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THE COURT: Okay, good afternoon, everyone.
I think somebody may have their video on. If everybody, at this point, can turn their video off, we'll just assure ourselves that those who are supposed to come on will come on at the right time.

So, welcome. We are here in the MDL Zantac matter.
I want to first say hello to everyone and wish everybody a happy new year, and I hope that everyone is doing well.

This is the first discovery conference that we have scheduled in the Zantac MDL. You may recall at the last status conference I had discussed, with the new phase of the case entering the new year, with it almost being a year since the inception of the MDL -- on or about February 6th, we had the transfer of the case to create the MDL here in our court.

And with the first round of Motions to Dismiss and orders, except for one order, having been issued and with discovery well under way, but much more to come, we had thought, that is "we", counsel and the Court, that it may be a productive new beginning of this phase of the litigation to try having discovery conferences in addition to the case management conferences that we already had been having.

And that we would do these discovery conferences every month, this being the first, and that we would also continue with status conferences every month, but we would stagger them
so that, in essence, the parties and counsel will have the opportunity to interact and be with the Court approximately every two weeks. We would have a discovery conference, and then in two weeks a status conference, two weeks later would be the discovery conference, which would be one month from the last status conference.

So, that is what we are going to do today, is to try our first discovery status conference, see how it goes and see if it is productive for the parties, for counsel, and for the Court. Som thank you for being here and for preparing for today's conference.

You can see that Judge Reinhart is with me, and he will be actively participating, and for the most part, we will both try to preside over the status conferences each and every time that they are scheduled.

I do want to remind everyone about the purpose -- at least the vision that the Court had, in conjunction with lead counsel, as to the purpose for the status conferences, the discovery status conferences, and that was really for informational purposes. In other words, it was an opportunity for the parties, through counsel, to apprise the Court as to how discovery is going, what things you are working on, what things are on the horizon, what issues you have just perhaps completed, and to allow the Court to remain knowledgeable, engaged, and aware on a more detailed level during this phase
of this litigation as to how discovery is going.
So, I view it as something of an informational sharing process where you are sharing information with the Court as to how discovery is going.

What these discovery conferences are not, they are not dispute resolution conferences, if you will. In other words, the intention is not to take discrete discovery matters that are giving rise to disagreement between the parties, disputes or on the brink of a dispute, and present it to the Court and seek relief from the Court. That is not the purpose of the discovery conference.

In fact, we have a pretrial order in place, PTO 32, that deals with the discovery process, that deals with dispute resolution, that provides the parties with, I hope you would agree, all avenues available to seek relief from the Court when disputes arise and the parties are unable to work those disputes out.

I always like to comment and commend the parties on how well they have done to date in working matters out. There have only been an isolated number of disputes that have actually risen to the level of Court intervention and that is a tribute to the work that each and every one of you are undertaking daily in working with one another to try to resolve your disputes before you need Court intervention.

But I have always made it clear, and I continue to
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want to reiterate that, that if you need Court intervention because a dispute cannot be resolved, I and Judge Reinhart are here to resolve those disputes and to render relief where appropriate given the nature of the dispute. That is not what the conferences are for, so I just wanted to reiterate that.

There was some desire, I think, on the part of counsel as to guidance in how to prepare for the conferences, and what kind of information would be helpful for the Court in anticipation of the conferences, so let me try to give as much clarity as I can, but $I$ want everyone to recognize that this is a work in progress, and if we feel that something did not go as well as maybe we would have liked in either preparing for or in undertaking the conference, that I am open to hearing suggestions as to how we might change, or differ, or improve the process so that we are constantly growing and making this as efficient and effective and user friendly an MDL as it can possibly be.

With that being said, based on this first discovery conference and the submissions that have been presented to the Court, what I would say would be helpful to the Court is, about a week or so in advance of the discovery conference, give or take a couple of days, $I$ think it would be helpful for the parties, lead counsel, to sit down with Special Master Dodge and create an agenda so we all know what we are going to be discussing at the discovery conference.

Hopefully there will be an agreement as to what that agenda is because, after all, it is for informational purpose. It is not about what is going to be disputed or disagreed, where there is disagreement, and that, I think, could lend itself perhaps less to seeing eye to eye on what the agenda should be, but really it is what issues do you want to inform the Court about.

Hopefully there can be a meeting of the minds, if you will, as to what that agenda would look like topically, so you come up with your four or five points, as you did today, and I appreciate that very much, Judge Reinhart does as well, so it gave us some indication of what we are going to be hearing from and learning from the parties today.

Once the agenda has been set, a week, five days in advance, I would ask that one day before the status conference that, just as you did this time, that there be a two-page status report, a two-page status report, and this way they will look somewhat alike insofar as at least the topics will be the same because you will have agreed on the agenda, and you can give us a brief summary in those two pages as to each topic that will be on the agenda.

It can be single spaced. I know the agenda that was submitted -- the status conference reports that were submitted this time to the Zantac email were single spaced, and that's fine. They can be single spaced, two pages. That was a
perfect number of pages. There shouldn't really be any need for attachments.

They should go to the Zantac email. It will be something that Judge Reinhart and I will review so that we are prepared, so that we have an idea of what you would like to put on the agenda. Ultimately, Judge Reinhart and I will decide what goes on the agenda.

There may be things you didn't include on the agenda that we may want to inquire about, that we may be interested in hearing about, and there may be things that you have put on the agenda that we may not think is the appropriate time at this particular discovery conference, for example, to address.

We may not necessarily always agree with the items that you have put on, although I suspect mostly we will, and in any event, receiving that status report one day, 24 hours in advance of the status conference. So, work backwards to whatever hour the status conference is set, and 24 hours in advance, please just submit it to the Zantac email, and it will be for our review and understanding of what you would like to discuss.

These aren't dispute resolution motions, if you will, or filings seeking relief, so they won't be filed on the court docket, but rather, they will be a working document for Judge Reinhart and I to consider and determine what ultimately should
be addressed at the discovery conference.
I lastly wanted to say that, in looking at the calendar, if we were to stick to the schedule that we had anticipated at the end of last year at our last status conference, we would be looking to have another status conferrence, in other words, a case management conference on or about the week of January 18th, so I would ask that you coordinate dates with the special master.

If you have already done so, maybe update those dates. Perhaps you gave her dates before the end of the year and some things have changed on your calendar. I would like to set a day that, obviously, all, or as many lead counsel, or participants, or those who will be actively presenting are available. So, always try to set a date that encompasses availability of most, if not all, of the participating counsel.

Also, our collective calendars should reflect that the next status conference should be on or about the week of February 1st. If you can take a look at your calendars, again coordinate with Special Master Dodge as to available dates and times, this way at least we can get the next case management conference and the next status -- discovery status conference set.

There is talk about whether we want to try to set those a few months out. I am amenable to that, so if you want to take a few months at a time and look at February, and --

January, February, and March, that would be fine. If you want to go further out than that and can put some dates together, then at least we could pencil in some dates beyond even the next three months so we know where we are going, and this way we can all plan accordingly.

I think those were all of the points that $I$ wanted to address as the first topic in terms of my opening remarks, as well as hopefully providing some guidance as to our vision of the discovery conferences, at least this being the first one, so the vision for this first one, and how best to prepare in getting the Court materials that would put the Court in the best position to be prepared to hear from you.

With that, let me turn it over to Judge Reinhart, who will take the next topic on the agenda, that being the topic involving brand discovery.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Judge.

Welcome. Let me ask Ms. Luhana, Mr. McGlamry --
MR. GILBERT: Excuse me, Judge Reinhart, you appear to be on mute.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Let me try it that way.
Thank you, Mr. Gilbert, for alerting me. Good afternoon, everyone.

Let me welcome Ms. Luhana, Mr. McGlamry, and Ms. Finken for the Plaintiffs and Mr. Sachse for the Defense to turn on their cameras. Good afternoon, everyone.
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I know we are here to talk about some topics relating to the brands. After I have heard from Mr. Sachse, if either Ms. Sharpe, Mr. Friedman, or Ms. Horne have anything they want to add, you certainly don't have to, but I welcome you to add any comments you would like to make after Mr. Sachse has concluded his remarks.

The first topic I would like to take up and give you an opportunity to brief Judge Rosenberg and me about is the status of the noncustodial and custodial productions pursuant to PTO 47. I know there were some deadlines toward the end of December for substantial production. I am going to anticipate that the parties may disagree as to what "substantial" meant in that setting and that is what we are going to hear, but let me invite the parties to give us a report on that.

Let me start with Ms. Luhana.
MS. LUHANA: Good afternoon, your Honor, and Magistrate Reinhart. Roopal Luhana of Chaffin Luhana for the Plaintiffs. Happy new year to you both and good to see you.

Judges, as the Plaintiffs stated in our status report to the Court, we are concerned about the limited productions we have received from the brands to date.

As the Court is aware, the brands have represented that they have substantially completed the first tranche of their custodial productions. The brands have collectively produced only 126,000 documents for a total of 68 custodians
across the brands. Moreover, three out of the four brands have represented that they have completed their noncustodial productions per PTO 47.

The completed noncustodial productions for Sanofi, BI, and Pfizer total approximately 101,000 documents. Those 101,000 documents are intended to include all relevant documents related to regulatory, adverse events, pharmacovigilance, SOPs, manufacturing, storage, transport, quality assurance, and marketing, to name some of the areas addressed in Plaintiffs' discovery.

However, the quantity of the production speaks volumes. In the Xarelto MDL, Judge Fallon required the Defendants produce at least 5 million pages per month per Court Order.

Here, the litigation has been pending for almost one year and collectively the brands have produced under four million pages of documents for a product that was on the market for 37 years and subject to essentially a worldwide recall.

We believe these productions, based on these numbers alone, are likely deficient.

As we stated in our report, however, 75,000 documents were produced in the last two weeks, and so it is going to take the Plaintiffs time to review and assess the deficiencies and subsequently address them with the Defendants and then update the Court accordingly.

I would like now to turn to the specific details of the productions to date for each brand. Let's start with Sanofi.

Sanofi has produced approximately 33,000 custodial documents for the 16 tranche one custodians and about 13,000 noncustodial documents. Judges, in identifying the appropriate custodians to designate we met and conferred with Sanofi who had disclosed the names of employees it found to be highly relevant. We relied on these representations in selecting custodians for tranche one. Five of those custodians identified as highly relevant have less than 600 documents each.

For example, Robert Bruce, director of analytical research and development, who is a current employee and joined in 1999, and worked on Zantac's stability testing, has less than 550 documents.

Yu Shou (phon), head of research and development U.S. for consumer health care, who joined in 2017, also a current employee and was involved in the market withdrawal related Zantac testing, has less than 500 documents. This is highly unusual considering Sanofi is the last Zantac manufacturer from 2017 until 2019, and should have larger productions for these custodians.

Let's now turn to GSK. GSK has produced approximately 5800 custodial documents for 13 tranche one custodians and
about 87,000 noncustodial documents. The parties agreed that GSK would produce a total of 38 custodial files, with 30 custodial files by December 31st, and the remaining eight would be produced in January 2021.

GSK hasn't complied with PTO 47. It was required to produce 30 custodial files by December 31st, and they produced 13 custodial files.

Moreover, for the custodial files GSK has produced, it is difficult to imagine how they are substantially complete. Ten of the 13 tranche one custodians each have less than 300 documents. GSK, in our meet and confers, also identified highly relevant custodians for us, but a review of these custodial files for these highly relevant custodians raises questions.

For example, Graham Carey, identified as a highly relevant employee by GSK, also a current employee who worked on Zantac in 2015, and then again in 2019 to the present, has only 118 custodial documents.

The same with Effie Connor (phon), another employee identified by GSK as a highly relevant employee, who worked on Zantac from 2014 to present, has 260 documents in her custodial file.

The same with Giuseppe Wheelan (phon), another GSK identified highly relevant employee, who worked on Zantac from 2016 to present, has a mere 18 documents in his custodial file,
and the list goes on to identify custodial files that simply seem incomplete.

Next I want to turn to BI. BI has produced approximately 24,000 custodial documents for the 24 tranche one custodians, and approximately 78,000 noncustodial documents. BI's custodial production for the 24 custodians include about 15 custodians with less than 600 documents produced in their custodial files.

Similar to the other brands, we engaged in meet and confers where BI identified highly relevant custodians for us, including Mark Blake, the executive director of drug safety, who is a current employee and was identified as a highly relevant employee, has 210 documents in his custodial file.

Phillip Brammel (phon), another employee identified by BI as highly relevant, who is a senior director and a current employee, has only 95 documents in his custodial file.

Janet Mensey (phon), another employee identified as highly relevant, who is the director of quality assurance and compliance and is a current employee, has 16 documents in her custodial file.

Based on these numbers and the importance of these custodians, who are all current employees, we don't understand how BI can represent these productions are substantially complete for PTO 47.

Lastly, Pfizer. Pfizer has produced approximately

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

63,000 custodial files for the 15 tranche one custodians and about 10,000 noncustodial documents. Almost 40 percent of the custodial documents produced are attributable to one custodian, with at least six custodians having less than 900 documents each.

Although Pfizer's last involvement with Zantac was in 2006, it has produced more custodial documents than the amount of custodial documents produced by GSK, BI, and Sanofi combined. We simply don't understand how this is the case.

Judges, as I raised in the last conference, based on our experience in similar litigations, there should be millions and millions of documents of responsive discovery produced and we're not seeing that here.

I want to remind the Court again that OpenText, our document production vendor, informed us that in a typical case one custodian's custodial file for two years would typically consist of 30,000 emails, with a total of 50,000 documents for their custodial file, and Plaintiffs are not seeing these numbers here.

In conclusion, we wanted to provide the Court with a status update on productions per PTO 47, we will follow up with the brands regarding the productions to date after we have had an opportunity to assess them and then followup with the court. To the extent Plaintiffs seek any type of relief, we will follow the protocol as set forth in PTO 32.

Thank you.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Ms. Luhana. Let me turn to Mr. Sachse and allow you to respond. MR. SACHSE: Thank you, your Honor. Will Sachse on behalf of the brand Defendants and also on behalf of GSK.

First, Judge Rosenberg and Judge Reinhart, I do want to wish you a happy new year to you and your staff. I also want to thank you, Judge Rosenberg, at the outset for the guidance that you gave us today about the vision for these conferences. It was quite helpful and we will be happy, of course, to work with Special Master Dodge and with counsel to hopefully accomplish the vision that you have set out.

So, let me start with just a couple of observations generally, and then if my colleagues want to chime in with their specific responses, I am happy to cede the floor.

I just want to start by saying that I am very proud, certainly, of my team who worked incredibly hard to try to meet the deadlines of PTO 47, and on behalf of GSK, we almost got there, we didn't quite. We have a couple more documents that are in review now that we expect to be getting out early -- end of this week, early next week.

I think all of the brands really did work incredibly hard to meet the substantial completion deadline of December 31st, and I know Pfizer and BI have met that. Sanofi and GSK, we've met that with respect to electronic documents,
and I think, as I just said, we have some additional custodial files, GSK has some additional custodial files, paper documents, and $I$ believe Sanofi does as well, that we are hoping to get out the door in relatively short order.

The other important thing here, and I really took Judge Rosenberg's guidance to heart at the last case management conference, communication is really key here. And we did, "we", GSK, did tell the Plaintiffs before the holidays that we thought we were not going to quite make it, but that we expected to be able to complete our custodial productions by the first or second week of January. We remain on track to do that.

