/3 15/6 16/9 16/21 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 23 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 11 & 20 / 12 & 27 / 6\end{array}$ |  | ing [2] |
| 27/15 28/23 28/24 29/14 | overlap [1] 3/11 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 21 & 31 / 8 & 33 / 10 & 34 / 19 & 35 / 1\end{array}$ | overrule [2] 11/8 14/11 | pdf [1] 94/15 |
| 38/18 40/14 40/22 41/19 | overseas [1] 9/10 | Peachtree [2] |
| 41/22 $44 / 8$ 50/3 50/5 51/5 | overseen [1] 22/5 | peel [1] 9/1 |
| 51/6 51/24 53/24 54/23 56/11 | own [5] 26/13 27/11 53/12 | peer [1] 63 |
| 57/4 58/6 61/17 63/24 66/20 | 56/10 87/1 | pending [1] |
| 66/25 66/25 67/17 67/19 |  | people [28] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}70 / 12 & 75 / 8 & 76 / 14 & 78 / 21 & 79 / 10\end{array}$ | P | 16/19 20/17 22/1 $22 / 14 \quad 24$ |
| 79/11 80/18 82/6 88/16 96/2 | P.C [1] 1/19 | 26/23 36/7 36/7 36/13 36/16 |
| 97/1 98/3 98/6 103/12 104/23 | PA [1] 1/24 | 54/5 59/9 63/24 64/13 66/25 |
| $105 / 20 ~ 107 / 1 ~ 107 / 19 ~ 107 / 25 ~$ $108 / 11$ $108 / 12$ | packaged [1] 14/1 | 70/7 70/24 82/22 88/2 99/11 |
| 108/11 108/12 110/23 | packaging [2] 8/25 12/14 | 102/25 107/2 107/5 108/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { others [5] 7/12 } & 7 / 24 & 35 / 15\end{array}$ | packet [2] 6/7 95/13 | 108/14 |
| 102/10 111/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { page [8] } & 13 / 1 & 13 / 8 & 13 / 20\end{array}$ | people's [1] |
| otherwise [5] 15/10 44/5 | 13/21 18/23 29/10 39/9 95/12 | per [2] 7/24 8/2 |
| 73/6 84/9 106/18 | pages [10] 4/21 4/23 39/11 | perceive [1] 77/6 |
| ought [3] 89/14 99/23 101/3 | 40/13 68/7 78/7 87/13 91/20 | percent [1] 64/9 |
| our [76] 12/7 12/19 12/20 |  | performed [2] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 19 & 18 / 7 & 18 / 21 & 18 / 23 & 21 / 20\end{array}$ | paid [8] 76/15 76/21 93/14 | perhaps [12] 9/24 30/14 38/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 25 & 22 / 8 & 22 / 10 & 27 / 16 & 29 / 10\end{array}$ | 99/2 99/7 99/8 99/14 108/20 | 55/12 64/20 87/9 88/4 88/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 10 & 32 / 10 & 32 / 13 & 33 / 3 & 34 / 6\end{array}$ | PAIGE [3] $2 / 1$ 15/24 $22 / 22$ | 89/1 93/11 96/1 106/4 |
| $34 / 20$ 35/5 $42 / 12 \quad 42 / 18$ 43/7 | pains [1] 110/15 | period [6] 7/9 7/22 9/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}43 / 23 & 44 / 14 & 44 / 15 & 48 / 22\end{array}$ | pales [1] 89/9 | 10/10 32/19 105/10 |
| 50/23 51/9 52/18 58/15 69/9 | PALM [3] 1/2 1/5 2/14 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}72 / 4 & 72 / 14 & 73 / 2 & 73 / 13 & 74 / 8\end{array}$ | paper [2] 69/21 109/10 | permeates |
| $\begin{array}{llll}74 / 22 & 75 / 14 & 75 / 23 ~ 76 / 9 ~ 76 / 23\end{array}$ | $\text { papers [5] 8/21 } 12 / 7 \text { 49/22 }$ | permission [1] 10/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}77 / 5 & 77 / 19 & 78 / 2 & 78 / 10 & 79 / 8\end{array}$ | 67/24 111/23 | perpetual [1] 84/9 |
| 80/11 81/4 $81 / 18$ 82/3 84/15 | paragraph [1] | person [10] 10/19 |
| 86/7 86/14 86/15 86/22 87/11 | paragraphs [2] 20/8 20/14 | 27/17 36/20 36/21 |
| 87/12 88/3 88/7 89/3 90/3 | pardon [1] 96/9 | $105 / 9 \text { 105/9 111/4 111/7 }$ |
| 90/19 91/21 91/25 92/16 95/3 | part [13] 6/16 6/22 7/1 8/10 | person' [1] 96/10 |
| 95/6 96/14 96/15 97/12 97/20 | $10 / 7 \text { 20/6 33/24 33/25 34/1 }$ | personal [3] 12/25 99/5 |
| 101/23 110/17 111/23 112/3 | $36 / 20 \quad 47 / 20 \quad 69 / 11 \quad 85 / 19$ | $111 / 6$ |
| ourselves [2] 76/21 95/5 |  |  |
| out [49] 4/2 10/25 12/14 |  | ersonaly [1] |
| 25/4 $29 / 6$ 34/19 $41 / 13142 / 12$ | participated [2] 111/21 | persons [2] 90/8 91/17 |
| 48/5 51/4 51/13 51/16 51/19 | particular [2] 4/25 36/17 | persons [2] 90/8 $91 / 17$ perspective [1] $34 / 6$ |
| 55/17 55/25 61/15 62/11 63/2 | parties [31] 4/7 6/14 15/13 | petition [37] 42/23 43/25 |


| P | 67/5 70/5 70/20 75/12 78/6 | erve [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| petition... [35] 46/16 48/15 | 79/18 80/10 84/14 84/19 | pretty [1] 58 |
| 49/9 51/9 54/5 54/7 54/8 | 102/12 106/14 110/16 111/2 | prevented [2] 13/19 13/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}54 / 17 & 56 / 3 & 56 / 13 & 57 / 7 & 57 / 9 \\ 58 / 14 & 59 / 4 & 60 / 3 & 62 / 13 & 62 / 20\end{array}$ | pointed [3] 34/19 67/10 | previous [1] 29/16 |
| 63/4 64/16 $66 / 22 \quad 67 / 12 \quad 70 / 11$ | 80/11 | previously [5] 33/15 45 |
| 75/24 77/21 77/24 78/19 91/3 | ```pointers [1] 64/5 points [7] 8/7 11/13 16/11``` | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} 67 / 8 & 102 / 19 & 105 / 12 \\ \text { price } & {[1]} & 8 / 1 \end{array}\right.$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}94 / 25 & 98 / 3 & 98 / 3 & 98 / 6 \\ 102 / 21 & 111 / 20 / 6 & 112 / 13\end{array}$ | 22/23 28/14 68/4 100/7 | prima [1] 36/1 |
| petitioner [1] 85/11 | police [1] 44/22 | primarily [4] 17/15 36/18 |
| petitions [6] 51/7 52/17 | policy [1] 13/5 | 51/24 52/14 |
| 90/24 91/2 94/23 103/14 | polite [1] 75/9 | primary [2] 51/9 72/4 |
| Pharma [2] 4/2 4/4 | polyethylene [1] 5/22 | print [1] 55/1 |
| pharmaceuticals [1] 73/20 | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { Ponce [1] } & 1 / 1 \\ \text { Pope [1] } & 1 / 19 \end{array}$ |  |
| pharmacy [1] 51/21 | Porter [1] 2/1 | 104/24 110/15 |
| Philadelphia [1] 1/24 | portion [2] 31/5 77/ | privacy [1] 16/5 |
| PI [1] 42/20 | pose [2] 43/10 43/10 | privilege [16] 19/14 53/1 |
| ure [2] 58/24 69/5 | position [36] 31/20 34/ | 88/11 88/12 88/15 88/19 |
| piece [1] $82 / 9$ | 42/12 $44 / 18$ 48/20 58/15 | 88/25 91/20 91/22 93/9 96/6 |
| piecemeal [1] 24/23 | 60/10 62/9 77/20 78/10 79 | 96/16 101/23 110/24 110/2 |
| pieces [2] 67/19 79/19 | 0/3 81/2 $86 / 7$ 86/14 86/22 | 110/25 |
| Pierce [1] 2/14 | 89/6 89/13 89/15 | privileged [15] 62/25 62 |
| pill [3] 6/9 6/10 14/6 | $96 / 14 \quad 96 / 15 \text { 99/14 } 99$ | 96/15 97/11 |
| pittance [1] 93/16 | 101/4 101/15 110/2 110/6 | 97/14 98/9 107/3 107/24 |
| pivot [1] 103/2 | 112/5 | probable [1] 70/6 |
| place [14] $2 / 11$ 3/13 8/22 | positions [1] 92/13 | probably [4] 66/1 99/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 9 & 21 / 17 & 23 / 16 & 25 / 24 & 28 / 6\end{array}$ | possession [1] 10/10 | 101/25 112/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 16 & 35 / 11 & 35 / 12 & 35 / 13 & 36\end{array}$ $36 / 7$ | possible [4] 10/21 70/6 | probative [3] 95/21 95/23 |
| places [1] 79/11 | 80/13 103 | 96/3 [1] |
| Plaintiff [3] 13/18 25/9 | possibly [4] 48/7 68/20 | probe [1] $24 /$ |
| 93/3 | 68/20 68/24 | problem [3] 30/7 34/8 11 |
| Plaintiff's [1] 51/11 | posturing [1] | procedurally [1] 99/17 |
| PLAINTIFFS [40] 1/11 4/9 | potential [2] 6/9 97/18 | proceed [1] 22/ |
| 4/12 5/1 5/7 5/14 6/25 11/19 | powerful [2] 59/9 63/11 | proceeding [1] 3/8 |
| 12/7 15/7 15/22 16/22 17/3 | PR [1] 58 | proceedings [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 18 & 24 / 9 & 25 / 2 & 25 / 3 & 25 / 5\end{array}$ | practical [1] | process [25] 12/15 16/7 |
| 25/12 25/23 $26 / 15 \quad 30 / 14$ | practitioner [1] 98/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 12 & 21 / 1 & 23 / 12 & 24 / 17 & 24 / 24\end{array}$ |
| 34/24 41/24 42/2 42/21 43/2 | termine [1] 42/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 22 & 28 / 3 & 29 / 2 & 29 / 6 & 33 / 16\end{array}$ |
| 43/10 $43 / 11 \quad 43 / 15$ 43/21 | prefer [1] 76/1 | $34 / 12$ 37/5 37/7 53/18 63/1 |
| 44/18 $48 / 18$ 76/8 $76 / 9 \quad 76 / 16$ | judice [4] $30 / 18$ 31/7 | 63/4 84/6 89/2 89/16 99/18 |
| 78/21 80/6 81/25 82/13 | prejudiced [1] | 108/19 109/5 <br> processes |