I think that in terms of -- if you want to call that substantial completion, $I$ think that is a pretty good job given the task we had in front of us.

Now I just want to turn to this concern that I hear from Ms. Luhana about the size of these productions.

First of all, to the extent there is any suggestion that any of us have done something wrong in terms of withholding documents or not, you know, trying to comply to the best of our ability with the deadine and to produce documents, I just categorically reject that. We have all been working hard and working in compliance with this Court's orders and in compliance with our obligations under the rules.

I think that Ms. Luhana's complaints may be really
just a matter of perspective because what we heard was a litany of the number of documents produced by each Defendant, but also, I think what was kind of embedded in there was a quick passing reference to the number of pages, and collectively the brands have produced approximately four million pages of documents.

This constitutes documents that relate to the entire 40-year history of this product, and it -- the documents that are included in these productions are not just emails, not just one-off memos, but there are also sort of core database documents. Again, it matters how you count.

For example, we, GSK, have produced a database readout from our safety database. What this does is, it essentially gives the Plaintiffs information about each instance where a -what is called an adverse event, a cancer adverse event was reported to the company. We gave that readout to the Plaintiffs. I am sure they count that as one document, but that has 600 entries in it.

There are other, quote, single documents that other Defendants have provided that might have thousands and thousands and thousands of individual entries, call logs, things like that.

So $I$ think, again, it is a matter of perspective in terms of the information that the Plaintiffs are getting.

What we hear is, we just think these numbers don't
make sense, they don't add up. We have heard reference to Xarelto, I think repeatedly, but this is not Xarelto, this is Zantac. This is a different product, it had a lengthy, lengthy history, and you have to take into account that lengthy history doesn't necessarily translate into there should be more documents.

To the contrary, I think you have to look at how each brand Defendant is situated and I think that explains to some degree what we are seeing in terms of these productions. For example, Ms. Luhana mentioned Pfizer. Pfizer stopped selling this product in 2005. Boehringer Ingelheim, they had this product for a little more than a decade, but they sold their entire consumer health care business.

Is it surprising to see this number of documents for a Boehringer Ingelheim or a Pfizer? No, I don't think it is.

For Sanofi, we know that Sanofi only held this product for a couple of years before the recall.

So, again, the number of documents or the number of pages that we are seeing $I$ don't think is surprising.

And then finally for GSK, for my client, GSK stopped actively promoting this product -- let me back up.

GSK has held the NDA, the license essentially, for this product since the early '80's, but GSK stopped promoting the product, advertising the product in the early 2000's. The market share declined thereafter and actually GSK discontinued
distributing the product in the U.S. in 2018.
Given that history, it is not surprising that GSK doesn't have a significant amount of recent documents relating to Zantac.

So, when I hear about current custodians who have only a few hundred pages of documents, that, to me, is not at all surprising because these people, although they are absolutely central to the current -- you know, the recall, the voluntary recall and the investigation, they have only had involvement with Zantac for a couple of years.

So, I think the other thing to keep in mind is the age of this product kind of cuts both ways. What we hear from the Plaintiffs is a four year history means there should be tens or hundreds of millions of pages of documents, and based on our investigation, that is simply not true.

I can give you a good example. We heard a lot about the GSK custodians and where we are in the custodial productions. The historic custodians who are overwhelmingly, I think with maybe one or two exceptions, the former employees who are custodians, are long gone from the scene.

And so, when we first talked to the Plaintiffs about custodians, and they gave us a list of roughly 25 names they were interested in, we gave them a list of 25 names that we thought were probably the people to focus on, essentially the Plaintiff said, well, why don't we just look at everybody. We
didn't like that because we thought that that was a lot of custodians.

We said, let's -- we'll go and take a quick look to see if there are even documents that might relate to these custodians because some of them left the company in 1985 or 1987, and the Plaintiffs agreed. The Plaintiffs understood when we said we'll look for custodial files, for these custodians we are not talking about emails, we are not talking about massive files, we are talking about, if we are lucky, we get maybe a box worth of materials that we can look through, and of that box, how much relates to Zantac.

So, we did that process, and after that process we ended up with -- I think we agreed, and as Ms. Luhana reported, we ended up with about 38 custodians total. After further investigation, after actually going to the warehouses when we could and pulling the boxes and opening them up and seeing what was in there, it turned out that only 26 of the 38 custodians have any documents to review and produce -- or to produce that are relevant.

So, we have been doing that and, of course, we have been slowed down by COVID, much like Sanofi has been slowed down by COVID.

It is not at all surprising, when you are looking at a file for somebody who left the company 25, 30, 35 years ago, that there aren't going to be that many documents left that
relate to Zantac.
And so, I think that this is not surprising. I really don't think it should be surprising to the Plaintiffs since we had this discussion last year when we talked about custodial files, and $I$ think that we have all been doing our best to find responsive -- find and produce responsive documents. We have done that, and we are ready to keep moving.

For GSK, we have -- of course, our deadline for noncustodial production is March 15 th, and we intend to meet that. In the meantime, we are gearing up and getting ready for a series of depositions.

So, unless you have questions about that, I am happy to turn it over to my colleagues if they want to add some flavor for their own clients.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Mr. Sachse. You certainly don't have to, but Ms. Sharpe, or Mr. Friedman, or Ms. Horne, if any of you would like to be heard, just activate your camera and $I$ will call on you.

Ms. Sharpe on behalf of Sanofi. Good afternoon.
MS. SHARPE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Good afternoon to Judge Rosenberg as well. It is a pleasure to be before you both again.

Let me apologize if you hear any sirens in the background. I am in downtown D.C. where things are a little bit hairy. I am hearing them go by intermittently, but
hopefully all will be well here.
I just wanted to add one additional point to the point that Mr. Sachse said because I also don't think you heard anything about the quality of what was produced, I think you heard a lot about the quantity.

I just wanted to make the point that there also needs to be a consideration of the relevant issues in litigation, and certainly from Sanofi's perspective -- I probably should have said at the outset this is Paige Sharpe on behalf of Sanofi -that we have been working to produce the documents that actually have the most relevance in the litigation.

So, what we have produced to Plaintiffs include, you know, documents going to the key issues in dispute. For example, we produced the regulatory file for Zantac, which includes test results and correspondence with FDA on NDMA related issues. We have produced adverse event reports for the entire history of the product, including the ones that we have inherited from the predecessor companies.

We have produced the underlying source files for cancer related adverse events. We have produced meeting minutes and materials from cross-functional committees that explored and analyzed the NDMA issues. We produced safety committee meeting minutes, information from Sanofi's medical literature database, information from our signal detection database, information from our product complaint database.

And while I do not have those same categories of information on behalf of the other Defendants, I understand that they also have been making similar productions.

I just wanted to add that I think there also needs to be a little bit of a focus on the substance of what has been produced and not just looking at numbers in a vacuum.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you very much, Ms. Sharpe. Be safe. It's sad that I have to tell you that, but be safe.

Mr. Friedman or Ms. Horne, if you would like to be heard, go ahead and activate your camera. You certainly don't have to.

Not seeing anyone, before -- let me just say I appreciate the report, and I will echo Ms. Luhana, I think both sides are following their processes. I know there has been a large production in the last week and you need to review that. If at the end of that process you believe you are entitled to some legal remedy, as Judge Rosenberg said, we are here and you are welcome to invoke PTO 30 procedures to try to get a resolution.

I am hopeful that through continued meet and conferral and open dialogue like you have been having many of those issues can be worked through. I thank you for the report, it has been very helpful.

Ms. Luhana, if you want, I can excuse you. You are
certainly welcome to stay on the call, but $I$ think you are only presenting on that one issue.

MS. LUHANA: Correct. I just wanted to raise one point here. In terms of the 38 custodians that we had chosen for tranche one, 30 of them were supposed to be produced by the end of December. GSK followed up and told us there were 18 custodians -- 20 custodians that they have electronic documents for and 14 that had hard copies only.

However, GSK had only produced 13 custodial files at the end of December. Granted, there are some paper files, but we are missing 17 custodians.

Importantly, I just want to highlight for the Court we are looking at the quality and the quantity of the production. Specifically, when I updated the Court, I highlighted examples of current employees who are all with these manufacturers and work specifically on Zantac. So, to have 18 documents for one custodian who is highly relevant, and identified as such by GSK, it is just surprising that we have a dearth of production like that with 18 documents.

That begs the question, is it substantially complete? However, as we had discussed, we are going to circle back with the Defendants, assess the production further, and followup with the Court after that.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Ms. Luhana. I appreciate that.

MR. SACHSE: Your Honor, if I may respond to that briefly? Will Sachse for GSK.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Briefly, yes.
MR. SACHSE: Thank you. So, Ms. Luhana will be happy to know that there is another production going out either today or tomorrow which will include additional documents, electronic documents that went through our QC and privilege review process, and I think that might answer some of the questions she has.

And with respect to those paper documents that got held up by COVID and the lockdown in the UK, I have been told that we have reviewed about three-quarters of the remaining documents and we should be pushing those out, as I said, the end of this week, early next week. So, I think we are pretty close to done here.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Very well. As I said before, there are processes on both sides and I appreciate that both sides are going through their processes. If at the end of the processes either side feels there is a remedy to be had, the Court is here for you. Thank you very much.

Let me turn to the next topic, which is the tranche two custodial files. Let me recognize Ms. Finken on behalf of the Plaintiffs and, I guess, Mr. Sachse, you are staying on the call.

MS. FINKEN: Good afternoon, Judge Reinhart. Good
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afternoon, Judge Rosenberg. Tracey Finken on behalf of Plaintiffs. It is good to see you both again.

I just wanted to talk to you very briefly, I will keep this very brief, about the tranche two custodians. Pursuant to amended PTO 47, we were instructed to identify a first tranche of custodians to be due by December 31st, with the understanding that that would be the first tranche, not the only tranche of custodians, and we should meet and confer moving forward about further tranches of custodians.

With that being said, we have started that meet and confer process with the Defendants prior to the holidays and we intend to continue along that path.

We really have tried to focus our first tranche of custodians on people that were relevant to the issues of the January 8th deadine, so we stuck mainly with regulatory, clinical, and pharmacovigilance types of witnesses, and there are a variety of other functional departments that we will need to identify witnesses for the second tranche of custodians, as well as for the class claims.

There are sales marketing and payor types of custodians that are necessary for the class certification and specifically for the class claims.

So, with that being said, we are going to continue with the meet and confer process. We hoping that we can come to a resolution with the Defendants about the scope and number
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of custodians, as well as the timing of the next production, and we just wanted to put it on your Honor's radar so that you are aware that we are involved in the process, and we may need to seek your assistance in the event that we can't come to an agreement on our own.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Finken.

Let me hear from Mr. Sachse.

MR. SACHSE: Your Honor, Will Sachse again for GSK and for the brand Defendants. I think I can be short and sweet, too.

I agree with what Ms. Finken said in terms of we have met and conferred, we are ready to see what names they float to us and we will consider them and we will work with them.

I do think just a couple of considerations from our perspective. One is that we think we are in kind of a funneling down, as it were, a funneling down process where we don't expect that we are going to see a big bonus of $30,40,50$ additional names. We think we need to be focusing, and I think the Plaintiffs agree with us on that.

I remember many months ago when Ms. Finken and I were talking and she said, I don't have time to do a hundred custodians for GSK, and I think that's probably true given the Court's aggressive schedule.

The other observation I have, or consideration I have
is that we, on the Defense side, really want to avoid what I would call death by a thousand cuts.

I don't think we want a situation where the Plaintiffs are going to come back to the well multiple times asking for 10 Z's and 20 Z's of additional custodians. I think we need to have reasonable limits. We need to have an understanding of when we can get past document production, move into the heavy discovery, the deposition schedule that $I$ think we are all focused on trying to get through.

I am not saying that it is going to be our position that there is an absolute cutoff. If discovery discloses that maybe there is another one or two custodians that the Plaintiffs come back and say we really need to see some documents from this person after a deposition of Mr. X or Ms. Y, of course we will consider that, we are reasonable.

But I do think that, in general, we would like this process to really focus on, A, funneling down, and B, making sure that we have some limits, we have some guardrails, and that is really all $I$ wanted to say.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you. I will say this about that whole principle.

Ideally we would all like to funnel down, I know the Plaintiffs would as well. Everybody wants to get to the most relevant evidence and the most pertinent evidence as quickly as they can. The problem is everyone on the Plaintiff's side is
sort of shooting in the dark because they don't know what the most pertinent evidence is. They have suspicion about what might exist, but they don't know that; and likewise on the Defense side, until you start digging you don't know either. So, I appreciate that.

The suggestion I'd make, and I think I said this previously, is I view discovery, you have different tools in your toolbox, some more blunt than others. A broad request for production is a very blunt tool. Interrogatories are a more focused tool, and depositions are a very much more focused and interactive tool.

So, I just want to reiterate to the parties that as you conceptualize your process going forward in discovery, the Court is certainly open to authorizing you to have extra interrogatories if that would be more efficient than having expansive document requests. The Court is open to working with you on some of the depositions that you are taking and helping you focus those depositions if you need that help. I hope you don't, but if you do, we are here.

I just want to make sure you are aware that certainly at least on the issue of interrogatories and requests for admission, things like that, I recognize those to be valuable tools and I am happy to give you extras if you need extras.

With that, thank you both very much. Ms. Finken, I don't think you have anything else, so if you are done, $I$ will
excuse you.

MS. FINKEN: Thank you, your Honor.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: The next topic is, I'm led to believe, another happy topic, so I will invite Mr. McGlamry and Mr. Sachse to brief us on the deposition scheduling. I always like when $I$ see the word agreement, so that gives me good news.

Mr. McGlamry, let me hear from you.
MR. MCGLAMRY: Thank you, your honor. Good afternoon to both your Honors. I really do appreciate you all providing us this opportunity to have this conference and going forward. We totally agree with the purpose Judge Rosenberg set out in the initial discussion about the purpose of this, and so that, from our perspective, is a great thing.

I do think we have an agreement here and I know the star of our show today, Mr. Sachse, will hopefully confirm that agreement. As your Honors will recall, at our last CMC we had raised some concerns about scheduling, particularly depositions.

Even before that, but since then primarily, we have had several communications between the parties. We have had multiple meet and confers, and ultimately, and most recently, Mr. Sachse and I have had additional discussions, and I intend to give a report of sort of two parts of an agreement as it relates to essentially the scheduling of depositions.

The first I would say relates to somewhat of the mechanics of the deposition scheduling. PTO 54 contemplates a deposition liaison for each side and we have -- again, since the last CMC, we have designated on each side a person that would be the deposition liaison so as to make sure that when depositions are, you know, agreed upon that we have a mechanism to inform and serve everybody and make sure they get that information, including notices.

We've also agreed -- and this first sort of agreement that I am talking about is for all -- as I understand it, is for the Plaintiffs and all of the Defendants, not just the brands.

We have also sort of talked through a mechanism to handle the communication and scheduling of the Defendant current and former employees, as well as nonparty witnesses, such that, arguably, PTO 54, maybe the letter of what we drafted would allow a lot of the people being engaged in setting up, for example, the deposition of a GSK employee. Essentially what we decided is there would be somebody on our side, we have designated those people, and on their side, that would discuss that one, get it set, provide that information to the deposition liaisons so the word sort of spreads out and everybody is aware.