| Plaintiffs' [19] 4/20 8/16 | prejudicial [1] 110 | produce [32] 3/8 14/13 $14 /$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}12 / 24 & 42 / 19 & 47 / 16 & 47 / 18\end{array}$ | prelaunch [1] 55/21 | 17/25 18/1 18/9 19/4 21/15 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}53 / 10 & 56 / 18 & 57 / 3 & 57 / 3 & 57 / 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { preliminary [2] } & \text { 15/25 } & 41 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 / 21 / 20 & 22 / 7 & 22 / 13 & 23 / 5 & 23 / 9\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}59 / 2 & 63 / 25 & 69 / 16 & 72 / 3 & 72 / 7 \\ 72 / 8 & 72 / 13 & 74 / 9 & & \end{array}$ | preparation [12] 4/19 20/19 | 23/11 27/5 $31 / 13$ 31/14 $36 / 24$ |
| $72 / 8$ 72/13 74/9 plan [1] 91/8 | 23/7 23/14 23/19 23/24 24/11 | 50/11 53/1 65/21 74/11 88/14 |
| plan [1] 91/8 | 24/16 24/24 26/12 28/10 | 88/14 91/12 101/22 104/2 |
| plans [1] 52/20 | 28/25 | 106/25 108/4 108/5 109/1 |
| plate [1] 90/17 | preparations [1] 22/10 |  |
| $\underset{70 / 7}{ }{ }^{\text {play }}\left[\begin{array}{llll} 4] & 21 / 5 & 41 / 13 & 67 / 3 \end{array}\right.$ | prepare [13] 18/25 19/7 | produce 29,000 [1] 53/ |
| played [2] 10/22 54/16 | 19/19 22/15 24/6 25/22 26/4 | produced [29] 12/23 18/ |
| player [2] 56/17 112/6 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 27 / 18 & 30 / 2 & 30 / 2 & 30 / 16 & 31 / 4\end{array}$ | 20/22 21/7 22/17 25/2 26/5 |
| players [1] 79/15 | 31/5 | $30 / 7$ 34/24 $35 / 2$ 42/1 $48 / 8$ |
| playing [2] 29/6 59/6 | prepared [9] 3/15 $18 / 25$ 19/6 | 49/14 $50 / 18$ 54/23 $54 / 23$ |
| please [7] $4 / 8$ 15/20 $17 / 16$ | 19/22 21/10 24/21 29/4 52/4 | 62/22 74/25 78/6 78/7 78/8 |
| 60/14 75/16 90/4 103/20 |  | 78/8 103/6 104/15 104/16 |
| plenty [3] 50/14 72/1 74/2 | preparing [3] 23/12 26/14 | 106/22 107/2 107/5 107/21 |
| PLLC [1] 2/7 |  | producing [1] 24/22 |
| plus [1] 91/20 | prescription [2] 5/11 7/3 <br> present [1] 69/16 |  |
| pocket [2] 98/22 100/4 | presentation [1] 8/25 | l2/11 $13 / 3$ 13/7 $13 / 11 \quad 13 / 22$ |
| point [35] 8/6 9/16 16/17 | presentations [1] 9/23 | 14/1 82/14 97/9 97/10 97/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 24 & 23 / 18 & 27 / 4 & 34 / 25 & 36 / 17 \\ 42 / 12 & 44 / 12 & 48 / 25 & 55 / 10\end{array}$ | presented [2] 81/9 104/17 | 97/20 98/10 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 42 / 12 & 44 / 12 & 48 / 25 & 55 / 10 \\ 55 / 12 & 60 / 8 & 61 / 18 & 64 / 6 \\ 65 / 14 \end{array}$ | presenting [2] 104/14 105/21 | production [11] 23/2 30/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}55 / 12 & 60 / 8 & 61 / 18 & 64 / 6 & 65 / 14\end{array}$ | preservation [2] 3/21 23/23 | 30/20 31/1 50/5 65/6 67/18 |


| P | put [15] 11/22 40/5 41/11 | 1 [2] 44/11 84/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| production... [4] 76/21 | 43/8 59/15 67/20 69/15 78/17 | receipt [1] 42/13 |
| prod/22 77/6 107/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 83 / 17 & 83 / 20 & 85 / 2 & 87 / 13 & 88 \\ 94 / 16 & 95 / 10 \end{array}$ | receive [6] 4/18 14/9 17 |
| productions [2] 102/9 107/25 | puts [1] 71/19 | received [13] 4/18 4/20 17/6 |
| products [10] 1/5 8/18 9/10 <br> 9/10 9/23 10/15 11/5 11/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { putting [5] } & \text { /18 } & 23 / 7 \quad 71 / 1\end{array}$ | 18/25 19/17 20/6 20/20 21/13 |
| $13 / 14 \quad 14 / 4$ | 77/21 102/23 | 33/14 61/12 94/9 108/11 |
| professional [1] 101/10 | Q | recess [4] 55/13 65/15 65/16 |
| Profiting [1] 61/13 | quash [12] 39/8 39/13 49/21 | 112/24 |
| prohibits [1] $86 / 8$ project [1] $87 / 2$ | 49/24 50/17 70/17 $73 / 5$ 86/15 | recognize [2] 33/15 85/9 |
| Promeco [1] 10/23 | 86/20 87/21 87/23 89/7 | recognized [2] 13/13 61 |
| promote [1] 80/2 | quashing [1] 91/24 <br> question [15] 24/15 | collection [1] 24/7 commend [1] 104/19 |
| proper [3] 13/12 15/10 $24 / 17$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { qu/13 } & 43 / 10 & 43 / 11 & 43 / 15\end{array}$ | recommendation [1] 106/3 |
| proportional [6] 36/11 53/3 | $\begin{array}{llllll}44 / 19 & 45 / 15 & 46 / 23 & 52 / 24\end{array}$ | reconsider [4] 31/17 31/20 |
| 53/8 96/3 96/4 96/5 | 57/24 69/22 $71 / 20 \quad 73 / 2 \quad 88 / 6$ | 32/24 33/7 |
| proportionality [7] 6/14 | questioning [2] 46/6 46/7 | reconsideration [2] 32/10 |
| $54 / 3$ $79 / 3$ | questions [4] 25/21 26/1 | 32/23 |
| 79/3 <br> proposal | 27/23 95/8 | reconsidered [1] |
| proposal $92 / 11$ | quickly [5] 28/12 57/10 | reconvene [1] 30 |
| - | 60/17 80/13 80/19 | record [15] 3/13 10 |
| proposed [1] 54/2 | quite [1] 81/11 | 33/17 33/25 34/16 35/20 40/3 |
| propounding [1] 86/17 | quote [2] 35/5 | 41/19 $44 / 17$ 57/21 65/17 |
| prosecutor [1] 44/22 | quoted [1] 68/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 66/15 } & 83 / 17 & 113 / 4 \\ \text { ecords [3] } & 10 / 9 & 10 / 12 & 10 / 23\end{array}$ |
| protected [3] 74/17 97/9 |  |  |
| 97/14 | R | redact [1] 83/8 |
| protection [7] 5/24 86/16 $87 / 24 \text { 87/24 88/1 88/21 97/10 }$ | ```rabbit [1] 8/19 raise [3] 63/25 64/15 68/18``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { redacted }[4] \quad 83 / 9 \quad 83 / 18 \\ & 83 / 2284 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| protections [1] 88/16 | raised [12] 15/4 28/14 $28 / 15$ | reduce [2] 6/4 6/ |
| proud [1] 98/16 proudly [1] $96 / 10$ | 69/7 71/12 71/16 75/19 77/17 | refer [1] 43/25 |
| proudly [1] 96/10 prove [5] | 77/18 81/20 83/24 88/25 | reference [6] 16/9 18/8 $24 / 3$ |
| prove [5] 43/13 44/5 65 | raising [4] 55/21 76/14 | 24/4 50/22 51/17 |
|  | 80/21 102/23 | referenced [20] |
| $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { provide [16] } \\ \text { 20/16 } \\ 20 / 18 \\ 20 / 15 \\ 23 / 15\end{array}\right) 24 / 4$ 17/23 | range [4] 92/11 92/12 92/16 | 19/22 20/7 23/1 36/16 36 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 16 & 20 / 18 & 23 / 15 & 24 / 14 & \\ 24 / 23 & 25 / 23 & 26 / 18 & 26 / 22 & 38 / 1\end{array}$ | 93/3 | 39/20 39/23 42/15 44/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 23 & 25 / 23 & 26 / 18 & 26 / 22 & 38 / 1 \\ 46 / 10 & 84 / 4 & 87 / 24 & 101 / 25 & \end{array}$ | RANITIDINE [27] $1 / 4$ 3/4 $42 / 2$ | 45/21 46/3 $48 / 17$ 56/5 57/20 |
| $\begin{array}{cccc}46 / 10 & 8 / 4 & 87 / 24 & 101 / 25 \\ \text { provided [16] } & 8 / 14 & 11 / 17\end{array}$ | 51/4 51/17 52/17 52/19 52/22 | 61/6 78/13 105/3 111/25 |
|  | 53/24 56/9 56/22 57/13 66/21 | referencing [4] 36/20 36 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}21 / 10 & 23 / 17 & 24 / 2 & 25 / 12 & 26 / 14 \\ 70 / 21 & 73 / 4 & 73 / 18 & 91 / 5 & 94 / 9\end{array}$ | 71/3 90/22 91/1 91/3 91/5 | $84 / 16 \quad 105 / 3$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}70 / 21 & 73 / 4 & 73 / 18 & 91 / 5 & 94 / 9 \\ 104 / 8 & 109 / 1 & 109 / 1 & 110 / 14\end{array}$ | 94/9 94/12 94/19 94/24 94/24 | referred [3] $4 / 4 \mathrm{l}$ 16/8 $29 /$ |
| $\begin{array}{rrrr}104 / 8 & 109 / 1 & 109 / 1 & 110 / 14 \\ \text { provides } & \text { [2] } & 24 / 19 & 86 / 16\end{array}$ | 97/19 98/3 98/5 98/12 | referring [3] 10/3 18/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { provides [2] } & 24 / 19 & 86 / 16 \\ \text { providing [3] } & 11 / 11 & 27 / 15\end{array}$ | rapid [1] 51/15 | 29/14 |
| providing $102 / 10$ | RE [2] 1/4 3/3 | reflect [2] 68/13 102/10 |
|  | reach [2] 81/13 83 | reflects [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { proving [1] } & 72 / 13 \\ \text { PTO [19] } & 4 / 20 \quad 17 / 3 & 17 / 19\end{array}$ | reached [1] 99/20 | refuse [1] 17/23 |