So, we are more efficient, we are more timely, yet we are as comprehensive as we can be with regard to that aspect of
it.
The second report, or the second issue, which I understand only applies to the brands, because the non-brands have apparently taken the position that discovery of them is over, concerns our concern about the length of time that, for example, your Honors earlier last year and in the fall about trying to schedule depositions, and we were concerned that it was taking too long not only to get a date, but then the date was so far out.

We have had, again, very robust discussions, again ending with discussions with Mr. Sachse on behalf of all of the brands. What we essentially said was, look, we are getting all this information in for PTO 47 now, and as was indicated to you just a moment ago, and we are going to within the next couple of days provide lists of people we would like to depose, and what we've asked is that the Defendants, the brands, provide us dates for those depositions, for the depositions to take place within 30 to 60 days after we give them the names.

In response to that, I believe that Mr. Sachse -- we have agreed that we -- obviously, the devil is in the details, as it always is, but that essentially what their goal is, when we give them those lists, that they make those witnesses available within the first quarter of the year.

Again, as is always the case, the devil is in the details. It may take longer to round up a former employee
versus a current employee that somebody can crack a whip on, but I think that what we have, we have worked out, hopefully, a mechanism where, because we have more to do and more to take and more, you know, production and so forth, that we are getting these depositions on the front end and, you know, what I would say quite frankly is, I appreciate Mr. Sachse working with us on this. I think what we have come to makes a lot of sense and hopefully we will work with both sides.

Thank you, your Honor.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Mr. McGlamry, I appreciate that.

Mr. Sachse.

MR. SACHSE: Thank you, your Honor. Will Sachse again for GSK and for the brand Defendants.

I will take the kudos. I appreciate that, Mr. McGlamry, and I think we both deserve a little bit of a victory lap on this one because $I$ do think that the liaison plan that we have in place is going to really help to streamline.

Just to echo and reiterate what Mr. McGlamry said about the fact witnesses and the scheduling, we, the lawyers for the brands, of course we are going to work with the Plaintiffs, we will see their lists, we will work with them. We will reach out to witnesses and we will try to figure out what scheduling works.

But again, as Mr. McGlamry said, the devil is in the
details, and the witnesses -- as I said, I think, at the last hearing, the witness is the star, so if the witness is not available until April, the witness is not available until April.

The other thing, just from a logistics and a practical standpoint, the schedule, $I$ think we all know, is going to get very congested in terms of depositions. We are all going to do our best. For example, we are going to have our next case management conference in a couple of weeks, and I believe many of us are going to be doing depositions that week.

So, as the schedule fills up, we will be flexible with the Plaintiffs, we will work with them. I hope and expect that they will work with us and we will try to accommodate witnesses and accommodate lawyers, so that we can get all of this done. It is going to be a bit like a game of Tetris trying to fit all the pieces together, but we will work hard and get it done.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Mr. Sachse and Mr. McGlamry, and kudos to both of you on behalf of your respective sides for working out that agreement.

Mr. McGlamry, if you are done for the day, you can turn off your camera.

MR. MCGLAMRY: No. I am out of here.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Mr. Sachse, I think you are also done for a little bit, so you can turn off your camera.

The next issue on the agenda relates to -- it is titled Sanofi email issue. Let me recognize Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Agneshwar first. Good afternoon, gentlemen.

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

MR. AGNESHWAR: Good afternoon, your Honor. Anand Agneshwar on behalf of Sanofi.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Very well. I just want to preface our discussion on this issue, following up on what Judge Rosenberg said earlier about the purpose of this hearing, I realize there is an issue that has arisen, and first I want to commend Sanofi for notifying the Plaintiffs promptly and being transparent on the issue, but I think for today's -- and I understand there are questions that the Plaintiffs have and inquiries the Plaintiffs would like to make. I understand there has been some conversations back and forth between the parties.

For purposes of today we should stay away from all of that. What I would really like to focus on today is the process, where are we in the process, Mr. Agneshwar. The framework is that Rule 37 anticipates that these sorts of issues may arise in litigation.

Rule 37 was enacted specifically to deal with these sorts of situations and there are procedures that need to be followed under Rule 37 to allow, first of all, in this case,
for Sanofi to conduct a factual inquiry, then to share that information with the Plaintiffs in a transparent way, to meet and confer and try to figure out if there are remedial steps that can be taken that would mitigate any harm to the Plaintiffs; and then if not, if the Plaintiffs believe at that point they are entitled some discovery to try to flesh out the facts, they certainly can request discovery to try to flesh out the facts.

Ultimately, if we need to get to a PTO 32 process to resolve a specific dispute and there is a remedy that the Plaintiffs are entitled to, then the Plaintiffs will get the remedy that they are entitled to.

Given that that is a long process, and I know we are early on in the process, that is what $I$ would like to focus on, just kind of where we are.

Let me turn first to Mr. Agneshwar, and if you can maybe update the Court on where you think you are in the process. I am not going to bind you to a specific deadline, but if you have a general sense of when you might be in a position to share some conclusions with Mr. Gilbert and sort of followup from there.

So, let me turn it over to Mr. Agneshwar.
MR. AGNESHWAR: Thank you, your Honor. Let me add my happy new years to your Honor and Judge Rosenberg. I appreciate the forum to address this issue.

I do have an update, your Honor, of sorts. We are continuing to look into the issue, and I can tell your Honor now, as $I$ told the Plaintiffs the other day, that to get to the next level, to really understand the scope of the issue, we have hired a consultant who is an expert in forensics, looking at emails and seeing what we can put together, what we can recover to identify the scope of the issue.

That work is going on right now, and I expect we are working on it 24/7, and I expect the work should be at least far along, if not concluded, by the time of the next discovery conference, and $I$ hope to be in a position then to understand the scope of this issue, whether it is just a little blip and not much at all, or whether it's something more than that.

I really don't know at this point, but $I$ will know in a few weeks at least much more than $I$ know today.

At that point, we also will be working with our consultant to figure out any remedial measures, if any, that we think are appropriate, and at that point, $I$ will contact Mr. Gilbert and share with him the facts that $I$ know, and hopefully work through a solution to this issue if any is needed.

At that point, I'd be happy to come back and give the Court another report on where we are then, but hopefully this can be resolved amicably without utilizing the Court's formal procedures.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Agneshwar. Let
me turn to Mr. Gilbert.

First of all, I am just sort of laying out the cold process here. I understand sometimes this sort of situation can be quite problematic and can create issues for Plaintiffs and can be prejudicial. I just don't believe we are at the point in the process where $I$ can reach those conclusions.

I don't want you to feel that by not kind of addressing those issues today $I$ am downplaying any concerns you may have because $I$ understand, rightly so, the Plaintiffs may have legitimate concerns about this issue.

With that, let me hear from Mr. Gilbert.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, your Honors. Thank you for the opportunity to address the issue.

Consistent with your request to keep this at a status level, $I$ will not delve too deeply into the details, but $I$ cannot allow, your Honor, your comment about the Sanofi counsel notifying us promptly to go unresponded to.

I apologize, I must say -- and we will address it in great detail at the appropriate time. We do not believe this was timely. We do not believe this was early disclosure, and when the facts come out, and they will, we believe that the Court will be quite disturbed by the events that took place not only with respect to a failure to disclose to us at a much earlier time, but a failure to disclose to the Court on an earlier time as well.

Your Honor, we obviously are in a position right now where we have to wait for Sanofi and its counsel to complete this forensic investigation and to provide that report to us and to the Court, at which time we will have the ability to consider what remedies, what processes, what discovery, as you noted, needs to be taken.

I want to -- in the spirit of what Judge Rosenberg said at the beginning, that this hearing, these discovery conferences are for informational purposes, I want to make sure it is clear to the Court that the impact of this ongoing effort that Mr. Agneshwar described is already affecting our ability to conduct discovery of appropriate Sanofi witnesses.

In fact, there was a custodial deposition that had been agreed to, to be taken on December 11th, long ago it had been agreed to. The custodial files were to have been produced to us by Thanksgiving for our review to prepare for that deposition.

This was the number one most important deposition for us to take at the beginning of this litigation with regard to Sanofi, and that is why it was discussed and agreed to, and Sanofi told us right after Thanksgiving that they needed to postpone the deposition because of some undisclosed problem with Mr. -- I believe his last name was Bailey -- Mr. Bailey's custodial file. We now know what that problem is.

I want to make sure that the Court knows from an
informational standpoint that the schedule that the Defendants insisted upon for completing discovery and getting to general causation Daubert by date certain are being impacted already as a result of this spoliation, regardless whether it is inadvertent or ultimately found to be intentional. I am not passing judgment on it now, but the fact is that it is impacting upon our ability to move forward with regard to Sanofi.

I realize that we may not be in a position to bring a formal motion for remedy as a result of the effort -- of the evidence of spoliation until after the report has been completed and after discovery has been taken, but this is a matter that we felt, since it first was brought to our attention on December 23rd -- and Mr. Agneshwar did notify the Court at our urging, because if he hadn't, we would have. We felt that it was important to put this on the Court's radar so that the Court is aware of it.

It is an unfolding situation, and as soon as we have more information from Mr. Agneshwar, we intend to move forward with it.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert.
First of all, if my impression of the timing is mistaken, then $I$ will be the first one to say it is mistaken when I see additional facts. If it turns out that the timing of the disclosure is relevant to the Rule 37 analysis, then it
will be relevant to the Rule 37 analysis. Like I said, I can't prejudge any of that. We have to let the process play its way out.

All $I$ can do is assure the Defendants they will have a fair opportunity to go through their process. If the Plaintiffs believe they are entitled to a remedy, they will get a fair hearing to determine if they are entitled to that remedy. I think that is all we can do at this time. I will encourage the parties to continue to work on their respective processes.

Thank you, gentlemen, I appreciate it very much.
I don't believe either one of you are on for anything else this afternoon, so I thank you and I will excuse both of you.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, Judge.
MR. AGNESHWAR: Thank you, your Honor.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: I think, Judge Rosenberg, you wanted to address the next issue.

THE COURT: Right. Thank you, Judge Reinhart.
The next issue on the agenda generally, as I
understand it at least, is what impact, if any, does the issuance of the various orders that I issued last year on most, but not all of the pending Motions to Dismiss, what impact does that have on discovery.

Let me first say that there is still one order that is
forthcoming and the Court intends to get that order out shortly, and that will complete the issuance of all orders on the first round Motions to Dismiss, but also included a few second round Motions to Dismiss as well. They were extensive, as I'm sure you know from reading the orders.

I am sure, given when the orders came out at the end of the year, with the holidays still underway, and we are only a few days beyond that, that perhaps counsel are still reviewing the orders, counsel are reviewing the orders with their clients, counsel are digesting the orders.

And certainly as far as repleading goes from the Plaintiffs' standpoint, Plaintiffs' counsel obviously are probably undertaking a review and consideration of what repleading is needed to conform with the Court's orders, recognizing that there is still one order that is forthcoming.

As the Court made very clear in all of its orders, the timeframe which the parties had outlined in the PTO, the case management schedule with respect to amended complaints to come 30 days after the Court's orders on these Motions to Dismiss, in fairness to Plaintiffs $I$ have extended that 30 days to commence from the date of the last remaining order to be issued.

So, the clock has not started running yet and Plaintiffs have time to continue to review and consider and determine how they are going to proceed from this point
forward.
As far as the Court is concerned, nothing has particularly or specifically changed with respect to discovery.

What I mean by that is, none of the orders that are in place that have set out the discovery schedule, none of the pretrial orders that the Court has issued relating to agreements that categories of Defendants have reached with the Plaintiffs pursuant to generally what we refer to as core discovery agreements, those are all still in place.

So, until such time as there is a specific event to change what I will call the status quo of discovery, the Court would anticipate that all of the parties would be continuing to meet their obligations in the context of discovery, whether those are obligations that arise from specific orders that the Court has issued, agreements that the parties have entered into, whether in written or other forms, and the Court is not in a position to say that anything has changed insofar as any one party is relieved of any specific obligation.

If that is anyone's understanding or impression as a result of the order that did not relate to discovery, but related to substantive legal issues, then, obviously, the avenue would be for that party or those parties to file any appropriate relief after the -- following, you know, the resolution processes that are in place between the parties pursuant to PTO 32.

That is about as specific as $I$ can get, which is not very specific because it is still very much in flux, if you will.

Until such time as the Plaintiffs replead and the Defendants are able to see what is repled and what claims are being repled and against which parties those claims are being repled, nothing has changed from the Court's perspective of how the discovery should be proceeding.

It would be incumbent upon any given party or parties to bring to the Court's attention a belief or a desire or a request that some agreement that has previously been entered into that has been memorialized in an order, or some order that the Court has independently issued affecting discovery, somehow no longer applies.

So, that is what the Court wanted to address as it relates to the issue that dealt with what impact the Motion to Dismiss orders had on the current state of affairs of discovery.

With that, I will turn it back over to Judge Reinhart to pick up on other nonbrand Defendant discovery matters.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Judge. If I could ask Ms. Goldenberg and Mr. Yoo or Mr. Barnes to turn on their cameras, please.

I don't know if you have anything to report, but since we gave the brands the opportunity to report on the status of
their discovery, I wanted to make sure that the generics and the retailers and the distributors all had an opportunity to be heard as well.

Let me turn to Ms. Goldenberg. I assume you got safely where you were going. I know you were in transit earlier today.

MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes, I did. Thank you, your Honor.
We have had many productive meet and confers with the generics, and we followed up with all of them, admittedly just under 48 hours ago, asking them to let us know whether or not they have completed their core discovery obligations at this point in time, and it is our understanding -- we have heard from all but ten of them that they are in compliance with the core discovery order, so it sounds like most of the generics are on track with where they need to be.

We also had a discussion with Mr. Yoo and a few of his colleagues the other day and talked about whether or not they -- their feelings about how discovery should proceed in light of the Motions to Dismiss, and we appreciate your Honor's guidance that we just received on how discovery should proceed from here.

To update the Court, we did send all of the generic Defendants a draft 30(b)(6) notice on December 7, and have had many meet and confers with almost all of them at this point to talk about those notices.

At this point in time, however, only one of them has offered to give us a date. Many of them have said that either they are not willing to do that or they are not going to be willing to do that for many months. We are still working through that, but at this point we just wanted to let the Court know that we are a little bit concerned that if they are unwilling to put up witnesses at this juncture, that we are going to be very crunched for time on the aggressive discovery schedule that we have all entered into.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Ms. Goldenberg, I appreciate that. Mr. Yoo.

MR. YOO: Good afternoon, your Honor, and good afternoon, Judge Rosenberg.

Let me start with the discovery that the generics -I'm sorry, for the Court Reporter, this is Thomas Yoo for the generic Defendants.

Let me start with the work that the generics have been doing pursuant to PTO 34, that is the core discovery agreement, and PTO 50, which relates to product identification information, that the generics have provided.

I can't speak in an absolute sense on behalf of what all 50 or so generics have done and their level of completion. There are a few exceptions for Defendants who I understand have ongoing discussions with Plaintiffs' counsel regarding extensions that they have received or requested, as well as
ongoing discussions about potential dismissal from the litigation altogether.

Generally speaking for the group, we have worked very hard and achieved substantial completion of our obligations under PTO 34 and PTO 50.

The last of the deadines set by those pretrial orders was on December 31st, as Ms. Goldenberg mentioned.

So, with all of that work, we provided a lot of information regarding our ANDA files, SOP's, our contracts, customers, communications with the regulatory agency regarding the recall, and some other issues as well.

So, to Judge Rosenberg's point and very helpful admonition about expectations regarding discovery obligations that we have had, we agree that with respect to PTO 34 and PTO 50 and the discovery that we have been engaged in, speaking for the group generally, we are pursuing completion of those obligations.

I think the issue that remains is new discovery. As we talked briefly about at the case management conference, the Plaintiffs, the week before the hearing on the Motions to Dismiss, approached the generics about $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ depositions, and they at one point sent the group a proposed -- not proposed, their actual $30(b)(6)$ notice, $I$ suppose, on some fairly broad topics related to our manufacturing supply chains and sales and distribution chains, and issues related to
quality management and quality assurance along those steps.
As Ms. Goldenberg mentioned, we have been engaged in good faith meet and confer discussions both as a group, Mr. Barnes and I and several of our generics colleagues with leadership for the Plaintiffs, as well as individual meet and confers by the various generic Defendants.

With receipt of the Court's Motion to Dismiss rulings, we have had discussions on our side about where we now stand on this further discovery that we have just initiated discussions with the Plaintiffs on.

It is our view that what we would like and what we really need is to see the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, which it sounds like is something that would be filed in 30 or 45 days time according to the Court's case management schedule, but right now it is difficult for us to continue with discussions about any further discovery in the dark because the Motions to Dismiss rulings have dismissed all of the claims against the generics, some with prejudice.

And with regard to potential claims and theories that haven't yet been articulated by the Plaintiffs, we don't know what those are going to look like, and we don't know who the Plaintiffs are going to choose to sue under those claims.

But what we would like to do is first look at the obligations on the repleading pursuant to Judge Rosenberg's order with regard to factual specificity, legal bases, etc.,
and then meet and confer with the Plaintiffs about what discovery they want, and whether that discovery is relevant and proportional to the new claims that they are articulating.

At this point, we feel it is appropriate not to continue on with the discussions based on the old 30(b) (6) notice that they issued to us before the Court's ruling, and halt those discussions at least until we see the amended allegations and then reengage with the Plaintiffs and try to have a meaningful meet and confer about what is appropriate, what is proportional, whether things can be prioritized.

If the Plaintiffs' discovery requests at that point are overly broad or we believe not relevant or not compliant with the Court's Motion to Dismiss rulings, at that point we can come back to your Honor and have a more concrete discussion about what the dispute is.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Mr. Yoo.

MS. GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, can I briefly respond to that?

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Yes, Ms. Goldenberg.
MS. GOLDENBERG: My understanding, your Honor, is that PTO 32, I believe it is, allows us to start discovery in earnest post CVA world on January 2nd of this year.

Per your Honor's ruling or guidance earlier today that we should not assume that any order entered that was already entered into has changed anything, it is our understanding that
we are permitted to move forward with discovery at this point.
I think the orders entered by the Court on the Motions to Dismiss are quite comprehensive and very clear, and while our pleadings are, of course, forthcoming and we do intend on amending them in accordance with the orders, I think we all have an understanding of what those are going to look like, and I don't see a reason to delay discovery at this point.

And I will just correct that $I$ believe it is PTO 34.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Okay. I will defer to Judge Rosenberg, she has already given you the guidance from the Court.

The other thing $I$ would just note for the parties is this is not a binary. Just because you are not a party does not mean you can't be subject to discovery, you would just be subject to discovery presumably under Rule 45, not under Rule 30, and subsequent rules there.

So, I would just commend that to the parties to think about that as you have these discussions, and also to be mindful that if we are proceeding with discovery against nonparties under Rule 45, there are some different procedures. In particular, the objection procedure would allow for objections to be heard in a different district.

There is a provision under Rule $45(f)$ that, under exceptional circumstances, any objection can be transferred back to the Court from which the subpoena issued.

I would encourage the parties to maybe meet and confer about whether they want to have a blanket agreement that in the event there is third party discovery and there is an objection, that the parties would agree to try to move that all back here so that Judge Rosenberg and I can have a unified approach to discovery and we don't have a judge in a different district who really isn't involved in this MDL ruling on some discovery issues.

I will leave it at that level of abstraction and let the parties continue with their conferrals. Again, if you need to invoke the procedures under PTO 32 and have a formal ruling on anything, we are here for you.

Thank you both, Mr. Yoo and Ms. Goldenberg.
Let me turn to the retailers. If I could ask Mr.
Pulaski and Ms. Johnston to come forward.
MR. PULASKI: Good afternoon, your Honors.
MS. JOHNSTON: Good afternoon.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Good afternoon, Ms.
Johnston.
Mr. Pulaski, anything to report with regard to the retailers?

MR. PULASKI: Sure. At this point, obviously, we have production underway from the retailers through the registry process for product identification with loyalty cards and prescription records, and we have met and conferred with

Ms. Johnston on several occasions regarding core discovery agreement production, as well as the taking of depositions.

Pursuant to our core discovery agreement, our depositions were to begin in earnest after the first ruling on the Motions to Dismiss, and that time has come and passed. We had been speaking informally with Ms. Johnston throughout December about getting dates on the books for the depositions. The production is due, I believe, on January 15th, which is in nine days.

I know that -- my understanding is Ms. Johnston's position is similar to Mr. Yoo's position, and I don't want to speak for her, so I will let her speak on her behalf.

I will tell you that our position, to mimic what Ms. Goldenberg stated, is that we would like to get the depositions set immediately and get dates, and we would want to ensure that the core discovery agreement production is timely submitted prior to the 15th, and again, I am sure we will have conversations with Ms. Johnston and discuss that.

I know that they, too, who have also just received the Court's orders and it was the holidays and had to meet with all their clients, are working on those issues. I don't know the full details of what their position is yet, but Ms. Johnston can inform the Court.

It is our position that, while we don't have the core discovery production as of yet, hopefully it will be submitted
by the 15 th, and again we will begin to get dates as soon as possible to start taking depositions.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you very much, Mr. Pulaski. Let me turn to Ms. Johnston.

I guess Mr. Pulaski raised two issues. One is, are you going to meet the January 15th deadline, and then anything else that you wanted to address.

MS. JOHNSTON: Good afternoon, your Honors. Sarah Johnston on behalf of the retailer and pharmacy Defendants. Nice to see you again. You, too, Judge Rosenberg.

So, to address the Court's questions, I will keep this brief and say, as Judge Rosenberg referenced earlier, a lot has changed in the last couple of days respecting the scope and the landscape of the litigation, and having received the orders on Motions to Dismiss just before the holiday weekend, there was a lot to digest and talk with each other about, as well as with our clients, before we could start the meet and confer process with Plaintiffs' counsel in earnest.

I think that the Court's guidance on the process moving forward and the expectations, as well as the process for dispute resolution under PTO 32, has been really helpful and we have heard that loud and clear.

I think that Mr. Pulaski and I have a history of very fruitful meet and confers and have been able to resolve almost all of our issues without a whole lot of trouble, and I think
that we can begin those discussions that we started earlier this week now that we have the Court's guidance, and I am hopeful that we can make the necessary progress to get that accomplished.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Ms. Johnston, I appreciate it and appreciate everyone's efforts in that regard. Thank you. I will excuse both of you.

I will turn to the distributors. I don't know if there are any issues, but I want to give them an opportunity to be heard. So, let me recognize Ms. Boldt and Mr. Kaplan. Good afternoon to both of you.

MR. KAPLAN: Good afternoon.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Ms. Boldt, I have been letting the Plaintiffs go first, so $I$ will let you go first. If you could announce your appearance for the Court Reporter, please.

MS. BOLDT: Thank you, your Honors. This is Paige Boldt with Watts Guerra for Plaintiffs.

I'm giving you a brief update on the status of the distributor Defendants discovery. As you are aware, under PTO 57, there is a 45-day window for those Defendants to provide documents related to the core discovery agreement. That window opened right before Christmas, and will be closing, completing at the end of this month.

To date, Plaintiffs have not received any production
pursuant to this agreement, and Plaintiffs and distributor Defendants have kind of informally discussed the scope of when to schedule the depositions, and similar to other groups of Defendants, we were informed this week that they would not be providing ongoing dates because of the Court's Motion to Dismiss last week.

With the Court's guidance, we will continue to work with the distributor Defendants in order to maintain the status quo of the Court's discovery schedule.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Ms. Boldt. Let me turn to Mr. Kaplan.

MR. KAPLAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Andrew Kaplan, I represent Cardinal Health, Inc. and I am here today on behalf of the distributor Defendants.

I will be brief, $I$ think this has been covered today. Briefly to update on the status, the core discovery agreement, as the Court knows, that was related to the distributor Defendants was signed by this Court on December 16 th, so just after the Motion to Dismiss hearings.

At least $I$ know our client, and I think others, have -- did actually begin producing under the agreement within seven days of that. So, there have been some productions pursuant to that agreement. It doesn't call for completion until February 1st.

We have had no discussions with Plaintiffs since the
entry of the orders on the Motions to Dismiss about the core discovery agreement, so this is the first time it is being raised today. Of course, we will engage and meet and confer with them and discuss that issue.

As to the depositions, the first time a deposition was raised, or a request for a date for deposition, I believe was on the 7 th of December, and with a request for dates within two days. We had no notice pending, nothing to work off of. We had asked before the holidays for a draft notice we had provided some concerns about the draft notice, which included subjects that did not in any way touch upon distributors, including 16 topics or subtopics on active pharmaceutical ingredient for example. We were expecting to get some comments back on that, and, of course, the orders came down on the 31st.

I think Mr. Yoo expressed this earlier when he was speaking today, but there are some concerns. Typically, we would frame what discovery is -- we would agree to based on whether we think it is relevant and proportional based on the allegations for the specific claims for a specific Defendant, and that may differ for a specific Defendant and may not even be specific to an entire group of distributors.

The orders were done -- were very comprehensive and addressed a lot of issues. We have all been analyzing them and continue to do so. But at least our general reading was that
the vast majority of the claims against the distributors were dismissed with prejudice.

There is a narrow window for amendment, but there are some potential significant issues with amendments that would need to be covered, and we want to see what those amendments are, want to understand specifically how it relates to our specific clients, and then actually engage in a discussion about what would be relevant and proportional if it was a well pled complaint.

We have that concern and we heard your Honor's comments about the PTO 32 and the process, and so, I will say that we will meet and confer with Plaintiffs and to the extent there is a dispute we need to raise, we will do it as per the Court's requirements.

Thank you.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you. I want to be clear, my reference to $P T O 32$ is not an invitation to use it if you don't need to. Trust me, I have plenty of other work to do. But if you need me, I am here and happy to help you resolve your issues.

Thank you both, Mr. Kaplan and Ms. Boldt. I will excuse both of you.

The last kind of general topic on the agenda for today has to do with class Plaintiff discovery. Let me turn to Ms. Whiteley and Mr. Sachse.

Good afternoon, Ms. Whiteley.
MS. WHITELEY: Good afternoon, your Honors. Thank you again for your time and patience with us today and for having this conference.

I represent the 183 class Plaintiffs in their consumer and medical monitoring claims. Starting in the summer, late summer, Plaintiffs substantially completed all of their informal discovery, and in early October we provided the Defendants with a spreadsheet listing by Plaintiff the pharmacies and the retailers and the medical providers for each Plaintiff so that they would have the basic information on each of the Plaintiffs.

In late October and early November we served responses to the 94 requests for production in one set for each of the Plaintiffs, and then we began responding to the 183 sets of interrogatories between late October and early November, and those were served on the Defendants by November 6th.

At the same time, we began our initial production on a rolling basis of our -- the documents that were in Plaintiffs' possession, and we also hired a vendor to collect additional documents that were not in the Plaintiffs' possession, which we have been collecting since then and throughout the holidays and received even more this morning.

It is -- we then began a meet and confer process with the Defendants starting in late December. During our first
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meet and confer, we mainly discussed the issues of scope, including the relevant time period for our answers and production and the appropriate redactions that should be made to the documents. We had a fruitful meet and confer.

We were not able to resolve everything, it is a
lengthy process and it will take more time, but we were able to exchange some ideas of why we made our objections and why the Defendants felt that they were unfounded or otherwise.

We hope to be able to reach some agreements because we would like to resolve all of our disagreements with regard to redactions so that we can make those redactions and begin the rolling production of the documents that required the redactions.

We also discussed interrogatories, and we will need to discuss those a bit further, and we have agreed to provide some followup information and the Defendants have agreed to do the same. We will pick up that process again tomorrow morning and I imagine there will be more than one meet and confer because we will have to go through each of the individual requests and we will do so diligently in the coming days and weeks if necessary.

I am happy to answer any questions you may have.
MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: No, Ms. Whiteley, that was very helpful. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Sachse.
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MR. SACHSE: Good afternoon, again, your Honor. Will Sachse on behalf of GSK and the Defendants.

I will be very brief. I thought Ms. Whiteley's report was quite helpful and accurate. I sign on to what she said, we do have a meet and confer tomorrow.

From the Defense perspective, we are concerned about the volume that we have gotten to date, the volume of documents we have gotten to date, but $I$ am heartened to hear that those documents are going to start flowing as soon as we resolve these redaction issues and some of these other issues.

The only other thing $I$ would say about the consumer class -- and we will raise these issues with the Plaintiffs. One would be we would like to know if the Plaintiffs intend to add named Plaintiffs when they replead; and if so, what will they do to make sure that the new Plaintiffs get caught up on discovery with the existing Plaintiffs.

And the other thing is, just looking at what we have to date, if we could get a little more basic information about the Plaintiffs such as address, date of birth, name, that kind of thing, but as $I$ said, we'll raise that with the Plaintiffs. I don't expect there are going to be significant issues or roadblocks and we will report back.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Mr. Sachse.
Ms. Whiteley, anything further?

MS. WHITELEY: No, your Honor. Thank you.
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MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you both. Ms. Whiteley, I will excuse you. Mr. Sachse, you have one more at bat here.

Let me recognize Mr. Dearman on behalf of the third party payors.

MR. DEARMAN: Good afternoon, your Honors. Mark Dearman on behalf of the third party payors.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: It occurs to me, Mr. Sachse, on this one you are kind of playing offense because you are the one who served the discovery, so maybe I should let you go first.

MR. SACHSE: I would be happy to. Again Will Sachse for the Defendants.

I think $I$ can be brief. I want to say at the outset, Judge Reinhart, when I took a look at the agenda, I was worried we were going to be here all night, so $I$ have been very impressed with how orderly we have all been. All the presenters have been very to the point, I think that's great, and you have been running a tight ship, so I appreciate it. So, let me not delay this any longer.

We have been talking to the third party payors. They produced about 36,000 pages of documents. There are some issues that we are continuing to work through with them. I think most notably, and there was a reference in the submission, the pharmacy benefit managers, or the PBMs, I know
the Plaintiffs have been trying to get documents, responsive documents from them and maybe meeting a little resistance, but we are continuing to work with the Plaintiffs and consider our options there, maybe going directly to the PBMs.

We also are going to continue to work with the Plaintiffs to follow up on getting more clarity about the claims data that they have, and also the time periods that are at issue for the third party payors, the times in which they allege they were reimbursing the product. But again, nothing ripe, just a status report, these are some of the things that are on our mind.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you, Mr. Sachse.
Let me turn to Mr. Dearman. You will get to be the last speaker for the day.

MR. DEARMAN: Thank you very much. I agree with what Will had to say. There have been three meet and confers, there is a fourth next week. We have collected a significant amount of ESI and hard copy documents for each of the third party payors which we are reviewing and which we may be producing in litigation.