| $\begin{array}{clllll}\text { PTO [19] } & 4 / 20 & 17 / 3 & 17 / 19 \\ 17 / 24 & 18 / 7 & 18 / 23 & 19 / 23 & 20 / 4\end{array}$ | react [1] 78/12 | refused [3] 72/23 89/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 24 & 18 / 7 & 18 / 23 & 19 / 23 ~ 20 / 4 \\ 20 / 7 & 21 / 6 & 21 / 11 & 22 / 9 & 23 / 1\end{array}$ | read [13] 5/6 27/18 31 | 99/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 7 & 21 / 6 & 21 / 11 & 22 / 9 & 23 / 1 \\ 29 / 10 & 32 / 7 & 33 / 15 & 83 / 6 & 84 / 22\end{array}$ | 38/2 $39 / 11$ 40/13 $40 / 14$ 40/20 | refusing [1] 40/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 29 / 1032 / 733 / 1583 / 6 ~ 84 / 22 \\ & 110 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | $40 / 23 \quad 40 / 24 \quad 71 / 2 \quad 80 / 18$ | regard [8] 19/5 32/1 52/24 |
| public [5] 13/5 74/18 8 | 109/10 | 74/4 75/2 75/3 76/10 84/5 |
| 83/17 85/1 | reading [2] 40/21 49/22 | regarding [9] 8/14 18/4 22/8 |
| publicity [3] 72/19 72/20 | real [2] 61/5 91/8 | 27/22 29/11 35/12 37/5 98/2 |
| 76/13 | really [24] 9/25 $11 / 14$ 24/15 | 98/4 |
| publicized [1] | 50/25 54/10 56/3 62/9 62/11 | regressive |
| publish [2] 54/18 69/20 | 67/20 78/17 79/9 79/24 86/8 | rehash [2] 111/13 111/1 |
| published [1] 47/1 | 86/23 88/1 88/2 90/3 90/15 | reimbursed [2] 76/9 77/12 |
| pulled [3] 51/20 51/22 52/7 | 92/3 101/3 102/6 108/22 | REINHART [4] 1/9 4/11 24/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { punitive [3] } 73 / 12 \quad 73 / 23 \\ & 99 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | reason [10] 11/11 15/11 | reiterate [7] $8 / 7$ 11/13 $16 / 3$ |
| Purdue [1] | 25/12 37/4 38/10 42/21 55/19 | 16/12 16/17 96/7 101/9 |
| pure [7] 25/16 32/2 32/3 | 73/24 96/17 105/2 <br> reasonable [6] 17/21 86/16 |  |
| $32 / 13$ 33/3 $34 / 18$ 68/20 | 86/17 89/15 108/21 110/6 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { related [25] } & 23 / 22 ~ 42 / 22\end{array}$ |
| purely [1] 37/18 | reasonably [2] 13/13 13/25 | 56/7 56/21 57/6 58/25 59/15 |
| purposes [2] 3/7 $28 / 18$ push [2] c/19 | reasons [6] 68/6 74/15 88/3 | 60/20 61/1 66/21 67/10 78/21 |
| push [2] 6/19 58/5 | 90/21 98/25 107/13 | 83/3 91/3 92/1 94/8 94/18 |


| R | Representatives [1] 60 | $21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| related... [8] 94/24 97/17 | ed [3] | 46/9 67/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 97 / 19 & 107 / 19 & 109 / 6 & 110 / 25 \\ 111 / 14 & 112 / 11 \end{array}$ | representing [3] 17/17 38/23 | retention [1] 56/14 |
| relates [1] 88/1 | 99/ | retracted [2] 62/3 71 |
| relating [12] 3/10 $3 / 17$ 3/18 | reproduce [1] 107/17 <br> request [41] $8 / 6$ 8/16 9/3 | urns [1] $81 / 13$   <br> enue [3] $64 / 9$ $75 / 17$ $75 / 20$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 3 / 18 & 4 / 25 & 5 / 7 & 21 / 4 & 38 / 16 \\ 39 / 18 & 63 / 13 & 84 / 22 & 90 / 14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { request } \\ 9 / 5 & 15 / 25 & 18 / 21 & 21 / 25 & 25 / 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { revenue [20] } & 17 / 2 & 24 / 5 & 37 / 11\end{array}$ |
| relationships [5] 72/3 72/ | 31/17 32/10 32/11 36/10 | 39/4 39/9 41/7 53/1 57/21 |
| 90/8 98/1 103/5 | 36/10 36/12 37/12 50/10 | 65/25 68/9 68/11 73/16 74/3 |
| relative [1] 79/10 | 50/23 52/12 65/20 72/25 77/7 | 74/11 83/8 83/15 88/11 91/19 |
| relevance [12] 6/15 11/15 | 78/2 86/14 86/15 90/10 90/23 | 95/12 104/9 |
| 11/25 14/12 25/14 41/25 | 91/2 91/4 91/6 93/13 94/7 | reviewed [13] 4/18 18/25 |
| 42/10 47/14 47/21 63/19 | 94/11 $94 / 12$ 94/14 94/17 | 19/6 20/7 20/20 25/1 25/3 |
| 64/20 111/14 | 94/20 94/22 97/16 97/23 | 25/9 39/14 39/16 40/10 63/4) |
| relevant [32] 5/11 7/8 7/22 | requested [10] 5/7 18/22 | 87/13 |
| 8/8 8/13 8/20 10/9 10/14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { requested [10] } 5 / 7 \text { 18/22 } \\ & 18 / 24 \quad 20 / 16 \quad 25 / 10 \quad 42 / 5 \quad 74 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reviewing [3] 41/14 76/23 } \\ & 96 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}11 / 16 & 11 / 19 & 12 / 3 & 12 / 5 \\ 1 / 2 / 21\end{array}$ | 102/2 109/3 110/14 | Richmond [1] 1/12 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 8 & 14 / 12 & 14 / 20 & 25 / 11 & 26 / 25 \\ 33 / 4 & 34 / 23 & 36 / 11 & 37 / 20 & 48 / 10\end{array}$ | requesting [6] 5/15 16/23 | right [16] 9/15 16/2 26/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 4 & 34 / 23 & 36 / 11 & 37 / 20 & 48 / 10 \\ 48 / 22 & 49 / 11 & 52 / 15 & 62 / 23\end{array}$ | 52/16 62/20 62/21 72/24 | 29/20 51/18 62/2 62/19 65/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}48 / 22 & 49 / 11 & 52 / 15 & 62 / 23 \\ 63 / 20 & 70 / 8 & 101 / 22 & 107 / 20\end{array}$ | requests [17] 31/25 32/13 | 78/6 81/4 85/2 86/6 89/25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 63 / 20 \quad 70 / 8 \\ & 111 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | reques $77 / 25$ 89/4 90/6 90/11 90/12 | 103/20 106/12 112/14 |
| reliable [1] | 94/1 94/2 94/4 94/7 96/4 | rights [3] 100/23 101/ |
| reliance [7] 23/6 23/15 | 7/13 101/23 111/2 111/4 |  |
| 24/14 24/19 25/23 28/25 | 111/5 | risk [2] 13/6 57/13 |
| 48/18 | require [4] 12/10 30/8 | road [2] 1/20 45/18 |
| relied [5] 25/3 56/25 71/5 |  | ROBERT [3] 1/15 15/21 $17 / 17$ |
| $80 / 7$ 111/23 | required [2] | ROBIN [1] |
| relies [1] 82/5 | quirement [3] 63/6 63/7 | Robinson [2] 2/10 38/23 |
| rely [5] 37/10 43/11 43/19 | quiring [3] 8/11 14/18 | role [5] 59/6 59/6 75/2 $102 / 7 \text { 111/10 }$ |
| 43/24 78/22 |  | roles [1] 102/1 |
| relying [15] 36/18 44/15 | rescheduled [1] 28/8 | rolled [1] 10/12 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}46 / 2 & 46 / 15 & 46 / 19 & 46 / 22 & 48 / 19\end{array}$ | research [9] 45/25 46/24 | Ron [2] 49/3 49/7 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}48 / 25 & 49 / 1 & 53 / 11 & 53 / 11 & 53 / 12 \\ 67 / 19 & 78 / 9 & 82 / 2 & & \end{array}$ | research $47 / 8 \quad 49 / 7$ $70 / 8$ | $\text { room [2] } 3 / 2 \text { 30/3 }$ |
| $\begin{array}{ccc}67 / 19 & 78 / 9 & 82 / 2 \\ \text { remains [1] } & 34 / 17\end{array}$ | $70 / 12$ 112/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { ROSENBERG [3] } & 1 / 3 & 2 / 13 & 4 / 3\end{array}$ |
| remains [1] 34/17 <br> remediation [1] | research for [1] 70/12 | round [1] 76/22 |
| mediation [1] | Reserve [1] 59/ | row [1] $94 /$ |
| ove [1] | resolution [1] 4/4 | rule [21] 18/24 19/5 19/ |
| ove [1] oved [2] | resolve [3] 80/9 106/1 | 19/16 27/20 30/8 33/2 35/22 |
| ng [1] | 106/18 | 38/8 66/14 80/17 81/8 86/8 |
| er [1] | resolved [2] 54/2 80/13 | 86/16 93/12 93/21 100/1 |
| $\text { renewing [1] } 36 /=$ | resources [5] 74/22 77/16 | 104/22 104/22 106/15 106/18 |
| reopen [1] 31/10 | 99/2 100/24 112/ | ruled [2] 4/3 25/13 |
| repeatedly [1] 31/25 | respect [8] 6/19 13/12 23/8) | rules [2] 6/13 30 |
| repeating [1] 17/19 | 23/25 24/1 25/7 37/3 85/2 | ruling [12] 15/12 29/25 |
| repeats [2] 94/13 94/13 | respectfully [2] 91/23 97/1 | $31 / 12$ 33/7 37/10 37/13 37 |
| report [22] 27/15 28/21 34/9 | respond [16] 6/17 7/18 8/4 | 38/11 40/16 81/14 81/15 |
| 42/1 42/4 42/6 43/8 53/10 | 28/13 $45 / 16$ 46/11 $46 / 14$ | 105/20 |
| 53/13 53/20 69/6 69/9 70/2 | 64/4 65/19 | rulings [1] 33 |
| 70/10 70/11 70/20 70/23 | 69/18 77/15 101/14 101/17 | run [4] 55/5 |
| 71/25 73/14 79/18 87/11 | onded [5] 8/9 8/12 19/3 | 111/16 |
| 99/13 | responding [2] 15/9 22/23 | rush [2] 55/14 60 <br> rushing [1] 85/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reporter [3] } 2 / 13 \text { 113/7 } \\ & 113 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | response [14] 4/23 5/12 5/15 <br> 6/22 14/14 14/23 19/4 19/9 | S |
| reporting [1] reports [9] 5 | 20/23 22/25 31/19 40/24 | sachet [1] 6/7 |
| $73 / 16 \quad 91 / 10 \quad 102 / 31$ | 100/7 111/3 | said [34] 14/7 16/16 19/13 |
| 109/2 110/13 | responsibilities [1] 20/12 | 29/10 31/25 34/4 41/10 48/23 |