The issue that Mr. Sachse raised with respect to the production to date and the numbers I think sort of does fall into the category of we are dealing with the pharmacy benefit managers as they have raised issues with the third party payors relating to contractual provisions between the third party
payors and the PBMs as to what can and cannot be produced, notwithstanding the fact that there is a protective order in this case and we provided them with that.

So, at these meet and confers we have been discussing these with Defendants. These issues are not ripe yet, but are getting ripe, and to the extent that we need assistance, we will certainly come to the court. And we appreciate the Defendants' position today, which is they also may want to get involved in some offensive discovery on that point.

I don't think any issue is ripe right now. We are meeting and conferring and I think we are all working well together with respect to this point.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: Thank you very much, Mr. Dearman.

Mr. Sachse, I appreciate the compliment, but I can't take credit for this being an efficient hearing. I think what it show us, though, is that if we stick to what Judge Rosenberg articulated as her vision of these hearings being informational and not for dispute resolution, and the parties can continue as they have in this case, identify jointly issues that are topical and need to be brought to the Court's attention, that help the Court in managing the litigation going forward either by highlighting for us the issues that are coming or maybe raising high level issues for which the Court can give you some guidance, we can actually cover a lot of ground in these
hearings.
I thank you for the compliment, but I really commend the parties for sticking with Judge Rosenberg's vision, and I think if we continue to do that in the future, these will be very productive events.

With that, Judge Rosenberg, I don't know if you had anything else you wanted to add other than -- I wanted to thank the parties for their presentation. It has been very helpful to me.

THE COURT: Ditto. Thank you all, and I couldn't agree more with Judge Reinhart. The credit goes to all of you who have prepared and presented and informed us of where you are, the progress you have made and the work that still lies ahead, that which is going well and that which you are able to work out cooperatively, and that which perhaps is causing frustration and may ultimately need to come to the Court for resolution, all of which is anticipated, all of which is appropriate, and permissible, and contemplated in a litigation of this nature.

I hope with this meeting and with ongoing regular meetings that you are assured of really where Judge Reinhart and I have been all along, which is here, available, engaged, informed, working hard, and perhaps now that we have all become more accustomed to Zoom, and really this is going to be the way this case will proceed for the foreseeable future -- I told you
before, our district is not even entertaining trials until April, and it is unclear whether that is even going to happen. Just by being able to see us more, albeit virtually, that just gives you even added assurance that we are here and we are very devoted to working with you to make this case work for you. By that $I$ mean that it is working in the timeframe that you set out for yourselves in the case management schedule, that it is working in a way that gets you, both sides, information that you need in the most expeditious manner so that the appropriate narrowing and winnowing and focusing and sharpening of the issues comes to light for everyone's benefit.

There is no question that the more informed we are about the day-to-day discovery matters that you are facing inevitably provides us with a greater knowledge base and that has to be a good thing.

I hope that you all have found the conference today as productive as we have. As I said, we have a format in place, if you will, as $I$ outlined in the beginning, and let's give it a try and see how it works. I am always open to suggestions for improvement, you know that, and so we will take it conference by conference and continue along.

I would strongly encourage you to meet with the special master so we can get the next couple of dates on the calendar, and this way you will know. And $I$ heard a lot of we
are going to continue our meet and confers, so please do that. We will be back together again in two weeks or so, and so if there are matters that come out of those meet and confers that would be appropriate to put on the agenda for the case management conference, then let's put it on the agenda. As you continue to meet and confer, these conferences are an ability for us to continue to monitor how things are going.

At all times, you know that if there is any particular relief that is needed when you can't resolve matters, then the processes are there for you to do so.

With that, everybody be well and remain safe, and we look forward to seeing you in a couple of weeks.

Thank you again for everything.
(Thereupon, the hearing concluded.)
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| ability [5] 19/21 42/4 42/11 | 36/13 36/25 54/10 55/17 56/1 | amendment [1] 60 |
| 43/7 69/6 | 56/10 61/3 62/17 63/1 64/12 | amendments [2] 60/4 60/5 |
| able [8] 19/10 47/5 56/24 | 65/9 69/2 69/13 | amicably [1] 40/23 |
| 62/5 62/6 62/9 67/14 68/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { against [4] } 47 / 651 / 1853 / 19 \\ & 60 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | amount [3] 17/7 22/3 65/1 analysis [2] 43/25 44/1 |
| about [73] | age [1] 22/11 | analytical [1] 14/13 |
| absolute [2] 31/11 49/21 | agency [1] 50/1 | analyzed [1] 25/22 |
| absolutely [1] 22/7 | agenda [19] 7/24 8/2 8/5 8/9 | analyzing [1] 59/24 |
| abstraction [1] 54/9 | 8/14 8/19 8/21 8/22 9/6 9/7 | ANAND [2] 3/1 38/6 |
| accommodate [2] 37/13 37/14 | 9/9 9/11 11/14 38/1 44/20 | Anapol [1] 1/12 |
| accomplish [1] 18/12 | 60/23 64/15 69/4 69/5 | ANDA [1] 50/9 |
| accomplished [1] 57/4 | agenda that [1] 9/9 | ANDREW [2] 3/4 58/1 |
| accordance [1] 53/5 | aggressive [2] 30/24 49/8 | Angeles [2] 3/8 3/1 |
| according [1] 51/14 | AGNESHWAR [10] 3/1 38/3 38/7 | announce [1] 57/15 |
| accordingly [2] 11/5 13/25 | 38/20 39/16 39/22 40/25 | another [10] 6/23 10/5 15/19 |
| account [1] 21/4 | 42/11 $43 / 14$ 43/19 | 15/23 16/14 16/17 28/5 31/12 |
| accurate [1] 63/4 | ago [5] 23/24 30/21 35/14 | 33/4 40/22 |
| accustomed [1] 67/24 | $2 / 144$ | nswer [2] |
| achieved [1] 50/4 | agree [10] 6/15 9/14 30/12 | answers [1] 62/2 |
| across [1] 13/1 | 30/20 33/12 50/14 54/4 59/ | anticipate [2] 12/11 46/12 |
| activate [2] 24/18 26/11 | 65/15 67/11 | anticipated [2] 10/4 67/17 <br> anticipates [1] 38/21 |
| active [1] 59/12 | agreed $12]$ $8 / 19$ $15 / 1$ $23 / 6$ <br> $23 / 13$ $34 / 6$ $34 / 9$ $35 / 20$ $42 / 14$ | anticipates [1] 38/21 anticipation [1] 7/9 |
| actively [3] 5/13 10/13 | 42/15 42/20 62/15 62/16 | Antonio [1] 2/3 |
| 21/21 [1] 50/ | agreement [20] 8/1 30/5 33/6 | any [30] $9 / 1$ 9/16 $12 / 5$ 17/24 |
| actually [7] 6/21 | 33/15 33/17 33/24 34/9 37/19 | 19/18 19/19 23/18 $24 / 17$ |
| $23 / 15 \quad 25 / 11 \quad 58 / 21$ | 47/11 49/18 54/2 55/2 55/3 | 24/23 39/4 40/17 40/17 40/20 |
| ADAM [1] 1/15 | 55/16 57/22 58/1 58/16 58/21 | 41/8 $44 / 244 / 2146 / 17$ 46/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { add [9] } & 12 / 4 & 12 / 4 & 21 / 1 & 24 / 13\end{array}$ | 58/23 59/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}46 / 22 & 47 / 9 & 51 / 16 & 52 / 24 & 53 / 24\end{array}$ |
| 25/2 26/4 39/23 63/14 67/7 | agreements [4] 46/7 46/9 | 57/9 57/25 59/11 62/22 64/20 |
| added [1] 68/4 | 46/15 | 66/10 69/8 |
| addition [1] 4/21 | ahead [2] 26/11 67/14 | anyone [1] 26/1 |
| additional [9] 19/1 19/2 | albeit [1] 68/3 | anyone's [1] 46/19 |
| 25/2 28/6 30/19 31/5 33/23 | alerting [1] 11/21 | anything [12] 12/3 25/4 |
| 43/24 61/20 | alike [1] 8/18 | 32/25 44/12 $46 / 17$ 47/24 |
| address [11] 9/13 11/7 13/24 | all [70] | 52/25 54/12 54/20 56/6 63/24 |
| 39/25 41/13 41/18 44/18 | allegations [2] 52/8 59/20 | 67/7 |
| 47/15 56/7 56/11 63/19 | allege [1] 65/9 | apologize [2] 24/23 41/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { addressed [3] } 10 / 1 \text { 13/10 } \\ & 59 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cccc} \text { allow }[6] \quad 5 / 24 \quad 18 / 3 \\ 38 / 25 & 41 / 16 & 53 / 21 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { apparently }[1] \quad 35 / 4 \\ & \text { appear [1] } 11 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| addressing [1] | allows [1] 52/21 | appearance [1] 57/1 |
| admission [1] 32/22 | almost [6] 4/13 13/15 17/2 | applies [2] 35/3 47/14 |
| admittedly [1] 48/9 | 18/18 48/24 56/24 | appreciate [19] 8/11 26/14 |
| admonition [1] 50/13 | alone [1] 13/20 | 27/25 28/17 $32 / 5$ 33/10 $36 / 6$ |
| advance [4] 7/21 8/15 $9 / 17$ | along [5] 29/12 40/10 51/1 $67 / 22 \text { 68/22 }$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 36 / 11 & 36 / 15 & 39 / 25 & 44 / 11 \\ 48 / 19 & 49 / 11 & 57 / 6 & 57 / 6 & 62 / 24 \end{array}$ |


| A | bases [1] | blunt [2] 32/8 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| appreciate... [3] 64/19 66/7 | basic [2] 61/11 63/18 | Bo |
| $66 / 15$ | basis [1] 61/19 | Boehringer [2] 21/11 21/15 |
| apprise [1] 5/21 | bat [1] 64/3 | BOLDT [6] |
| approach [1] 54/5 | [1] | 57/18 58/10 60/21 |
| approached [1] 50/21 | be an [1] $8 / 1$  <br> BEACH [3] $1 / 2$ $1 / 5$ | bonus [1] $30 /$ <br> books [1] $55 /$ |
| appropriate [13] 7/4 9/11 | because [22] 7/2 8/2 8/19 | both [22] 5/14 12/18 22 |
| 14/6 40/18 41/19 42/12 46/23 | 20/1 $22 / 7$ 23/1 $23 / 5 \quad 25 / 3$ |     <br> $24 / 22$ $26 / 14$ $28 / 17$ $28 / 18$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}52 / 4 & 52 / 9 & 62 / 3 & 67 / 18 & 68 / 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 1 & 35 / 3 & 36 / 3 & 36 / 17 & 41 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 24 & 33 / 10 & 36 / 8 & 36 / 16 & 37 / 18\end{array}$ |
| 69/4 | 42/22 43/15 47/2 51/16 53/13 | 44/13 51/3 54/13 57/7 57/11 |
| 14/4 14/24 16/4 16/5 16/2 | 58/5 62/9 62/18 64/9 | 60/21 60/22 64/1 68/8 |
| $20 / 5$ | become [1] 67/23 | Boulevard [1] 1/23 |
| April [3] 37/3 37/4 | been [48] 4/17 4/22 6/20 | box [2] 23/10 23/11 |
| Arch [1] 2/19 | 7/19 8/14 13/15 19/22 23/20 | boxes [1] 23/16 |
| are [195] | $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 21 & 23 / 21 & 24 / 5 & 25 / 10 & 26 / 3\end{array}$ | Brammel [1] 16/14 |
| areas [1] 13/9 | 26/5 26/15 26/22 26/24 28/11 | brand [6] 11/15 $14 / 2$ 18/5 |
| aren't [2] 9/22 23/25 | 6 42/14 $42 / 15$ 42/15 | 21/8 30/10 36/14 |
| arguably [1] 34/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}43 / 11 & 43 / 12 & 47 / 11 & 47 / 12 \\ 49 / 17 & 50 / 15 & 51 / 2 & 51 / 20\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { brands } & {[18]} & 12 / 2 & 12 / 21 & 12 / 22 \\ 12 / 24 & 13 / 1 & 13 / 1 & 13 / 16 & 16 / 9\end{array}$ |
| arise [3] 6/16 38/22 46/14 | $56 / 21 \quad 56 / 24 \quad 57 / 13 \quad 58 / 15$ | $17 / 22 \quad 18 / 22 \quad 20 / 5 \quad 34 / 123$ |
| arisen [1] 38/11 | $58 / 22$ 59/24 61/22 64/16 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 35 / 3 & 35 / 12 & 35 / 16 & 36 / 21 & 47 / 25\end{array}$ |
| Arnold [2] 2/22 3/1 | 64/17 64/18 64/19 64/21 65/1 | brands have [1] 12/22 |
| ticulated [2] 51/20 66/18 | 65/16 66/4 67/8 67/22 | brief [9] 8/20 12/8 29/4 |
| articulating [1] 52/3 | before [17] 1/8 6/24 8/15 | 33/5 56/12 57/19 58/15 63/3 |
| as [132] | 10/10 19/8 21/17 24/22 26/13 | 64/14 |
| $47 / 22 \quad 54 / 14$ | 28/17 33/20 50/20 52/6 56/15 | briefly [6] 28/2 28/3 29/3 |
| asked [2] 35/16 59/9 | 56/17 57/23 59/9 68/1 | 50/19 52/17 |
| asking [2] 31/4 48/10 | began [3] 61/15 61/18 61/24 | bring [2] 43/9 47/1 |
| aspect [1] 34/25 | begin [5] 55/4 56/1 57/1 | brink [1] |
| assess [3] 13/23 17/23 27 | 58/21 62/11 | broad [3] 32/8 |
| assistance [2] 30/4 66/6 | beginning [4] 4/20 42/8 | brought [2] 43/13 66/21 |
| assume [2] 48/4 52/24 | $42 / 1968 / 19$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { BRUCE [2] } & 1 / 9 & 14 / 13 \\ \text { business [1] } & 21 / 13\end{array}$ |
| assurance [4] 13/9 16/18 | $\text { behalf [19] } 18 / 5$ | business [1] |
| 51/1 68/4 | 24/19 25/9 26/2 28/22 29/1 | C |
| assure [2] 4/4 44/ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}35 / 11 & 37 / 18 & 38 / 5 & 38 / 7 & 49 / 21\end{array}$ | CA [2] 3/8 3/12 |
| assured [1] 67/21 | 55/12 56/9 58/14 63/2 64/4 | calendar [3] 10/3 10/11 |
| Atlanta [1] 1/20 | $64 /$ | 68/25 |
|  | being [17] 4/13 4/24 5/10 | calendars [2] 10/16 10 |
| $66 / 21$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}7 / 18 & 11 / 9 & 11 / 14 & 29 / 10 & 29 / 23\end{array}$ | call [8] 19/13 20/21 24/18 |
| attributable [1] 17/3 | $34 / 17$ 38/13 43/3 47/6 47/6 | 27/1 28/24 31/2 46/11 58/23 |
| authorizing [1] 32/14 | 59/2 66/16 66/18 68/3 | called [1] 20/15 |
| availability [1] 10/15 | belief [1] 47/ | came [2] 45/6 59 |
| available [7] 6/15 10/14 | believe [19] 13/19 19/3 | camera [4] 24/18 26/11 37/21 |
| 10/19 35/23 37/3 37/3 67/22 | 26/17 33/4 $35 / 19$ 37/9 39/5 | 37/25 [2] 11/25 47/23 |
| avenue [6] 1/16 2/8 2/11 | 41/5 41/19 $41 / 20$ 41/21 $42 / 23$ | cameras [2] |
| 2/22 3/5 46/22 | 44/6 44/12 52/12 52/21 53/8 | Camp [1] 2/ |
| avenues [1] 6/15 | benefit [3] 64/25 65/23 | $8 / 8 \quad 8 / 19 \quad 8 / 22 \quad 8 / 25 \quad 10 / 18$ |
| avoid [1] 31/1 | $68 / 12$ | 10/20 11/2 11/5 16/23 22/1 |
| aware [7] 5/25 12/22 30/3 | best [5] 11/10 11/12 19/21 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 23/10 } & 26 / 23 & 26 / 25 & 29 / 24\end{array}$ |
| 32/20 34/23 43/17 57/20 | 24/5 37/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 10 & 31 / 7 & 31 / 25 & 34 / 25 & 36\end{array}$ |
| away [1] 38/18 | between [6] | $37 / 14$ 37/20 37/24 39/4 3 |
| B | 46/24 61/16 65/25 | 39/16 40/2 40/6 40/6 40/23 |
| back [13] 21/21 27/21 31/ | beyond [2] 11/3 45/8 | 41/4 41/4 41/5 41/6 44/4 |
| 31/13 38/16 40/21 47/19 | BI [8] 13/4 16/3 16/3 $16 / 10$ | 44/8 47/1 52/10 52/14 52/17 |
| 52/14 53/25 54/4 5 | 16/15 16/23 17/8 18/24 | 53/24 54/5 55/23 57/1 57/3 |
| 69/2 | BI's [1] 16/6 | 62/11 64/14 66/1 66/19 66/24 |
| 69/2 | big [1] 30/18 | 66/25 68/24 |
| backsrords [1] 9/17 | binary [1] 53/13 | can't [6] 30/4 44/1 49/21 |
| backwards [1] | bind [1] 39/18 | 53/14 66/15 69/9 |
| Bailey's [1] 42 | birth [1] 63/19 | cancer [2] 20/15 25/20 |
| Barnes [3] 3/10 47/22 51/4 | bit [7] 24/25 26/5 36/16 | cannot [3] 7/2 41/16 66/1 |
| base [1] 68/15 | 37/15 37/24 49/6 62/15 | Cardinal [1] 58/13 |
| based [8] 7/18 13/19 16/21 | Blake [1] 16/11 | cards [1] 54/24 |
| 17/10 22/14 52/5 59/18 59/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { blanket [1] 54/2 } \\ & \text { blip [1] } 40 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { care [2] } 14 / 18 \text { 21/13 } \\ & \text { Carey [1] } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |


| C | commend [4] 6/18 $38 / 12$ 53/17 | 65/16 66/4 69/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| case [21] $1 / 3$ 4/12 $4 / 15$ 4/21 | comment [2] 6/18 41/16 | confirm [1] $33 / 16$ <br> conform [1] $45 / 14$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 6 & 10 / 20 & 17 / 9 & 17 / 15 & 19 / 6\end{array}$ | comments [3] $12 / 5$ 59/14 | congested <br> [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 24 & 37 / 8 & 38 / 25 & 45 / 17 & 50 / 19 \\ 51 / 14 & 66 / 3 & 66 / 20 & 67 / 25 & 68 / 5\end{array}$ | $60 / 11$ | conjunction [1] 5/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51/14 66/3 66/20 67/25 68/5 } \\ & 68 / 769 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | committee [1] 25/23 | CONLEE [1] 2/4 |
| categorically [1] | committees [1] 25/21 | Connor [1] 15 |
| categories [2] 26/1 46/7 | communication [2] 19/7 | consider [6] 9/25 |
| category [1] 65/23 | communications [2] 33/21 | consideration [3] 25/7 30 |
| caught [1] 63 | companies [1] 25/18 | $45 / 13$ |
| causation [1] | company [3] 20/16 23/5 23/24 | considerations [1] 30/15 |
| causing <br> cede [1] | complaint [3] 25/25 51/12 | considering [1] 14/ |
| central [1] 22/8 | 60/9 | consist [1] 17 |
| Centre [1] 2/1 | complaints [2] | Consistent [1] |
| Century [1] 3/11 | complete [6] 15/9 16/24 | constantly [1] |
| certain [1] 43/3 | 19/10 27/20 42/2 45/2 | constitutes [1] |
| certainly [11] 12/4 18/17 | completed [7] 5/24 12/23 | consultant [2] 40/5 |
| 24/16 25/8 $26 / 11 \quad 27 / 1 \quad 32 / 14$ | 13/2 13/4 43/12 48/11 61 | consumer [4] |
| 32/20 39/7 45/11 66/7 | completed noncustodial [1] | 61/5 63/11 |
| certification [1] |  | contact [1] |
| certify [1] 69/16 | completing [2] 43/2 57/23 | contemplated |
| Chaffin [2] 2/8 12 | completion [6] 18/23 19/14 | contemplates |
| chains [2] 50/24 50/25 | 49/22 50/4 50/16 58/23 | context [1] 46 |
| change [2] 7/14 46/11 | compliance [4] 16/19 | continue [18] |
| changed [6] 10/11 46/3 46/17 | 24 48/13 | 29/12 29/23 44/9 45/24 51/15 |
| 47/7 52/25 56/13 | compliant [1] 52/ | 52/5 54/10 58/7 59/25 |
| chime [1] 18/14 | complied [1] 15/5 | 66/19 67/4 68/22 69/1 69/6 |
| choose [1] 51/22 | compliment [2] 66/15 67/2 | 69/7 |
| chosen [1] 27 | comply [1] 19/20 | continued |
| Christmas [1] 57/23 | comprehensive [3] 34/25 53/3 | continuing [4] 40/2 46/1 |
| Cira [1] 2/19 |  | 64/2 |
| circle [1] 27/ | conceptualize [1] | contracts [1] 50 |
| circumstances [1] 53/24 | concern [3] 19/16 35/5 60/10 | contractual [1] 65/25 |
| claims [12] 29/19 29/22 47/5 | concerned [5] 12/20 35/7 | contrary [1] 21/] |
| 47/6 51/17 51/19 51/22 52/3 | 46/2 49/6 63/6 | conversations [2] |
| 59/20 60/1 61/6 65/7 | concerns [6] 33/18 35/5 41/8 | 55/18 |
| clarity [2] 7/10 65/6 | 10 59/10 59/1 | cooperatively [1] 67 |
| ```class [6] 29/19 29/21 29/22 60/24 61/5 63/12``` | concluded [3] | coordinate [2] copies [1] 27/8 |
| clear [6] 6/25 42/10 45/16 | conclusion [1] 17/20 | copy [1] 65/18 |
| 53/3 56/22 60/17 | conclusions [2] 39/20 41/6 | core [12] 20/10 |
| client [2] 21/20 58/20 | concrete [1] 52/14 | 48/14 49/18 55/1 55/3 55/1 |
| clients [5] 24/14 45/10 | conduct [2] 39/1 42/1 | 55/24 57/22 58/16 59/ |
| 55/21 56/17 60/7 | confer [17] 29/8 29/11 29/24 | correct [3] 27/3 53/8 69/1 |
| clinical [1] 29/ | $39 / 3$ 51/3 $52 / 1$ 52/9 54/1 | correspondence |
| clock [1] 45/23 | 56/17 59/3 60/12 61/24 62/1 | could [8] 8/4 11/3 23/16 |
| close [1] 28/15 | 62/4 62/18 63/5 69/6 | 47/22 54/14 56/17 57/15 |
| closing [1] | conference [36] 1/8 4/10 | 63/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { CMC [2] } & 33 / 17 & 34 / 4\end{array}$ | 4/12 5/3 5/4 5/5 5/6 5/8 | couldn't [1] 67/1 |
| cold [1] 41/2 | 5/11 6/11 $7 / 13$ 7/19 7/21 | counsel [18] 4/19 5/1 5/9 |
| colleagues [4] 18/14 | 7/25 8/15 8/23 9/12 9/17 | 5/18 5/21 7/6 7/23 10/12 |
| 48/17 51/4 | 9/18 10/1 10/5 10/6 10/17 | 10/15 18/11 41/16 42/2 45/8 |
| collect [1] 61/20 | 10/21 10/21 17/10 19/7 33/11 | 45/9 45/10 45/12 49/24 56/18 |
| collected [1] 65 | 37/9 40/11 50/19 61/4 68/17 | count [2] 20/11 20/17 |
| collecting [1] 61/22 | 68/22 68/22 69/5 | couple [11] 7/22 18/13 $18 / 19$ |
| collective [1] 10/16 | conferences [16] 4/21 4/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 17 & 22 / 10 & 30 / 15 & 35 / 14 & 37 / 9\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { collectively [3] 12/24 13/16 } \\ & \text { 20/4 } \end{aligned}$ | 4/23 4/25 5/14 5/18 5/19 6/5 $\begin{array}{lll}6 / 6 & 7 / 5 & 7 / 7 \\ 7 / 9 & 11 / 9 & 18 / 10\end{array}$ | 56/13 68/24 69/12 <br> course [8] 18/11 23/20 24/8 |
| combined [1] | 2/9 69/6 | 31/15 36/21 53/4 59/3 59/1 |
| come [18] $4 / 4$ 4/5 4/18 $8 / 10$ | conferral [1] 26/21 <br> conferrals [1] 54/10 | $\begin{array}{clllll}\text { court } & {[69]} & 1 / 1 & 3 / 15 & 4 / 15 \\ 4 / 19 & 5 / 2 & 5 / 10 & 5 / 17 & 5 / 21 & 5 / 24\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} 29 / 24 & 30 / 4 & 31 / 4 & 31 / 13 & 36 / 7 \\ 40 / 21 & 41 / 21 & 45 / 18 & 52 / 14 \end{array}$ | conferred [3] 14/7 30/13 | 6/3 6/9 6/10 6/15 6/21 6/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}40 / 21 & 41 / 21 & 45 / 18 & 52 / 14\end{array}$ | 4/25 | 7/1 7/8 7/20 7/20 8/7 9/23 |
| es [1] 68/11 | conferrence [1] 10/6 | 11/11 11/11 12/20 12/22 |
| ming [2] 62/20 66/23 | conferring [1] 66/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 13 & 13 / 25 & 17 / 14 & 17 / 20\end{array}$ |
| ming [2] 62/20 66/23 | confers [11] 15/11 16/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 23 & 27 / 12 & 27 / 14 & 27 / 23\end{array}$ |
| mmence [1] 45/21 | 33/22 48/8 48/24 51/6 56/24 | 28/20 32/14 32/16 39/17 |


| C | 10/19 11/2 11/3 35/17 55/7 | $37 / 10$ 50/21 55/2 55/4 55 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| court... [32] 40/22 41/22 | 55/15 56/1 58/5 59/7 68/24 Daubert [1] 43/3 | 55/14 56/2 58/3 59/5 escribed [1] 42/11 |
| 41/24 42/4 42/10 42/25 43/15 | $\text { day }[10] \quad 8 / 15 \quad 9 / 16 \quad 10 / 12$ | deserve [1] 36/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 43 / 17 & 45 / 1 & 45 / 16 & 46 / 2 & 46 / 6 \\ 46 / 11 & 46 / 15 & 46 / 16 & 47 / 13 \end{array}$ | 37/20 40/3 48/17 57/21 65/14 | designate [1] 14/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 47 / 15 & 48 / 22 & 49 / 5 & 49 / 15 & 53 / 2\end{array}$ | 68/14 68/14 | designated [2] 34 |
| 53/11 53/25 55/23 57/15 | day-to-day [1] 68/14 | desire [2] 7/6 47/10 |
| 58/17 58/18 66/7 66/22 66/24 | $\begin{array}{ccccc} \text { days }[13] & 7 / 22 & 8 / 14 & 35 / 15 \\ 35 / 18 & 45 / 8 & 45 / 19 & 45 / 20 & 51 / 14 \end{array}$ | detail [1] 41/19 detailed [1] 5/25 |
| 67/16 69/21 Court's [21] coll | 55/9 56/13 58/22 59/8 62/20 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { details [6] } & 14 / 1 & 35 / 20 & 35 / 25\end{array}$ |
| Court's [21] 19/23 30/24 $40 / 23 \text { 43/16 45/14 45/19 }$ | de [1] 1/23 | 37/1 41/15 55/ |
| $47 / 10$ 51/7 51/14 52/6 52/13 | deadline [6] 18/23 19/21 | detection [1] 25/2 |
| 55/20 56/11 56/19 57/2 58/5 | 24/8 29/15 39/18 56/6 | determine [3] 9/25 44/7 |
| 58/7 58/9 60/14 66/21 | deadlines [ | development |
| Court's discovery [1] 58/9 | deal [1] 38/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { devil [3] } & 35 / 20 & 35 / 24 & 36 / 25\end{array}$ |
|  | dealing [1] 65/23 | devoted [1] 68/5 |
| Covid [3] 23/21 23/22 | deals [2] 6/13 6/13 | dialogue [1] 26/2 |
| crack [1] 36/1 | dealt [1] 47/16 | did [13] 7/11 8/10 |
| create [3] 4/15 7/24 | DEARMAN [5] 2/14 64/4 64/7 | 18/22 19/7 19/8 23/12 43/14 |
| credit [2] 66/16 67/11 | 65/13 66/14 | 46/20 48/7 48/22 58/21 59/1 |
| cross [1] 25/21 | arth [1] 27 | didn't [3] 9/8 18/19 23/1 |
| cross-functional [1] 25/21 | death [1] 31/2 | differ [2] 7/14 59/21 |
| Crowell [1] 3/4 | [1] | different [5] $53 / 20 \quad 53 / 22 \quad 5$ |
| crunched [1] 49/8 | 15/6 18/24 27/6 27/10 29/6 | difficult [2] 15 |
| current [13] 14/14 14/18 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} \\ 42 / 14 & 43 / 14 & 48 / 23 \quad 50 / 7 \quad 55 / 7\end{array}$ | digest [1] 56/ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 16 & 16 / 12 & 16 / 15 & 16 / 19\end{array}$ |  | esting [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}16 / 22 & 22 / 5 & 22 / 8 & 27 / 15 & 34 / 15\end{array}$ | December 11th [1] 42/14 | digging [1] |
| 36/1 47/17 |  | diligently |
| custodial [37] 12/9 12/24 | December 23rd [1] 43/14 | directly [1] 65 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 4 & 14 / 25 & 15 / 2 & 15 / 3 & 15 / 6\end{array}$ | December 31st [4] 15/6 18/24 | director [4] $14 / 13$ 16/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 7 & 15 / 8 & 15 / 13 & 15 / 18 & 15 / 22\end{array}$ | December 50/7 29/6 | 16/15 16/18 |
| 15/25 16/1 16/4 16/6 16/8 |  | disagree [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llll}16 / 13 & 16 / 16 ~ 16 / 20 ~ 17 / 1 ~ 17 / 3 ~\end{array}$ | Dechert <br> [1] <br> 2/18 | disagreed [1] 8/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}17 / 7 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 16 & 17 / 18 & 19 / 1\end{array}$ | Dechert [1] 2/18 $\text { decide [1] } 9 / 6$ | disagreement [2] |
| 19/2 19/10 22/17 $23 / 7$ 24/4 | decided <br> [1] <br> 34 | disagreements [1] 62/ |
| 27/9 28/22 42/13 42/15 42/24 | declined [1] 21/25 | disclose [2] 41/23 41/24 |
| custodial documents [1] | deeply [1] $41 / 15$ | disclosed [1] 14/8 |
|  | Defendant [6] 20/2 21/8 | discloses [1] |
| custodian's [1] 17/16 | 34/14 47/20 59/20 59/21 | disclosure [2] 41/20 43/25 |
| custodians [42] 12/25 14/5 | DEFENDANTS [37] 2/18 13/13 | discontinued [1] 21/2 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 7 & 14 / 10 & 14 / 10 & 14 / 23 & 14 / 25\end{array}$ | 13/24 18/5 20/20 26/2 27/22 | discovery [91] |
| 15/10 15/12 $15 / 1316 / 5 \quad 16 / 6$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 11 & 29 / 25 & 30 / 10 & 34 / 11\end{array}$ | discrete [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 7 & 16 / 10 & 16 / 22 & 17 / 1 & 17 / 4\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 5 / 16 & 36 / 14 & 43 / 1 & 44 / 4 & 46 / 7\end{array}$ | discuss [5] 9/21 34/21 55/18 |
| 22/5 22/17 22/18 22/20 22/22 | /5 $58 / 23$ 49/16 49/23 51/6 | 59/4 62/15 |
| 23/2 23/5 23/8 23/14 23/17 | 56/9 $57 / 20$ 57/21 $58 / 2$ 58/4 | discussed [6] |
| 27/4 27/7 27/7 27/11 29/4 | 61/17 | 42/20 58/2 62/1 62/14 |
| 29/6 29/8 29/9 29/14 29/18 | 1/25 62/8 62/16 | discussing [2] $7 / 25$ 66/4 |
| 29/21 30/1 30/23 31/5 31/12 | Defendants' <br> [1] 66/8 | discussion [6] 24/4 33/13 38/9 48/16 52/14 60/7 |
| customers [1] 50/10 | Defense [4] 11/24 31/1 32/4 | discussions [14] 33/23 35/10 |
| cutoff [1] 31/11 | 63/6 [4] 11/21 31/1 32/4 | 35/11 $49 / 24 \quad 50 / 1 \quad 51 / 3 \quad 51 / 8$ |
| cuts [2] 22/12 31/2 CVA [1] 52/22 | defer [1] 53/ | 51/9 51/16 52/5 52/7 53/18 |
| CVA [1] 52 | deficiencies [1] | 57/1 58/25 |
| D | deficient [1] 13/20 | Dismiss [17] 4/16 44/23 45/3 |
|  | degree [1] 21/9 | 45/4 45/19 47/17 48/19 50/21 |
| daily [1] 6/23 | delay [2] 53/7 64/20 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}51 / 7 & 51 / 17 & 52 / 13 & 53 / 3 & 55 / 5\end{array}$ |
| dark [2] 32/1 | delve [1] 41/15 | 56/15 58/6 58/19 59/1 |
| data [1] 65/7 | departments [1] 29/17 | dismissal [1] 50/1 |
| database [6] 20/10 20/12 | depose [1] 35/15 | dismissed [2] 51/17 60/ |
| 20/13 25/24 25/25 25/25 | deposition [14] 31/8 31/14 | dispute [12] 6/6 6/9 6/13 |
| date [18] 6/19 10/14 $12 / 21$ | $33 / 5$ 34/2 $34 / 3$ 34/5 $34 / 18$ | $\begin{array}{llll}7 / 2 & 7 / 4 & 9 / 22 & 25 / 13 \\ 39 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 14/2 17/22 $35 / 8 \quad 35 / 8 \quad 43 / 3$ | 34/22 42/13 42/17 42/18 | 52/15 56/21 60/13 66/19 |
| 45/21 49/2 57/25 59/6 63/7 | 42/22 59/5 59/6 | disputed [1] 8/3 |
| 63/8 63/18 63/19 65/22 69/19 | depositions [21] 24/11 32/10 | disputes [6] 6/8 6/16 6/17 |
| dates [13] 10/8 10/9 10/10 | 32/17 32/18 33/19 33/25 34/6 <br> 35/7 35/17 35/17 36/5 37/7 | 6/20 6/24 7/3 <br> disputes and [1] 7/3 |