| represent [5] 11/3 $71 / 4$ 91/8 | responsibility [1] 37/3 | 49/17 53/10 69/3 69/11 69/11 |
| 100/16 102/2 | responsible [5] 11/23 16/20 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}74 / 3 & 75 / 13 & 75 / 21 & 76 / 6 & 84 / 23\end{array}$ |
| representation [2] 100/19 | 16/21 20/13 110/17 | 86/22 87/16 87/23 92/16 |
| 102/6 | responsive [4] 8/16 18/9 | 92/18 94/1 97/25 99/8 99/13 |
| representations [3] 37/9 | 1/20 101/23 | 100/2 104/12 105/9 105/23 |
| 41/18 95/11 | rest [1] 71/2 | 105/24 112/1 112/19 |
| representative [1] 63/8 | result [1] 13/18 | same [16] 6/4 16/7 19/11 <br> 21/19 27/20 31/13 $33 / 23 \quad 34 / 4$ |


| S | script | e [1] 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| same... [8] 53/25 58/16 84/2 | scroll [1] | [14] 4/22 18/21 19 |
| 88/18 91/6 94/19 108/19 | $83 / 14 \quad 83 / 22$ | $94 / 3 \text { 95/4 95/19 102/1 106/7 }$ |
| me process [1] 16/7 | sealed [1] 83 | 106/10 |
| same process [1] 16/7 | SEAN [3] 2/7 60/6 85/10 | server [2] 27/25 52/7 |
| sanction [2] 86/19 93/23 | search [23] 38/9 50/23 52/9 | services [3] 46/10 70/7 70/7 |
| sand [1] 109/22 | 52/25 76/20 87/11 92/9 92/9 | serving [5] 28/17 28/20 |
| sanitizer [1] $82 / 12$ | 92/18 93/3 93/4 93/5 93/7 | 40/21 87/17 10 |
| Sanofi [41] 3/20 10/5 10/10 | 93/10 93/13 $93 / 18$ 99/12 | set [20] 3/14 4/6 18/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 17 & 10 / 21 & 11 / 3 & 15 / 18 & 15 / 24\end{array}$ | 102/1 102/3 102/3 104/6 | 23/16 $26 / 6$ 26/14 $48 / 6$ 48/6 |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{llllll}59 / 8 & 65 / 24 & 65 / 25 & 79 / 21 & 79 / 22\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}19 / 2 & 19 / 3 & 19 / 8 & 19 / 18 & 19 / 20\end{array}$ | searches [1] | 84/7 84/24 85/5 86/9 94/17 |
| 19/23 20/4 20/16 21/20 22/7 | ond [9] 3/20 3/22 | 107/11 |
| 22/22 23/2 $23 / 4$ 23/8 23/11 | (90/9 47/10 64/23 87/22 | sets [1] 79/21 |
| 27/4 27/11 27/12 $28 / 5$ 30/18 |  | settlement [1] 81/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 24 & 32 / 18 & 35 / 7 & 35 / 18 & 38 / 19\end{array}$ | $110 / 15$ | several [3] 28/14 |
| 38/20 84/10 94/2 | secret [1] | $102 / 18$ |
| Sanofi's [9] 19/16 20/7 20/9 | see [37] $31 / 22 \quad 32 / 12 \quad 35 / 24$ | SGF [1] |
| 20/23 23/22 26/12 27/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 36 / 6 & 38 / 2 & 44 / 21 & 47 / 23 & 48 / 20\end{array}$ | shaded [1] 41/ |
| 8 | 49/2 49/6 50/12 50/14 54/15 | shall [2] 60/13 86/6 |
|  | 57/22 58/23 59/13 59/14 62/2 | share [1] 89/19 |
| 78/24 79/5 80/4 | 62/14 62/15 62/18 64/10 72/2 | shared [1] 100/5 |
| say [37] $6 / 20$ 7/25 9/5 19/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll}77 / 9 & 77 / 21 & 78 / 5 & 78 / 12 & 78 / 13\end{array}$ | sharing [2] 55/4 104/10 |
| 28/4 29/8 30/14 31/23 35/9 | 79/19 83/4 89/22 90/11 94/16 | SHARPE [16] 2/1 11/2 15/19 |
| 35/21 39/16 40/10 40/12 | 4/22 102/21 103/7 109/1 | 15/24 17/11 18/19 22/20 |
| 44/22 48/5 50/18 62/8 63/2 | ek [2] 6/11 94/16 | 22/22 25/25 29/8 $30 / 1$ 31/13 |
| 68/21 68/24 69/2 71/1 71/15 | seeking [7] 88/21 | 33/9 33/18 $37 / 9$ 83/2 |
| 72/5 72/8 75/22 84/13 $92 / 10$ | 8 98/12 99/15 101/21 | sharpening [1] 8/6 |
| 95/9 96/11 98/16 98/22 100/7 | seeking these | she [42] 19/19 20/7 20/8 20/18 20/20 22/15 23/5 23 |
| 105/7 107/6 108/2 108/19 | seeks [2] 90/23 91/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 23 / 13 & 24 / 3 & 24 / 3 & 24 / 3 & 24 / 5\end{array}$ |
| saying [14] 5/13 11/12 11/13 | seem [1] 22/4 | 24/8 25/10 $26 / 12$ 26/13 $26 / 13$ |
| 34/5 40/19 61/4 61/21 68/19 | seems [5] 9/6 26/22 30/1 | 26/16 27/12 28/9 28/20 29/2 |
| 70/9 70/13 72/21 72/24 82/18 | 30/4 41/24 | 29/3 29/5 29/15 29/22 29/22 |
| 99/9 ${ }_{\text {says [4] }}$ 24/3 30/10 | seen [9] 51/10 52/6 68/10 | 29/23 29/24 30/3 30/5 30/13 |
| says [4] 24/3 30/10 106/24 | 102/9 102/11 103/21 111/9 | $34 / 22$ 34/22 $34 / 22 \quad 35 / 21$ |
| nario | 112/4 112/6 | 35/22 35/23 36/22 36/23 75/9 |
| scheduled [5] 17/25 18/2 | segregable [1] 30 | shelf [1] 51/ |
| 19/16 22/11 50/7 | select [1] 50/24 | shell [1] 64/12 |
| scheduling [1] 91/1 | selecting [1] 50 | shield [1] 103/2 |
| scheme [1] 93/16 | lf [2] 40/21 87/17 | ships [1] 88/5 |
| Scholer [1] 2 | self-serving [2] 40/21 87/17 | short [4] 36/17 55/13 65/16 |
| school [2] 88/8 92/22 | [2] 10/8 70/6 |  |
| science [49] 42/15 44/1 | selling [1] 109/11 <br> semipermeable [1] 5/23 | shorter [1] $94 / 7$   <br> shortly [4] $24 / 20$ $25 / 23$ $59 / 5$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}45 / 21 & 46 / 3 & 48 / 24 & 53 / 9 & 54 / 11\end{array}$ | Senate [1] 61/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { shortly } \\ 102 / 5\end{array}[4] \quad 24 / 20 \quad 25 / 23 \quad 59 / 5$ $102 / 5$ |
| 54/16 55/24 56/11 56/11 | send [3] 40/13 40/21 99/5 | SHORTNACY [7] $2 / 4$ 4/16 $5 / 3$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}56 / 22 & 57 / 4 & 57 / 15 & 58 / 6 & 59 / 1 \\ 59 / 9 & 59 / 10 & 59 / 15 & 59 / 21 & 61 / 1\end{array}$ | sends [1] 61/21 | 8/3 14/18 15/4 49/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}59 / 9 & 59 / 10 & 59 / 15 & 59 / 21 & 61 / 1 \\ 61 / 5 & 61 / 6 & 61 / 10 & 61 / 16 & 62 / 1\end{array}$ | senior [3] 54/5 103/2 112/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { should [36] } & 12 / 22 & 13 / 5 & 14 / 8\end{array}$ |
| $61 / 5$ 61/6 61/10 61/16 62/1 $62 / 10 \quad 64 / 1765 / 11$ 65/11 | seniority [1] 77/22 | $\begin{array}{rlll}\text { 16/12 } & 18 / 16 & 21 / 7 & 21 / 10 \\ 25 / 22\end{array}$ |
| $62 / 10$ $65 / 11$ $67 / 17$ $6768 / 11$ $68 / 3$ $70 / 4$ | sense [1] 88/17 | 27/4 27/20 29/5 31/5 32/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}65 / 11 & 67 / 13 & 68 / 3 & 70 / 4 & 71 / 25\end{array}$ | sensitive [5] 5/25 5/25 6/1 | 36/6 37/10 42/12 48/12 49/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}78 / 11 & 78 / 20 & 78 / 25 & 79 / 1 & 79 / 25 \\ 80 / 1 & 80 / 4 & 80 / 5 & 95 / 6 & 95 / 7\end{array}$ | 74/16 99/1 | 50/2 53/6 77/1 89/17 90/9 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 80 / 1 & 80 / 4 & 80 / 5 & 95 / 6 & 95 / 7 \\ 96 / 1 & 111 / 15 & 111 / 20 & 112 / 12 \end{array}$ | sensitivity [1] | 93/6 100/14 101/7 104/25 |
| $\text { ientific [9] } 8 / 2361 / 8$ | sent [3] 44/24 82/14 112/7 | 105/7 105/8 105/18 106/19 |
|  | sentence [1] 93/22 | 106/25 107/20 110/3 110/6 |
| /12 67/9 67/1 <br> $7103 / 8$ | separate [8] 4/6 17/6 39/7 | 110/17 |
| entist | 39/17 51/14 52/4 84/21 94/3 | show [11] 21/14 30/12 34/5 |
| scientists [2] 58/7 61/17 | separately [2] 4/6 47/12 | 34/5 43/17 47/15 55/16 89/25 |
| scientists' <br> [1] 96/2 | September [4] 36/22 55/19 | 94/3 98/1 103/4 |
| $\begin{array}{lrll} \text { scientists' } & {[1]} & 96 / 2 & \\ \text { scope [8] } & 18 / 20 & 76 / 17 & 76 / 19 \end{array}$ | 56/14 58/13 | showing [7] 27/14 36/1 55/20 |
| 92/19 92/20 93/10 98/11 | September 13th [1] 58/13 | 58/2 60/20 60/25 67/22 |
| 107/15 | September 2018 [1] 55/19 | shown [4] 15/12 33/5 34/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { screen [5] } 4 / 9 \text { 51/14 } 55 / 5 \\ & 55 / 1589 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | series [1] 3/14 <br> Seroquel [3] 75/24 77/19 <br> 111/22 | shows [16] 14/6 56/15 56/21 57/2 57/5 57/7 58/8 58/11 |


| S | 40/19 46/19 46/22 64/18 71/8 | started [6] 48/15 53/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| shows... [8] 58/21 59/20 | 71/16 71/22 81/23 81/24 82/4 | 61/14 72/6 85/25 86/12 |
| 59/24 60/19 60/23 61/7 61/10 | $83 / 17$ $84 / 10$ $84 / 13$ $84 / 19$ <br> $96 / 18$ $96 / 23$ $97 / 2$ $104 / 18$ | $\begin{array}{\|lrl} \hline \text { starts [1] } & 58 / 20 \\ \text { startup [2] } & 86 / 12 & 86 / 13 \end{array}$ |