| D | East [1] 3/11 | $67 / 5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| distributing [1] 22/1 | echo [2] 26/14 36/19 effective [1] 7/16 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { every [5] } \\ 6 / 22 \end{array}$ |
| distribution [1] 50/25 | efficient [4] 7/16 $32 / 15$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { everybody [7] } & 4 / 3 & 4 / 8 & 22 / 25\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { distributor }[5] \quad 57 / 20 \text { 58/1 } \\ & 58 / 858 / 1458 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | 34/24 66/16 | 31/23 $34 / 7 \begin{array}{ll}\text { a/23 } & 69 / 11\end{array}$ |
| distributors [5] 48/2 57/8 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Effie [1] } & 15 / 19 \\ \text { effort [2] } & 42 / 10 & 43 / 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|ccccc} \hline \text { everyone }[8] \quad 4 / 1 & 4 / 7 & 4 / 8 \\ 5 / 16 & 7 / 10 & 11 / 22 & 11 / 25 & 31 / 25 \end{array}$ |
| 59/12 59/22 60/1 <br> district [6] 1/1 1/1 | efforts [1] 57/6 | everyone's [2] 57/6 68/11 |
| district [6] 1/1 1/1 1/9 $53 / 22 \quad 54 / 6 \quad 68 / 1$ | eight [1] 15/3 | everything [2] 62/5 69/13 |
| disturbed [1] 41/22 | $\begin{array}{ccccc} \text { either [8] } & 7 / 12 & 12 / 2 & 28 \\ 28 / 19 & 32 / 4 & 44 / 12 & 49 / 2 \end{array}$ |  |
| Ditto [1] 67/10 | electronic [3] 18/25 27/7 | example [11] $9 / 12$ 14/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { DIVISION } & {[1]} & 1 / 2 & & \\ \text { do [36] } & 4 / 23 & 5 / 7 & 5 / 16 & 8 / 6\end{array}$ | 28/6 | 15/15 20/12 21/10 22/16 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { do [36] } & 4 / 23 & 5 / 7 & 5 / 16 & 8 / 6 \\ 18 / 6 & 19 / 11 & 26 / 1 & 30 / 15 & 30 / 22\end{array}$ | electronic documents [1] | 25/14 $34 / 18$ 35/6 $37 / 8 \quad 59 / 13$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} 18 / 6 & 19 / 11 & 26 / 1 & 30 / 15 & 30 / 22 \\ 31 / 16 & 32 / 19 & 33 / 10 & 33 / 15 & 36 / 3 \end{array}$ | 27/7 | examples [1] 27/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 31 / 16 & 32 / 19 & 33 / 10 & 33 / 15 & 36 / 3 \\ 36 / 17 & 37 / 7 & 40 / 1 & 41 / 19 & 41 / 20 \end{array}$ | else [4] $32 / 25$ 44/13 $56 / 7$ | except [1] 4/17 |
| 44/4 44/8 $49 / 3 \quad 49 / 4 \quad 51 / 23$ | 67/7 | exceptional [1] 53/24 |
| 53/4 59/25 60/13 60/19 60/24 | email [4] 8/24 9/3 | exceptions [2] 22/19 49/23 |
| 62/16 62/20 63/5 63/15 67/4 | anils [4] 17/17 20/9 23 | exchange [1] $62 / 7$   <br> excuse [7] $11 / 18$ $26 / 25$ $33 / 1$$l$ |
|  | embedded [1] 20/3 | 44/13 57/7 60/22 64/2 |
| cument [5] 9/24 | employee [16] 14/14 14/ | executive [1] 16/11 |
| 20/17 31/7 32/16 | 15/16 15/16 15/20 15/20 | exist [1] 32/3 |
| documents [72] | 15/24 16/12 $16 / 1316 / 14$ | existing [1] 63/16 |
| Dodge [3] 7/23 10/19 18/11 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}16 / 16 & 16 / 17 & 16 / 19 & 34 / 18\end{array}$ | expansive [1] 32 |
| does [7] 8/11 19/3 20/13 | employee identified [1] | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { expect [6] } & 18 / 20 & 30 / 18 & 37 / 1 \\ 40 / 8 & 40 / 9 & 63 / 21\end{array}$ |
| $44 / 21 \quad 44 / 23$ | enployee identified [1] | expectations [2] 50/13 56/20 |
|  | employee who [1] 15/16 | expected [1] 19/10 |
| doing [5] 4/8 23/ <br> 37/10 49/18 | employees [5] 14/8 16/22 | expecting [1] 59/13 |
| $\text { don't [37] } 12 / 4 \quad 16 / 22 \quad 17 / 9$ | 22/19 27/15 $34 / 15$ | expeditious [1] 68/9 |
| 20/25 21/1 21/15 21/19 22/25 | enacted [1] 38/23 | experience [1] 17/11 |
| 24/3 24/16 $25 / 3 \quad 26 / 11 \quad 30 / 18$ | encompasses [1] 10/14 | expert [1] 40/5 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 30 / 22 & 31 / 3 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 3 & 32 / 4\end{array}$ | encourage [3] 44/9 54/1 | explains [1] 21/8 |
| 32/19 32/25 40/14 41/5 41/7 | 68/23 | explored [1] $25 / 22$ <br> expressed [1] $59 / 1$ |
| 44/12 47/24 51/20 51/21 53/7 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 54 / 6 & 55 / 11 & 55 / 21 & 55 / 24 & 57 / 8 \end{array}$ $60 / 1863 / 2166 / 1067 / 6$ | $28 / 18 \quad 36 / 5 \quad 45 / 6 \quad 57 / 24$ | extended [1] $45 / 20$ <br> extensions [1] $49 / 25$  |
| 60/18 63/21 66/10 67/6 done [12] 6/19 10/9 19 | ended [2] 23/13 23/14 | extensive [1] 45/4 |
| $24 / 7 \quad 28 / 15 \quad 32 / 25 \quad 37 / 14 \quad 37 / 16$ | ending [1] 35/11 | extent [4] 17/24 19/18 60/1 |
| 37/20 37/24 49/22 59 | engage [2] 59/3 60/7 | 66/6 |
| door [1] 19/4 | engaged [6] 5/25 16/9 34/17 | extra [1] |
| Dowd [1] $2 / 14$ | $50 / 15$ $51 / 2$ $67 / 22$ <br> ensure $[1]$ $55 / 15$  | ```extras [2] 32/23 32/23 eye [2] 8/5 8/5``` |
| down [8] 7/23 23/21 23/22 | entered [6] 46/15 47/11 49/9 | eye [2] 8/5 8/5 |
| 30/17 30/17 31/17 31/22 | $52 / 24 \quad 52 / 25 \quad 53 / 2$ | F |
|  | entering [1] 4/13 | facing [1] 68/14 |
| wntown [1] | entertaining [1] 68/ | fact [5] 6/12 36/20 42/13 |
| $\text { draft [3] } 48 / 2359 / 9$ | entire [4] 20/7 21/13 25/17 | 43/6 66/2 |
| drafted [1] 34/17 | 59/22 | facts [5] 39/7 39/8 40/1 |
| drug [1] 16/11 | entitled [6] 26/ | 41/21 43/24 |
| due [2] 29/6 55/8 | 39/11 39/12 44/6 44/7 | factual [2] |
| during [2] 5/25 61/25 | entries [2] 20/18 20/ entry [1] 59/1 | failure [2] 41/23 41/24 |
| E | ESI [1] 65/18 | fairly [1] 50/2 |
| each [18] 5/14 6/22 8/20 | ESQ [15] 1/11 1/15 1/18 1/21 | fairness [1] 45/20 |
| 14/2 14/12 15/10 17/5 20/2 | 2/1 2/4 2/7 $2 / 10$ 2/14 $2 / 18$ | faith [1] 51/3 |
| 20/14 21/7 34/3 34/4 56/16 | 2/21 3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10 | fall [2] 35/6 65/22 |
| 61/10 61/11 61/14 62/19 | essence [1] 5/1 | Fallon [1] 13/12 |
| 65/18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { essentially [8] } 13 / 18 \text { 20/1 } \\ & 21 / 2222 / 2433 / 2534 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | far [4] <br> $46 / 2$$\quad 35 / 9 \quad 40 / 10 \quad 45$ |
| earlier [9] 35/6 38/10 41/24 | 35/12 35/21 | FDA [1] 25/15 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}41 / 25 & 48 / 6 & 52 / 23 & 56 / 12 & 57 / 1\end{array}$ | etc [1] 51/25 | February [5] 4/14 10/18 |
| early [10] 18/20 18/21 21/23 | even [8] 11/3 23/4 33/20 | 10/25 11/1 58/24 |
| 21/24 28/14 39/14 41/20 61/8 | 59/21 61/23 68/1 68/2 68/4 | February 6th [1] 4/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 61/13 } \\ \text { earnest [3] } & 61 / 16 \\ & 52 / 22 & 55 / 4 & 56 / 18\end{array}$ | ```event [7] 9/16 20/15 20/15 25/16 30/4 46/10 54/3``` | Federal [1] 69/20 <br> feel [3] 7/11 41/7 52/4 |