| 103/8 shrink | 105/11 109/10 112/21 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { state [5] } & 13 / 3 & 13 / 13 & 14 / 2\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { shrink [1] } 73 / 10 \\ & \text { side [2] } 11 / 14 \quad 27 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | sometime [2] 20/3 23/10 | 14/7 48/18 |
| sides [1] 41/20 | sometimes [4] 33/16 90/14 | stated [1] 28/19 |
| sift [1] 101/11 | 91/16 91/17 <br> somewhat [2] 69/19 82/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { statement [3] 33/3 51/18 } \\ & 69 / 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { sifting [1] } & \text { 96/20 } \\ \text { Signature [1] } & 113 / 8\end{array}$ | somewhere <br> [1] 82/24 | statements [4] 31/21 32 |
| Signature [1] 113/8 <br> significant [7] 23/24 44/18 | soon [1] 49/4 | 50/4 60/9 |
| ```significant [7] 23/24 44/18 59/16 77/2 85/16 100/14``` | sooner [1] 31/10 | states [7] 1/1 1/10 13/1 |
| $101 / 2$ | sorry [7] 5/10 25/9 29/12 | 13/9 13/17 92/2 101/1 |
| significantly [1] 100/4 | /22 48/3 | stating [1] 68/3 |
| silo [1] 67/11 | ort [6] 8/18 9/25 12/10 $47 / 16$ 67/23 80/10 | $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { status [1] } & 35 / 13 & \\ \text { steps [3] } & 12 / 15 & 86 / 17 & 8 \end{array}$ |
| similarly [1] 8 | sorts [1] 52/20 | still [17] 8/12 10/17 21 |
| simple [1] 8/1 <br> simplify [1] 48 | sounding [1] 54/11 | 29/2 48/16 50/10 56/16 60/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { simply [7] } & 11 / 13 & 23 / 17 & 29 / 5\end{array}$ | sounds [3] 26/21 28/23 95/24 | 61/5 61/22 67/24 76/11 $78 / 20$ |
| 36/24 45/8 96/17 100/3 | source [2] 79/15 95/13 | 83/1 83/2 86/12 105/13 |
| simulated [1] 47/7 | sources [5] 52/19 78/9 | Stipes [5] 2/13 55/11 60/5 |
| since [12] 25/17 28/10 31/14 | 03/12 108/11 108/12 | 21 113/7 |
| 35/5 70/10 70/19 71/6 73/13 | SOUTHERN [1] 1/1 | stipulation [1] 19/17 |
| 73/13 77/4 77/7 92/22 | Spalding [1] 2/ | stood [2] 31/24 89/10 |
| single [2] 7/2 86/11 | speak [5] 47/25 49/12 93/25 | stop [4] 104/12 105/10 |
| sir [1] 81/21 | aking [1] | stored [1] |
| situation [2] 33/20 80/10 | special [7] 41/22 75/9 81/11 | $\text { story [1] } 67 / 20$ |
| situations [1] 33/12 | $101 / 25 \text { 104/5 106/4 112/17 }$ | strange $\text { [1] } 78 / 16$ |
| six [1] 73/14 | specific [7] 8/10 27/5 31/21 | strategies [1] 105/5 |
| size [1] | 38/7 64/25 65/20 78/25 | Street [2] 1/24 2/5 |
| skip [1] 58/14 | specifically [3] 8/11 18/3 | strength [2] 95/25 96/1 |
| slide [6] 55/16 55/18 56/6 | 19/21 | stretching [1] 68/25 |
| 90/19 92/8 97/12 | spectrometry | rikes [1] 44/21 |
| slightly [1] 30/19 |  | striking [1] 64/15 strong [1] 41/12 |
| slow [1] 60/4 | speculation [8] 25/16 32/2 | rongly [5] |
| slower [1] 60/15 | $32 / 3 \quad 32 / 14 \quad 33 / 4 \quad 34 / 18 \quad 37 / 17$ | 112/16 112/16 112/1 |
| small [1] 94/4 | 68/21 | structure [1] 8/24 |
| smaller [5] $51 / 2$ 65/24 | speculative [1] | struggle [1] 108/22 |
| 51/2 65/24 smiled [1] 96/10 | spend [4] 72/20 100/18 | studies [11] 45/21 46/3 56/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { smiled [1] } & 96 / 10 \\ \text { Smith [2] } & 44 / 23 & 44 / 25\end{array}$ | 100/19 104/20 | 56/25 61/6 61/22 66/19 66/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Smith [2] } & 44 / 23 & 44 / 25 \\ \text { Smith's [1] } & 44 / 24\end{array}$ | spending [2] 18/19 58/5 | 78/22 80/6 96/2 |
| Smith's [1] | spent [12] 54/9 62/14 62/15 | study [35] 8/23 42/1 42/16 |
|  | 72/18 73/24 73/25 75/4 75/10 | 43/3 43/12 43/19 43/25 44/4 |
| $11$ | 77/10 100/10 100/20 100/20 | 45/19 46/2 46/7 47/2 47/2 |
|  | spirit [1] 30/10 | 47/7 47/13 47/20 47/20 48/9 |
|  | split [2] 76/1 76/2 | 54/13 54/18 56/1 57/6 61/5 |
| solicit [1] | splitting [1] 75/25 | 62/3 67/4 67/10 69/6 69/24 |
| solicit [1] 68 | spoke [1] 104/5 | 78/11 78/13 78/13 78/14 |
|  | spoliation [3] 18/4 21/4 | 78/14 78/14 86/8 |
| solutions [1] | 7/22 | stuff [3] 63/9 82/8 84/ |
| some [40] 3/11 6/20 7/25 | spot [1] 99/11 | subject [7] 8/23 9/6 14/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 10/24 } & 16 / 9 & 16 / 11 & 17 / 7 & 29 / 21\end{array}$ | spreadsheet [3] 39/10 52/5 | 49/19 74/18 81/4 97/5 |
| $30 / 17$ 36/17 37/18 41/13 | 18 | submission [19] 4/21 5/5 |
| 47/16 51/5 51/20 52/5 55/10 | staff [1] 30/2 | 17/3 17/6 17/19 18/8 18/23 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}57 / 17 & 64 / 8 & 74 / 9 & 74 / 16 & 75 / 22\end{array}$ | staffing [1] 77/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 23 & 20 / 4 & 20 / 7 & 21 / 14 & 21 / 22\end{array}$ |
| 76/13 80/6 82/3 82/8 82/12 | stage [1] 72/24 | 22/9 22/25 29/10 32/7 35/5 |
| 83/3 83/3 88/3 89/5 89/25 | stages [1] 55/22 | 79/6 79/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 92 / 8 & 92 / 12 & 92 / 18 & 94 / 20 \\ 100 / 3 & 109 / 11 & 111 / 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { stand [3] } \\ \text { stand-alone [1] } & 26 / 15\end{array}$ | $\text { submit [14] } 4 / 24 \quad 17 / 8 \quad 17 / 11$ |
| somebody [5] $11 / 5$ 46/8 $82 / 4$ | standard [1] 37/17 | 32/8 37/12 39/19 39/22 70/18 |
| 103/23 103/24 | standards [2] 13/9 32/2 | 70/18 71/17 71/18 83/21 |
| meone [2] | STANLEY [8] 1/11 4/12 4/25 | 91/23 96/17 |
| something [32] 7/11 8/20 | 5/16 8/18 9/7 9/14 12/18 | submitted [12] 5/2 5/12 20/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { a/14 } & 9 / 24 & 28 / 22 & 28 / 23 \\ 29 / 14 & 29 / 24 & 39 / 10 & 40 / 11\end{array}$ | ```Stanley's [1] 8/6 start [4] 9/13 22/23 49/20``` | $\begin{array}{llll} 33 / 6 & 39 / 6 & 39 / 9 & 39 / 12 \\ 59 / 15 \\ 56 / 16 & 60 / 22 & 83 / 6 & 84 / 17 \end{array}$ |


| S | T | es [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| subpoena... [35] 38/17 38/17 | tab [1] 57/21 | $\begin{array}{ccc} {[5]} \\ 72 / 16 \end{array} 19 / 1 \text { 19/1 }$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}40 / 24 & 43 / 1 & 49 / 5 & 49 / 5 & 49 / 24\end{array}$ | table [4] 86/9 105/13 105/16 | testifying [4] 43/6 43/7 |
| 50/17 54/4 $73 / 5$ 86/7 $86 / 15$ | 107/22 | $69 / 10 \quad 73 / 13$ |
|  | tainted [1] 69/24 | testimony [5] 32/4 34/16 |
| 90/21 91/24 $92 / 10 \quad 92 / 15$ | 41/14 55/7 55/10 55/12 55/13 | 35/25 37/10 62/1 |
| 92/19 92/20 94/5 95/4 97/5 | 58/3 60/18 61/14 62/11 63/2 | testing [38] |
| 97/13 98/8 100/23 106/6 | 64/22 64/23 65/13 66/9 68/24 | 45/25 46/1 49/8 49/16 52/21 |
| 110/16 | $\begin{array}{llll}69 / 2 & 69 / 8 & 73 / 7 & 73 / 9 \\ 74 / 5\end{array}$ | $54 / 13 \quad 54 / 14 \quad 56 / 2 \quad 56 / 4 \quad 56 / 14$ |
| subpoenaed [3] 92/6 96/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll}74 / 6 & 74 / 8 & 74 / 23 & 78 / 15 & 78 / 19\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}56 / 19 & 56 / 20 & 58 / 9 & 58 / 11 & 60 / 21\end{array}$ |
|  | $88 / 24$ 89/18 99/25 101/4 | 62/4 62/12 63/22 66/19 66/20 |
| subpoenas [4] 94/3 95/17 | $104 / 9 \text { 110/4 }$ | $\begin{array}{llll}67 / 25 & 72 / 14 & 72 / 15 & 78 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 95/19 110/18 | taken [14] 16/18 16/24 18/15 | 78/22 78/22 80/7 82/15 94/9 |
| subsequent [2] 70/24 70/25 | 21/3 26/3 28/11 29/15 31/20 | 94/18 98/5 tests [1] 76/25 |
| substance [1] 6/13 | 32/17 65/16 84/24 92/4 92/23 | $\text { than [17] } 9 / 24 \text { 17/8 } 17 / 12$ |
| substantially [1] 13/24 substantive [2] 43/12 5 | 101/12 takes [4] | 28/24 29/14 $34 / 10$ 44/8 55/8 |
| Substantively [1] 99/17 | takes [4] $84 / 7$ | 66/1 $74 / 23$ 76/10 $81 / 10$ 81/12 |
| success [2] 60/25 61/11 | taking [13] 16/21 26/13 | 84/8 89/20 95/20 108/24 thank [38] 8/3 8/5 14/10 |
| such [7] 13/4 29/11 35/8 | 27/17 $32 / 16$ 35/11 $35 / 12$ | $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { 15/13 } & 15 / 15 & 15 / 16 & 17 / 1 & 17 / 16\end{array}$ |
| 83/9 86/18 95/3 97/8 | 35/13 $36 / 4$ 44/19 55/25 82/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 22 / 11 & 22 / 12 & 22 / 19 & 25 / 25 & 27 / 9\end{array}$ |
| suddenly [1] 27/25 | 89/15 112/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 33 / 20 & 36 / 13 & 36 / 14 & 37 / 8 \\ 38 / 12\end{array}$ |
| suffer [2] 99/24 101/3 | talk [7] 6/18 11/6 49/4 | $\begin{array}{llll}38 / 14 & 38 / 15 & 38 / 20 & 41 / 16\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sufficient [3] 31/5 73/5 } \\ & 98 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | 64/21 86/5 89/8 96/8 talked [3] 12/21 18/1 | 45/13 $46 / 20$ 53/14 $58 / 1 \quad 60 / 13$ |
| suggest [5] 11/4 28/3 29/4 | talking [18] 6/5 8/17 19/21 | 68/14 68/17 77/13 81/19 |
| 34/7 35/1 | 23/1 23/6 24/24 27/21 33/24 | 83/25 85/6 86/2 101/16 |
| suggested [1] 92/12 | 48/21 51/24 58/23 59/2 59/5 | 109/21 112/14 112/23 |
| suggesting [4] 14/19 21/1 | 59/6 59/11 67/11 92/13 | hat [912] |
| 55/25 71/11 | 109/11 | 51/21 74/7 84/12 106/3 |
| suggestion [1] 34/11 | tangentially [1] 92/1 | the citizen [2] 51/9 75/24 |
| Suite [5] 1/13 1/17 1/20 2/5 | task [1] 9/25 | The FDA [1] 63/4 |
| 2/8 | team [5] 20/12 26/24 28/5 | the independence [1] 92/2 |
| sum [2] $5 / 4$ 101/2 | 31/3 40/5 | the laboratory [1] 46/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { summaries [3] } & 41 / 3 & 41 / 7 & 69 / 3 \\ \text { summarize [1] } & 75 / 14\end{array}$ | technical [1] 8/22 | their [40] 4/9 6/22 12/22 |
| summarize [1] 75/14 | technically [2] 13/23 49/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 14 & 18 / 1 & 18 / 16 & 19 / 4 & 19 / 9\end{array}$ |
| summarized [1] 57/18 | techniques [1] 13/9 | 19/12 21/13 21/22 22/24 |
| summary [2] 39/6 80/11 sun [1] $51 / 14$ | technological [2] | 24/24 25/7 26/25 31/20 32/4 |
| sun [1] 51/14 <br> super [1] 56/ | 110/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 41 / 3 & 41 / 6 & 43 / 13 & 44 / 1 & 44 / 13\end{array}$ |
| superior [1] 35 | $107 / 9$ | 47/20 49/6 49/7 49/8 53/12 |
| superiors [1] 32/18 | technologically [4] 104/7 | 56/10 63/22 66/15 70/7 70/7 |
| supervisor [3] 20/11 36/2 | 107/24 108/4 108/20 | $70 / 25$ 72/2 79/13 83/16 86/1 |
| $37 / 2$ superv | Technology [1] 78/4 <br> tell [5] 24/5 36/21 | them [43] 6/20 7/17 7/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { supervisory [1] } \\ \text { supplement [2] } & 14 / 14 & 71 / 13\end{array}$ | $104 / 25 \quad 106 / 18$ | 14/22 20/20 22/13 25/11 |
| supplemental [4] 14/23 19/9 | telling [4] 27/2 49/7 54/18 | 25/12 25/19 25/23 26/18 $28 / 7$ |
| 37/12 70/15 | 57/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 11 & 30 / 7 & 31 / 5 & 34 / 4 & 34 / 4\end{array}$ |
| support [3] 24/2 52/11 61/22 | tells [1] 56/19 | $34 / 10$ 34/24 $35 / 8 \quad 35 / 2440 / 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { supported }[3] \quad 34 / 15 \quad 41 / 18 \\ & 100 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | temperature [2] 71/4 71/5 ten [4] 46/3 65/13 65/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 51 / 10 & 53 / 15 & 62 / 25 & 62 / 25 & 68 / 9 \\ 68 / 11 & 71 / 19 & 72 / 12 & 72 / 23 & 76 / 2 \end{array}$ |
| supporting [1] 103/5 | $\left.\right\|_{87 / 1} ^{\operatorname{ten}[4]} 46 / 3 \quad 65 / 13$ | 76/7 77/7 80/6 80/7 82/2 |
| suppose [1] 43/1 | tens [5] 87/9 87/10 96/2 | 82/19 82/21 83/8 83/15 91/21 |
| supposed [8] 16/20 21/3 | 109/11 110/1 | 103/7 |
| 46/14 107/1 107/2 107/3 | term [4] 10/2 15/1 99/13 | themes [1] 5/24 |
| 107/4 108/2 | 102/3 | themselves [2] $22 / 4107 / 10$ |
| sure [17] 7/6 15/5 20/1 $30 / 8$ | terms [13] 53/19 62/22 87/11 | hen [48] 3/12 7/10 11/1 <br> $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 8 & 16 / 21 & 21 / 10 & 21 / 25 & 23 / 15\end{array}$ |
| 46/13 49/4 60/16 63/17 65/19 | 90/17 92/9 92/18 93/6 93/10 | $\begin{array}{llll} 14 / 8 & 16 / 21 & 21 / 10 & 21 / 25 \end{array} 23 / 150$ |
| 66/14 67/11 $76 / 14$ 77/16 | 102/1 102/3 104/6 104/6 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}82 / 23 & 87 / 25 ~ 100 / 6 ~ 107 / 8 ~ \\ \text { switch [3] } & 48 / 16 & 48 / 24 \quad 55 / 15\end{array}$ | 107/3 | 58/20 59/1 59/4 62/5 63/3 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { switch [3] } & 48 / 16 & 48 / 24 & 55 / 15 \\ \text { sworn [2] } & \text { 5/12 } & 50 / 4\end{array}$ | terribly [2] 86/13 87/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}64 / 16 & 70 / 20 & 73 / 9 & 73 / 17 & 74 / 14\end{array}$ |
| sworn [2] 5/12 50/4 | terrific [2] 50/19 75/10 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}77 / 8 & 77 / 24 & 78 / 14 & 81 / 13 & 82 / 4\end{array}$ |
| sympathy [1] 98/16 system [1] 27/17 | test [3] 56/9 59/22 60/2 | 83/13 83/18 89/13 90/11 |
| system [1] 27/17 | tested [1] 71/3 | 91/21 99/23 103/2 104/19 |
|  | testified [1] 35/16 | 107/4 107/15 108/4 109/17 |

## T

then... [3] 110/4 110/9 110/15
theory [3] $11 / 25 \quad 41 / 25 \quad 42 / 10$ there [101] 3/16 9/9 9/19 12/15 13/23 16/19 16/20 23/24 24/3 24/4 24/13 24/22 25/12 26/7 26/9 26/15 26/17 26/22 26/23 27/2 28/14 29/22 $30 / 21 \quad 31 / 14 \quad 32 / 4 \quad 32 / 15 \quad 33 / 21$ $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 8 & 34 / 9 & 34 / 11 & 34 / 11 & 34 / 18\end{array}$ 34/25 35/1 35/11 35/11 35/12 $36 / 4 \quad 37 / 4 \quad 37 / 18 \quad 39 / 4 \quad 39 / 6$ $39 / 7$ 39/24 42/3 42/7 44/19 47/21 47/24 49/25 51/19 52/6 53/5 54/3 60/9 64/8 64/8 64/11 65/5 66/18 66/19 67/9 67/18 69/22 71/6 71/8 71/8 $71 / 9 \quad 71 / 9 \quad 71 / 17 \quad 73 / 1 \quad 74 / 15$ 74/16 76/7 76/16 77/22 78/5 $80 / 1$ 83/19 85/3 89/19 91/13 91/18 95/14 96/6 96/23 97/2 98/7 98/25 100/9 100/22 102/18 106/13 107/8 108/23 111/4 111/11 111/12 111/18 111/19 111/20
therefore [4] 11/21 47/19 67/2 88/10
Thereupon [2] 65/16 113/1 these [40] 6/1 9/22 18/21 21/11 22/1 25/7 25/14 26/11 26/23 27/22 27/24 29/2 31/9 32/1 34/1 34/22 35/10 35/25 $36 / 16$ 36/19 38/2 47/11 47/17 51/23 54/19 67/19 69/19 73/15 73/21 78/9 83/3 87/4 87/5 90/17 93/24 94/21 96/18 99/11 99/15 110/25
they [228]
they be [1] 69/23
thing [12] $8 / 2312 / 6 \quad 15 / 6$ 34/4 58/16 62/3 67/17 72/6 75/13 79/9 95/16 111/9
things [17] 9/2 26/2 26/17 34/21 37/16 $44 / 12 \quad 44 / 14 \quad 48 / 6$ 49/23 50/21 52/14 54/22 64/2 66/5 66/18 82/9 83/20
think [113] 8/7 12/19 16/10 16/17 17/14 22/24 22/25 $\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 17 & 25 / 13 & 27 / 18 & 29 / 15 & 30 / 9\end{array}$ $30 / 18$ 33/10 36/10 36/16 37/1 40/11 40/22 41/4 41/5 42/17 $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 21 & 44 / 18 & 47 / 6 & 48 / 11 & 48 / 14\end{array}$ 48/21 49/11 49/14 53/10 53/11 53/21 55/6 56/3 58/15 58/16 59/12 60/9 62/23 63/10 63/12 63/15 64/19 65/18 66/13 68/1 68/2 69/1 70/1 $\begin{array}{lllll}70 / 20 & 71 / 4 & 71 / 5 & 71 / 9 & 71 / 10\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}71 / 14 & 72 / 19 & 73 / 1 & 73 / 21 & 73 / 22\end{array}$ 73/23 76/17 78/20 78/23 79/4 $79 / 5$ 79/14 80/2 80/12 81/23 82/11 82/18 84/6 84/19 84/23 84/23 86/13 87/7 87/25 88/4 88/7 89/12 90/1 92/2 93/14 94/10 94/11 95/7 95/12 95/15 96/3 96/4 98/18 99/16 99/18
$99 / 25$ 100/1 100/14 100/24 102/8 102/13 102/15 103/7 $107 / 20$ 107/20 108/22 109/10 $109 / 12$ 110/6 110/7 110/17 111/13 111/23
third [23] 3/23 3/23 $3 / 24$ $10 / 24$ 26/6 27/2 $31 / 14$ 31/15 $37 / 2 \quad 38 / 16 \quad 46 / 9 \quad 67 / 1 \quad 67 / 20$ 79/11 84/16 84/18 91/17 97/1 $98 / 24 \quad 106 / 23 \quad 107 / 19107 / 25$ 111/9
third-party [1] 84/16
this [227]
thorough [1] 95/9
those [79] 9/2 9/10 10/12 $10 / 15$ 12/3 12/9 16/23 17/6 20/17 20/18 20/21 21/24 22/3 22/14 22/15 22/16 24/5 25/5 25/11 26/4 27/6 30/6 31/13 $32 / 7 \quad 32 / 12 \quad 32 / 15 \quad 32 / 25 \quad 34 / 6$ 34/23 35/22 35/23 36/7 36/7 $36 / 25 \quad 39 / 12 \quad 39 / 25 \quad 39 / 25$ 44/14 58/25 62/20 62/22 64/13 68/3 68/5 74/19 74/24 76/24 77/3 78/16 79/13 83/14 84/18 88/11 88/14 88/16 90/12 91/12 91/19 92/5 95/7 95/12 95/15 96/12 96/16 96/20 96/24 100/10 101/5 101/11 101/24 102/3 102/4 103/7 104/9 105/4 107/16 108/20 111/4 111/5
though [2] 73/18 104/12
thought [13] $7 / 13$ 7/14 $34 / 12$ 34/22 34/23 40/3 54/1 70/13 72/15 80/20 91/9 91/13 107/14
thousand [7] 50/24 50/25 56/8 73/6 91/20 93/15 93/16 thousands [6] 21/4 87/1 87/9 87/10 96/21 110/2
three [7] 13/22 21/12 26/2 26/17 32/11 35/25 51/6
through [54] $1 / 9 \quad 10 / 13 \quad 12 / 10$ 14/9 26/24 32/19 33/6 38/1 39/4 39/13 40/2 47/24 49/2 49/10 50/1 50/4 50/9 52/5 53/7 53/20 54/19 54/25 55/5 55/7 55/8 55/11 55/13 57/10 60/17 61/25 64/20 64/25 66/23 68/18 73/15 73/17 $74 / 19$ 74/21 75/10 79/2 $82 / 9$ 88/13 88/18 96/20 97/3 98/20 98/23 100/6 101/11 103/9 104/20 110/15 111/16 112/10
through the [1] 53/20
throughout [6] 21/1 32/19
42/14 90/6 94/14 112/6
TIAA [1] 68/19
ties [1] 111/15
time [56] $4 / 17$ 5/11 $7 / 9 \quad 7 / 22$ 9/9 9/12 10/9 13/4 13/6
$\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 14 & 13 / 22 & 14 / 3 & 14 / 8 & 16 / 11\end{array}$ 18/14 18/14 20/2 27/4 27/16 29/1 29/9 30/16 30/17 31/5 $31 / 13$ 31/25 32/2 33/16 34/14 35/8 36/9 36/12 44/12 55/13 60/18 68/9 73/25 74/23 75/12

76/23 77/11 77/24 78/6 80/8 80/24 83/21 86/25 87/1 87/25 88/23 94/6 99/6 99/9 101/12 104/20 110/19
time than [1] 74/23
timeline [28] 39/15 40/1 40/3 40/4 40/7 41/7 41/14 47/23 49/2 49/7 49/10 50/13 54/15 54/19 55/1 55/7 55/11 55/14 55/17 57/22 63/17 66/11 68/10 68/12 68/18 72/2 95/9 112/6
timelines [1] 95/12
times [1] 94/14
timing [3] 24/15 49/15 75/2
title [2] 16/8 21/24
titled [1] 39/7
to avoid [1] 86/17
to coordinate [1] 108/3
to email [1] 52/10
to explore [1] 50/21
to introduce [1] 44/5
to non-privileged [1] 98/9
to prove [1] 102/16
to what [1] 8/12
today [24] 3/16 $4 / 14 / 5$ 5/18
16/7 19/15 26/20 27/4 29/9
29/17 33/24 34/5 40/19 50/10
66/14 75/5 80/18 84/3 85/9
85/13 86/4 95/22 100/8 106/16
today's [2] $3 / 7$ 4/19
together [8] 23/7 40/5 67/21 82/9 94/16 99/17 102/24
109/16
told [6] 21/13 26/6 32/8 44/23 89/8 105/15
Tom [3] 47/25 58/4 77/23
tomorrow [4] 74/13 84/25
87/15 106/17
ton [3] 73/25 73/25 75/11
too [5] 15/7 54/15 72/25
111/24 112/9
took [6] 22/14 36/7 46/18 51/19 58/24 92/13
top [2] 87/16 100/5
topics [4] 18/21 23/22 $31 / 8$ 54/19
total [3] 5/4 89/6 95/13
totally [1] 92/25
touches [1] 93/19
touching [1] 110/20
tough [1] 99/11
tour [1] 10/25
track [1] 83/22
tracking [1] 11/14
trade [1] 110/23
transaction [1] 10/13
transcript [2] 3/8 113/3
transfer [1] 106/11
transferred [2] 10/20 102/4
transparency [2] 21/1 21/5
traveled [1] 96/9
treat [1] 3/7
trial [4] 43/17 45/1 95/20 95/20
tried [5] 30/11 63/23 63/23 63/24 75/10

| T | 29/13 29/18 49/16 84/12 | usually [1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| true [4] 10/11 45/8 45/8 | undertaken [1] 44/9 | utilization [1] 3/19 <br> utilized [4] 5/8 13/9 26 |
| truth [2] 45/7 82/24 | undue [2] 11/22 86/18 | 82/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { truth } \\ \text { try [19] } & 4 / 17 & 12 / 11 & 18 / 20\end{array}$ | unduly [2] 7/4 33/4 | utilizing [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 26 / 25 & 38 / 5 & 42 / 5 & 43 / 2 & 43 / 13\end{array}$ | unfavorable [1] 63/ | utilizing too |
| 44/3 44/5 47/17 59/8 65/3 |  | V |
| 80/18 90/5 92/16 92/17 | Unile <br> [1] 109/11 | valid [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lll}112 / 18 & 112 / 21 \\ \text { trying } & {[14]}\end{array}$ |  | validate [1] 62 |
| $\begin{array}{rlll}\text { trying } & {[14]} & 11 / 14 & 42 / 17 \\ 60 / 16 & 65 / 7 & 73 / 19 & 73 / 22\end{array}$ | 107/23 108/6 108/10 111/3 | validity [1] 42/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 60 / 16 & 65 / 7 & 73 / 19 & 73 / 22 & 75 / 6 \\ 75 / 22 & 79 / 20 \quad 79 / 24 & 80 / 25 \end{array}$ | unit [2] 8/2 12/12 | Valisure [160] |
| 82/19 102/14 102/16 | UNITED [3] 1/1 1/10 | Valisure citizen's [1] 62/13 |
| turn [6] 5/16 8/3 49/20 | universe [3] 32/14 49 | Valisure's [29] |
| 53/14 60/12 85/8 | unless [5] 40/18 64/21 71/8 | $42 / 17 \text { 55/21 56/10 56/22 57/5 }$ $58 / 258 / 18 \text { 59/22 60/1 60/2 }$ |
| turnaround [1] 99/6 | 71/15 71/21 | 60/24 60/25 61/4 61/11 61/20 |
| turned [2] 10/25 81/19 | Unlike [1] 75/24 | 61/23 67/2 67/23 69/5 69/6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ing [2] } \\ & \text { s }[1] \end{aligned}$ | unnamed [2] 10/24 | 71/25 79/1 88/22 92/5 96/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { ns } & {[1]} \\ \text { ce } \end{array}$ | unnecessary [1] 82/11 | 108/3 111/1 |
| two [42] 4/21 4/23 13/16 | unrelated [1] 92/ | value [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 10 & 18 / 11 & 18 / 12 & 18 / 19\end{array}$ | unseal [1] 84/8 | various [1] 90/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 21 & 18 / 23 & 20 / 8 & 20 / 14 & 20 / 24\end{array}$ | eat [1] 104/3 | vehicles [1] 64 |
| 23/10 23/16 25/17 $28 / 5$ 31/3 | until [8] 20/23 21/2 21/22 | vendor [6] 52/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 32 / 25 & 33 / 10 & 40 / 5 & 47 / 12 & 49 / 23\end{array}$ | 22/1 23/20 30/3 89/17 102/4 | 99/3 99/5 99/10 |
| 52/14 54/6 62/19 68/3 74/14 | unto [1] 97/4 | rbatim [3] |
| 74/23 77/3 77/24 79/21 82/15 | old [1] 13/6 | 10 |
| 90/9 94/3 94/7 98/19 99/6 | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { unwind [1] } 9 / 15 \\ \text { up [35] } & 23 / 20 \quad 27 / 14 & 29 / 4 \end{array}$ | verdict [1] $81 / 13$  <br> versus [2] $3 / 5$ $12 / 5$ |
| 104/16 104/18 105/18 109/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 3 & 30 / 12 & 40 / 3 & 43 / 17 & 45 / 4\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { very [42] } & 8 / 22 & 9 / 2 & 9 / 3 & 14 / 10\end{array}$ |
|  |  | 15/16 20/2 21/19 28/4 29/19 |
| two-week [1] 99/6 | 48/6 48/23 50/24 52/9 59/8 | 29/24 31/21 38/12 38/15 |
| Tylenol [1] 51/1 | 61/5 61/19 64/18 71/21 75/25 | 39/10 42/8 42/9 42/11 42/18 |
| Tylenol [1] 51/15 | 78/18 80/11 82/23 83/25 | 44/17 49/4 53/14 56/12 58/16 |
| type [4] 6/5 6/7 $7 / 9$ 7/23 | 87/19 90/1 92/13 92/23 99/2 | 58/17 60/7 74/19 75/8 75/8 |
| U | 99/22 104/4 111/15 | 78/15 79/14 79/20 80/19 85/6 |
| U.S [1] 60/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { upcoming [3] } & 3 / 21 & 57 / 14 & 75 / 2\end{array}$ | 95/8 95/9 98/16 101/16 $\text { 101/16 110/21 112/14 } 1$ |
| ultimate [4] 92/1 95/3 95/21 | updating [1] 36/5 | $112 / 23$ |
| 95/23 | upon [18] 43/12 44/15 57/22 | view [5] 33/11 40/15 68/12 |
| ultima <br> 88/21 | 62/13 64/24 70/24 80/7 82/2 | 89/3 95/5 |
| um [1] 25/ | 82/5 86/18 93/21 94/2 94/3 | viewed [1] 88 |
| um-m-m [1] 25/1 | 94/11 95/4 95/17 95/19 104/6 | violations [1] 62/ |
| unavoidable [1] 13/19 | us [42] 9/3 9/17 9/18 11/12 | visits [1] 58/25 |
| unaware [1] 70/10 | 12/16 17/22 19/11 20/16 | voice [1] |
| unbundle [1] 42/17 | 20/18 22/2 28/1 43/7 44/23 | voluminous [2] 86/24 90/4 |
| uncommon [1] 86/13 | 46/19 52/25 53/4 55/22 67/20 | voluntarily [1] 78/3 |
| under [16] 17/24 18/3 18/5 | 69/9 72/24 74/9 80/24 80/24 | W |
| 21/6 21/6 30/8 32/22 32/23 | 90/4 92/18 93/18 98/23 104/8 |  |
| 66/9 76/3 $82 / 7$ 83/12 $83 / 14$ |  | waiting [2] 3/2 84/9 |
| 85/7 92/4 93/12 | $106 / 21 \quad 108 / 22 \quad 109 / 1 \quad 109 / 1$ | waive [1] 88/12 |
| undercover [2] 44/24 45/2 <br> underlying [28] 41/3 41/8 | 110/14 | waived [2] 15/8 15/9 |
| 41/9 42/23 45/22 47/8 48/11 | use [19] 6/3 6/21 7/24 13/12 | walk [3] 49/10 54/25 64/25 |
| 48/14 $48 / 24$ 49/14 52/3 54/13 | $\begin{array}{llll}14 / 8 & 15 / 8 & 16 / 6 & 40 / 4 \\ 42 / 1 & 43 / 3 & 43 / 7 & 44 / 16 \\ 50 / 3\end{array}$ | walks [1] $30 / 3$   <br> want [70] $6 / 20$ $8 / 7$ $15 / 19$ |
| 56/2 61/16 61/16 62/12 62/12 | 51/1 74/19 74/22 88/2 107/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 17 / 5 & 27 / 1 & 30 / 12 & 30 / 15 & 31 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| 66/11 $66 / 18$ 68/14 69/4 $69 / 22$ | used [25] 5/10 5/13 5/14 | $31 / 22 \quad 35 / 4 \quad 35 / 23 \quad 42 / 1 \quad 43 / 2$ |
| 69/25 72/2 78/10 95/5 103/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}5 / 20 & 6 / 6 & 6 / 8 & 6 / 23 & 7 / 3 \\ 7 / 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}43 / 10 & 43 / 25 & 44 / 17 & 44 / 19\end{array}$ |
| understand [16] 5/9 12/17 | 7/23 10/2 14/3 16/11 19/19 | 46/11 47/15 49/23 51/10 53/9 |
| 年/3 17/22 $24 / 13$ 26/21 30 | 22/15 44/21 56/1 65/11 66/19 | 60/11 62/21 62/25 63/17 |
| $42 / 24 \text { 44/16 46/20 51/3 }$ | 66/20 73/14 90/14 93/6 95/7 | 63/21 64/2 64/23 64/25 65/19 |
| 64/24 65/2 68/10 86/9 | 100/24 | 66/5 66/14 66/16 66/22 67/11 |
| understanding [8] 3/10 3/15 | useful [1] 61/22 | 68/6 69/16 70/18 70/21 70/22 |
| 7/1 26/11 42/19 64/13 79/25 | using [14] 14/21 21/14 41/3 | 71/18 72/5 72/21 73/7 74/5 |
| 87/19 | 49/12 52/9 52/25 53/15 69/9 | 74/5 74/8 74/9 77/15 78/17 |
| understood [7] 6/21 11/9 | $\begin{aligned} & 69 / 9 \quad 70 / 3 \quad 74 / 15 \quad 74 / 18 \quad 111 / 6 \\ & 111 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 80 / 24 & 81 / 3 & 81 / 9 & 81 / 22 & 85 / 17 \\ 86 / 10 & 87 / 23 & 96 / 6 & 99 / 14 & 102 / 6 \end{array}$ |


| W | 15 55/19 58/14 60/12 | ss' [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| want... [9] 103/4 104/18 | 75/12 $76 / 25$ 77/6 83/21 88/18 | woman [2] 36/19 58/24 |
| 104/24 105/21 106/13 106/17 | 14 | /12 92/4 |
| 107/6 109/25 112/21 | $106 / 14 ~ 107 / 5 ~ 110 / 19 ~$ | 93/4 95/18 100/6 103/9 |
| wanted [10] 15/3 15/4 16/3 | 16/8 24/18 34/14 35/10 44/22 | Wo |
| 32/21 49/18 55/10 68/4 85/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 45 / 10 & 48 / 25 & 54 / 10 & 55 / 22\end{array}$ | word [10] 16/15 27/8 29/20 |
| $105 / 7 \quad 105 / 17$ wants [2] 64 | 62/10 75/24 78/11 79/15 | 52/4 53/24 66/9 90/14 93/3 |
| wants [2] | 79/18 79/18 81/2 81/12 86/9 | 104/6 104/6 |
|  | 99/14 102/22 103/2 104/14 | words [3] 53/24 93/4 93/13 |
| warrant [1] | 109/22 111/2 111/4 111/8 | work [28] 18/15 24/16 31 |
| warranted [1] 63 | Whereas [1] 30/18 | $\begin{array}{llll}36 / 5 & 42 / 17 & 58 / 20 & 64 / 18 \\ 70 / 25 / 24\end{array}$ |
| warrants [1] 91/24 | whether [12] 5/8 6/6 14/3 | 70/25 75/6 75/7 76/9 80/1 |
| was [141] | 29/22 29/23 29/24 44/4 47/21 | 81/17 82/2 92/24 96/22 97/9 |
| Washington [2] $2 / 2$ 96/9 | 48/21 49/12 54/12 107/5 | 97/10 97/14 97/20 98/9 99/11 |
| wasn't [4] 15/1 21/10 33/22 | which [58] 3/9 4/21 4/23 5/8 | 99/12 106/4 107/13 110/15 |
| 99/10 | 5/25 6/5 6/7 7/3 7/22 9/18 | 112/18 |
| waste [1] 30/ | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 16 & 13 / 8 & 17 / 3 & 17 / 6 & 18 / 8\end{array}$ | worked [6] 10/7 16/22 18/14 |
| way [21] $7 / 13$ 17/20 $22 / 5$ | 19/10 $20 / 8 \quad 22 / 24$ 23/10 $28 / 25$ | 32/4 75/9 92/23 |
| 24/23 29/21 31/22 34/25 35/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 15 & 30 / 10 & 34 / 13 & 39 / 9 & 39 / 11\end{array}$ | working [8] 31/3 54/5 5 |
| 43/19 $44 / 1$ 46/16 $49 / 3$ 51/2 | 39/13 $39 / 16$ 41/17 $42 / 146 / 7$ | 54/8 78/1 78/18 79/17 91/11 |
| 54/20 63/10 65/25 67/25 | /18 47/8 51/1 51/13 51/14 | world [2] 8/17 112/3 |
| 73/24 83/14 90/10 95/12 | 51/15 $63 / 16$ 68/12 $70 / 22$ | worried [1] 109/ |
| we [431] | 70/24 73/18 75/4 75/25 76/1 | worth [4] 64/12 102/2 |
| We have [1] | 77/11 82/10 83/3 86/13 87/12 | 103/16 108/13 |
| we'll [2] 54/15 65/ | 89/3 89/9 89/9 90/14 95/16 | would [103] 5/19 7/10 7/20 |
| we're [1] 72/1 | 97/5 99/3 104/19 110/4 | 10/12 10/19 11/25 12/2 12/4 |
| weakness [2] 96/1 | which was [1] 29 | 12/6 12/11 12/13 13/24 14/22 |
| Wednesday [2] 30/22 31/2 | while [5] 7/12 37/8 60/6 | 15/9 15/11 15/25 16/11 16/12 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { week [6] } & 16 / 15 & 43 / 24 & 84 / 25\end{array}$ | 21 83/1 | 18/9 19/4 21/11 22/7 23/10 |
| 89/2 99/6 99/7 | White [2] | 23/15 25/12 25/14 25/21 |
| weekend [3] 31/4 99/12 | whittle [1] 53/18 | 27/14 28/3 29/3 31/10 31 |
| 109/10 | whittled [1] 62/23 | $33 / 7$ 34/23 37/4 38/1 40/4 |
| weeks [3] 25/4 | who [34] 10/14 10/19 | 41/21 44/22 46/3 47/19 50/1 |
| weight [1] 42/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 3 & 11 / 6 & 16 / 5 & 16 / 20 & 16 / 22\end{array}$ | 50/17 50/19 53/25 54/25 60/1 |
| Weiselberg [1] | 18/13 18/14 20/10 23/21 | 62/1 66/8 67/25 68/16 69/1 |
| welcome [1] 85/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 27/17 } & 32 / 4 & 32 / 21 & 32 / 21 & 35 / 16\end{array}$ | 69/3 $70 / 14$ 70/16 71/12 71/15 |
| well [28] $3 / 4$ 4/22 12/2 | $36 / 8$ 36/19 37/2 44/23 49/3 | 73/23 75/5 75/5 75/13 $78 / 15$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 22 & 16 / 24 & 29 / 1 & 29 / 10 & 31 / 20\end{array}$ | 56/17 57/4 61/17 64/13 66/25 | 79/5 79/6 79/19 80/12 81/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 7 & 32 / 10 & 34 / 16 & 38 / 15 & 41 / 24\end{array}$ | 75/3 75/13 85/13 87/6 87/7 | 82/6 83/21 84/6 84/10 84/13 |
| 43/8 48/18 56/11 58/3 58/21 | 96/12 97/24 | 84/14 84/17 87/3 87/15 91/9 |
| 58/21 59/12 63/10 69/11 83/4 | whole [3] 61/14 $61 / 18$ 72/6 | 91/14 $93 / 23$ 96/18 96/25 |
| 84/24 89/8 97/20 112/15 | whose [3] 32/17 35/18 95/5 | 96/25 97/2 97/3 97/4 97/6 |
| 112/23 | why [26] 3/1 11/25 12/21 | 97/9 98/15 98/23 98/24 98/25 |
| went [8] 48/13 53/20 63/23 | 12/22 17/21 24/13 25/18 | 99/1 99/20 101/9 103/6 104/9 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 77/6 } & 79 / 10 \quad 79 / 11 ~ 87 / 7 ~ 88 / 8 ~\end{array}$ | 27/24 $44 / 9$ 45/5 $45 / 1748 / 10$ | 107/13 108/19 108/21 109/4 |
| were [49] 5/10 5/13 5/14 | 55/11 $56 / 8$ 57/23 69/23 70/8 | 110/4 110/24 112/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}5 / 21 & 13 / 3 & 13 / 14 & 13 / 18 & 17 / 4\end{array}$ | 71/12 72/12 85/15 99/19 | wouldn't [4] 54/2 81/1 81/12 |
| 19/5 19/6 19/13 19/22 21/19 | 04/25 106/19 109/3 112/7 | 107/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 24 & 25 / 17 & 26 / 3 & 26 / 4 & 26 / 23\end{array}$ | 112/8 | wound [1] |
| 29/16 $32 / 8 \quad 32 / 9$ 32/15 $33 / 3$ | wide [1] 23/22 | Wrapping [1] 61/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 1 & 34 / 23 & 35 / 5 & 35 / 11 & 35 / 11\end{array}$ | widget [1] 8/2 | write [3] 87/5 106/24 107/5 |
| 35/11 $35 / 12 \quad 36 / 4 \quad 36 / 4 \quad 39 / 24$ | will [150] | wrong [1] 64/17 |
| 39/25 40/2 52/4 62/11 62/14 | WILLIAM [2] 2/10 | wrote [2] 29/23 29/23 |
| 62/15 62/23 63/25 70/12 | willing [4] | Y |
| 72/16 $78 / 1$ 78/15 79/13 $89 / 8$ | win [1] 112/20 |  |
| 97/10 109/2 | win | [2] 79/17 106/7 |
| WEST [3] 1/2 $1 / 5$ 2/14 | withheld [1] 19/1 |  |
| what [152] | withholds [1] | $92 / 22$ |
| whatever [13] 42/1 43/25 | within [2] 3/8 95/20 | yes [16] $28 / 16$ 30/25 $35 / 4$ |
| 55/13 $68 / 15 \quad 70 / 25 \quad 74 / 10$ | without [11] 8/11 13/24 | $45 / 1145 / 17 \quad 47 / 3 \quad 50 / 11 \quad 50 / 17$ |
| $74 / 2181 / 381 / 5 ~ 81 / 1783 / 8$ $100 / 19109 / 17$ | 17/19 31/7 33/11 72/9 85/3 | 51/13 51/18 52/6 80/21 84/14 |
| 100/19 109/17 whatsoever [3] | 93/2 95/1 104/10 107/9 | 93/14 105/2 109/20 |
| whatsoever $93 / 3$ | witness [18] 23/3 23/5 23/12 | yesterday [3] 39/7 99/6 99/7 |
| when [25] $6 / 6$ 9/13 $9 / 25$ 20/1 | 23/21 $23 / 25$ 24/2 $24 / 16$ 24/18 | yet [9] 5/14 19/15 39/23 |
| 20/3 24/20 28/10 31/7 40/10 | 24/23 25/1 $25 / 3$ 25/9 25/22 | 56/25 79/3 84/4 95/7 96/25 |
|  | 28/18 30/2 32/4 34/20 38/6 | 102/11 |