| F | forward [11] 29/9 32/ | al [1] 35/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| feels [1] 28/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 33 / 11 & 43 / 7 & 43 / 19 & 46 / 1 & 53 / \\ 54 / 15 & 56 / 20 & 66 / 22 & 69 / 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { goes [5] } \\ 67 / 1\end{array} \quad 5 / 8$ 9/7 $16 / 145 / 1$ |
| felt [3] 43/13 43/16 62/8 | found [3] 14/8 43/5 68/17 | going [53] 5/7 5/22 6/1 6/4 |
| Ferguson [1] 1/22 | four [5] $8 / 10 \quad 13 / 1 \quad 13 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll} \\ 7 / 24 & 8 / 3 & 8 / 12 & 11 / 4 & 12 / 11\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { ew } \\ 40 / 15 & 45 / 3 & 45 / 8 & 48 / 16 & 49 / 23\end{array}$ | 20/5 22/13 | $12 / 13$ $13 / 22$ $19 / 9$ $23 / 15$ <br> $1 / 23 / 25$    |
| figure [3] 36/23 39/3 40/17 | fourth [1] 65/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 13 & 27 / 21 & 28 / 5 & 28 / 18 & 29 / 23\end{array}$ |
| file [11] 15/22 15/25 16/13 | frame [1] 59/18 | $\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 18 & 31 / 4 & 31 / 10 & 32 / 13 & 33 / 11\end{array}$ |
| 16/16 16/20 17/16 17/18 | framework [1] 38/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}35 / 14 & 36 / 18 & 36 / 21 & 37 / 6 & 37 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 23/24 25/14 42/24 46/22 | frankly [1] 36/6 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}37 / 8 & 37 / 10 & 37 / 15 & 39 / 18 & 40 / 8\end{array}$ |
| filed [2] 9/23 51/13 | Friedman [3] 12/3 24/16 | 45/25 48/5 49/3 49/8 51/21 |
| files [20] 15/2 15/3 15/6 | 26/10 | 51/22 53/6 56/6 63/9 63/21 |
|  | friendly [1] 7/ | 64/16 65/4 65/5 66/22 67/14 |
| 17/1 19/2 19/2 23/7 23/9 | front [2] 19/15 36/5 | 67/24 68/2 69/1 69/7 |
| 24/5 25/19 27/9 27/10 28/22 | fruitful [2] 56/24 62/4 | GOLDENBERG [10] 2/10 2/11 |
| 42/15 50/9 | ```frustration [1] 67/16 Ft [1] 3/16``` | $\begin{array}{lllll} 47 / 22 & 48 / 4 & 49 / 10 & 50 / 7 & 51 / 2 \\ 52 / 19 & 54 / 13 & 55 / 14 \end{array}$ |
| files by [1] 1 | full [1] 55/22 | gone [1] 22/20 |
| filings [1] 9/23 | functional [2] 25/21 29/17 | good [33] 4/1 11/21 11/25 |
| fills [1] 37/11 | funnel [1] 31/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 16 & 12 / 18 & 19 / 14 & 22 / 16\end{array}$ |
|  | funneling [3] 30/17 30/17 | 24/19 24/20 24/20 28/25 |
| fine [2] $8 / 25$ 11/1 | $31 / 17$ | 28/25 29/2 33/7 33/9 38/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { FINKEN [8] } & 1 / 11 & 11 / 24 & 28 / 22\end{array}$ | further [8] 11/2 23/14 27/22 | $38 / 4$ 38/6 49/12 49/12 51/3 |
| 29/1 30/7 30/12 30/21 32/24 | 29/9 51/9 51/16 62/15 63/24 | 54/16 $54 / 17$ 54/18 56/8 57/10 |
| first [39] 4/7 4/10 4/16 | future [2] 67/4 67/25 | 57/12 58/12 61/1 61/2 63/1 |
| 4/24 5/8 7/18 11/7 11/9 | G |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 10 & 12 / 7 & 12 / 23 & 18 / 6 & 19 / 11 \\ 19 / 18 & 22 / 21 & 29 / 5 & 29 / 7 & 29 / 13\end{array}$ | GA [1] | gotten [2] 63/7 63/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} & 34 / 1 & 34 / 9 & 35 / 23 & 38 / 3\end{array}$ | game [1] 37/15 | Graham [1] 15/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 25 & 39 / 16 & 41 / 2 & 43 / 13 & 43 / 22\end{array}$ | gave [7] 8/12 10/10 18/9 | Granted [1] |
| 43/23 44/25 $45 / 3$ 51/23 55/4 | 20/16 22/22 22/23 47/25 | great [3] 33/14 41/ |
| 57/14 57/14 59/2 59/5 61/25 | gearing [1] 24/10 | greater [1] 68/15 |
| 64/11 | Geller [1] 2/14 | ground [1] 66/25 |
| fit [1] 37/15 | general [5] 31/16 $39 / 19$ 43/2 | group [5] 50/3 50/16 50/22 |
| five [3] 8/10 8/14 14/10 |  |  |
| FL [4] $1 / 5$ 1/24 $2 / 16$ 3/16 | $46 / 850 / 350 / 16$ | growing [1] 7/15 |
| flavor [1] 24/14 | generic [3] 48/22 49/16 51/6 | GSK [33] 14/24 14 |
| flesh [2] 39/6 39/7 | generics [10] $48 / 1$ 48/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 5 & 15 / 8 & 15 / 11 & 15 / 16 & 15 / 20\end{array}$ |
| flexible [1] 37 | 48/14 49/14 49/17 49/20 | 15/23 17/8 18/5 18/18 18/25 |
| float [1] 30/13 | 49/22 50/21 51/4 51/18 | 19/2 19/8 20/12 21/20 21/20 |
| or [3] <br> RIDA [1] | gentlemen [2] 38/3 44/11 | 21/22 21/23 21/25 22/2 22/17 |
|  | get [30] 10/20 19/4 23/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 8 & 27 / 6 & 27 / 9 & 27 / 18 & 28 / 2\end{array}$ |
|  | 26/19 $31 / 7 \quad 31 / 931 / 23 ~ 34 / 7$ | $30 / 9$ 30/23 34/18 36/14 63/2 |
| focus [7] 22/24 26 | $34 / 21$ 35/8 37/6 37/14 37/16 | guardrails [1] 31/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}31 / 17 & 32 / 18 & 38 / 19 & 39 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll}39 / 9 & 39 / 11 & 40 / 3 & 44 / 6 & 45 / 1\end{array}$ | Guerra [2] 2/1 57/1 |
| focused [3] 31/9 32/10 32/10 |  | guess [2] 28/23 56/5 |
| focusing [2] 30/19 68/10 | 59/14 63/15 63/18 65/1 65/13 | guidance [11] 7/7 11 |
| follow [3] 17/21 17/25 65/6 | 8 68/24 | 19/6 48/20 52/23 53/10 56/19 |
| followed [3] 27/6 38/25 48/9 | gets [1] 68/8 | 57/2 58/7 66/25 |
| following [3] 26/15 38/9 | ge | H |
| 46/23 | $55 / 765 / 6 \quad 66 / 6$ | had [42] 4/12 4/14 4/18 4/22 |
| $\begin{array}{ccc} \text { followup }[4] & 17 / 23 & 27 / 22 \\ 39 / 21 & 62 / 16 & \end{array}$ | GILBERT [10] 1/21 1/22 11/21 | 5/17 $10 / 314 / 8$ 17/22 $19 / 15$ |
| for GSK [1] | 38/2 38/5 39/20 40/19 41/1 | 21/3 21/11 22/9 24/4 27/4 |
| foregoing [1] 6 | 41/11 43/21 | 27/8 27/9 27/21 28/19 33/17 |
| forensic [1] 42 | Giuseppe [1] 15/23 | 33/21 33/21 33/23 35/10 |
| forensics [1] 40/5 | give [15] 7/9 7/21 8/20 12/7 | 42/13 42/14 45/17 47/17 48/2 |
| foreseeable [1] 67/25 | 12/14 22/16 32/23 33/24 | 48/8 48/16 48/23 50/14 51/8 |
| formal [3] 40/23 43/10 54/11 | 35/18 35/22 40/21 49/2 57/9 | 55/6 55/20 58/25 59/8 59/9 |
| format [1] 68/18 | 66/24 68/19 | 59/10 62/4 65/16 67/6 |
| former [3] 22/19 34/15 35 | given [8] 7/4 19/14 22/2 | hadn't [1] 43/15 |
| forms [1] 46/16 | $30 / 23$ 39/13 45/6 47/9 53/10 | hairy [1] 24/25 |
| forth [3] 17/25 36/4 38/16 | gives [3] 20/14 33/6 68/4 | halt [1] 52/7 |
| forthcoming [3] 45/1 45/15 | giving [2] 6/8 57/19 | handle [1] 34/14 |
| 53/4 | go [12] 7/11 9/3 11/2 $23 / 3$ | happen [1] 68/2 |
| forum [1] 39/25 | 24/25 26/11 41/17 44/5 57/14 | happy [14] 4/8 12/18 18/7 |
| forum [1] 39/25 | 57/14 62/19 64/11 | 18/10 18/15 24/12 28/4 32/23 |


| H | his [6] $12 / 6$ 15/25 $16 / 13$ | 43/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| happy.. [6] 33/4 39/24 | $\begin{array}{ccc}16 / 16 & 42 / 23 & 48 / 16 \\ \text { historic [1] } & 22 / 18\end{array}$ | Importantly [1] 27/12 <br> impressed [1] 64/17 |
| 40/21 60/19 62/22 64/12 hard [8] 18/17 18/23 19/23 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { historic } \\ \text { history [7] } & 20 / 8 & 21 / 4 & 21 / 4\end{array}$ | $\text { impression [2] 43/22 } 4$ |
| $27 / 8 \quad 37 / 16 \quad 50 / 4 \quad 65 / 18 \quad 67 / 23$ | 22/2 22/13 25/17 56/23 | improve [1] 7/14 |
| harm [1] 39/4 | holiday [1] $56 / 15$   | improvement [1] 68/21 <br> inadvertent [1] 43/5 |
| has [48] 8/14 $12 / 5$ 13/15 | holidays [6] 19/8 29/11 45 $55 / 20 \quad 59 / 9 \quad 61 / 22$ | inadvertent <br> Inc [1] 58/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 4 & 14 / 15 & 14 / 20 & 14 / 24 & 15 / 8\end{array}$ | Holland [1] 3/7 | inception [1] 4/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 17 & 15 / 21 & 15 / 25 & 16 / 3 & 16 / 13 \\ 16 / 16 & 16 / 19 & 16 / 25 & 17 / 7 & 19 / 2\end{array}$ | HON [1] 3/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { inception } \\ \text { include [5] } & \text { 9/8 } & 13 / 6 & 16 / 6\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 16 & 16 / 19 & 16 / 25 & 17 / 7 & 19 / 2 \\ 20 / 18 & 21 / 22 & 23 / 21 & 26 / 5 & 26 / 15\end{array}$ | honor [25] 12/16 18/4 24/20 | 25/12 28/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 18 & 21 / 22 & 23 / 21 & 26 / 5 & 26 / 15 \\ 26 / 24 & 28 / 9 & 38 / 11 & 38 / 16 & 43 / 11\end{array}$ | 28/1 30/9 33/2 33/9 36/9 | included [3] 20/9 45/3 59/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 24 & 28 / 9 & 38 / 11 & 38 / 16 & 43 / 11 \\ 43 / 12 & 45 / 23 & 46 / 2 & 46 / 6 & 46 / 15\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 13 & 38 / 6 & 39 / 23 & 39 / 24 & 40 / 1\end{array}$ | includes [1] 25/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}43 / 12 & 45 / 23 & 46 / 2 & 46 / 6 & 46 / 15 \\ 46 / 17 & 47 / 7 & 47 / 11 & 47 / 12 & 47 / 13\end{array}$ | 40/2 41/16 $42 / 1$ 44/16 48/7 | including [5] 16/11 25/17 |
|  | 49/12 $52 / 14$ 52/17 52/20 | 34/8 59/12 62/ |
| 56/21 58/15 60/24 67/8 68/16 | 58/12 63/1 63/25 | incomplete [1] |
| hasn't [1] 15/5 | Honor's [4] 30/2 48/19 52/23 | incredibly [2] 18/17 18/22 |
| Hausman [1] 2/2 | 60/10 | incumbent [1] |
| have [202] | HONORABLE [2] 1/8 $1 / 9$ | independently [1] 47 |
| haven't [1] 51/20 | Honors [10] 33/10 33/17 35/6 | indicated [1] 35/13 |
| having [8] 4/17 4/21 4/22 | 4 41/12 54/16 56/8 57/17 | indication [1] 8/12 |
| 17/4 26/22 32/15 56/14 61/3 | [9] $3 / 8 \quad 4 / 8 \quad 6 / 14 \quad 32 / 18$ | individual [3] 20/21 |
| he [3] 5/12 43/15 59/16 | 37/12 40/11 62/9 67/20 68/17 | inevitably [1] 68/15 |
| head [1] 14/17 health [3] 14/18 | hopeful [2] 26/21 57/3 | inform [3] 8/6 34/7 55/23 |
| hear [11] 11/12 12/13 19/16 | hopefully [11] 8/1 8/8 11/8 | informal [1] 61/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 20 / 25 & 22 / 5 & 22 / 12 & 24 / 23 & 30 / 8\end{array}$ | 18/12 25/1 33/16 36/2 36/8 | informally [2] 55/6 |
| 33/8 41/11 63/8 | 40/19 40/22 55/25 | information [19] 6/3 7/8 |
| heard [15] 12/2 20/1 21/1 | oping [2] 19/4 29/24 | 20/14 20/24 25/23 25/24 |
| 22/16 24/17 25/3 25/5 26/11 | horizon [1] 5/23 | 25/25 26/2 $34 / 8 \quad 34 / 21 \quad 35 / 13$ |
| 48/3 48/12 53/22 56/22 57/10 | Horne [3] 12/3 24/17 26/10 | 39/2 43/19 49/20 50/9 61/11 |
| 60/10 68/25 | hour [1] 9/18 | 62/16 63/18 68/9 |
| hearing [11] 7/13 8/12 9/10 | hours [3] 9/16 9/18 48/10 | informational [6] 5/20 6/2 |
| 24/25 37/2 38/10 42/8 44/7 | Houston [1] 1/16 | 8/2 42/9 43/1 66/18 |
| 50/20 66/16 69/14 | how [22] 5/8 5/22 | informed [5] 17/15 58/ |
| hearings [3] 58/19 66/18 | 6/19 7/7 7/14 11/10 15/9 | 67/12 67/23 68/13 |
| $67 / 1$ | 16/23 17/9 20/11 21/7 23/11 | Ingelheim [2] 21/11 21/15 |
| art [1] | 45/25 47/7 48/18 48/20 60/6 | ingredient [1] 59/13 |
| heartened [1] 63/ | 64/17 68/20 69/7 | inherited [1] |
| heavy [1] 31/7 | however [5] 13/11 13/21 27/9 | initial [2] 33/13 61/18 |
| held [3] 21/16 21/22 28/11 | 49/1 | initiated [1] 51/ |
| hello [1] 4/7 | hundred [2] 22/6 30/22 | inquire [1] 9/9 |
| help [4] 32/18 36/18 60/19 | hundreds [1] 22/14 | inquiries [1] |
| 66/22 | I |  |
| helpful [10] 7/8 7/20 7/22 | I welcome [1] | insofar [2] 8/18 4 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 18 / 10 & 26 / 24 & 50 / 12 & 56 / 21 \\ 62 / 24 & 63 / 4 & 67 / 8 & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { I'd [2] } & 32 / 6 & 40 / 21\end{array}$ | instance [1] 20/14 |
| elping [1] 32/ | I'm [4] $33 / 3$ 45/5 $49 / 15$ | instructed [1] 29/ |
| her [7] 10/10 15/21 16/19 | 57/19 | instructed to [1] 29/5 |
| 55/12 55/12 55/12 66/18 | idea [1] 9/5 | intend [6] 24/9 29/12 $33 / 23$ |
| here [28] $4 / 6$ 4/15 5/10 $7 / 3$ | Ideally [1] 31/ | $43 / 19$ 53/4 63 |
| 12/1 13/15 17/13 17/19 19/5 | ideas [1] 62/7 | intended [1] 13/6 |
| 19/7 25/1 26/18 27/4 28/15 | identification [2] 49/19 | intends [1] 45/1 |
| 28/20 $32 / 19 \quad 33 / 15 \quad 37 / 22 \quad 41 / 3$ | 54/24 | intention [1] 6/7 |
| 48/21 54/4 54/12 58/13 60/19 | identified [10] 14/11 15/11 | intentional [1] 43/ |
| 64/3 64/16 67/22 68/4 | 15/15 $15 / 20 \quad 15 / 2416 / 10$ | interact [1] 5/2 |
| high [1] 66/24 | 16/12 16/14 16/17 27/17 | interactive [1] 32/11 |
| highlight [1] | identify [5] 16/1 29/5 29/18 | interested [2] 9/10 22/23 |
| highlighted [1] 27/14 | 40/7 66/20 | intermittently [1] 24/25 |
| highlighting [1] 66/23 | identifying [1] 14/6 | interrogatories [5] 32/9 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { highly [13] } & 14 / 8 & 14 / 11 & 14 / 20\end{array}$ | imagine [2] 15/9 62/18 | 32/15 32/21 61/16 62/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 12 & 15 / 13 & 15 / 15 & 15 / 20\end{array}$ | immediately [1] 55/15 | intervention [3] 6/21 6/2 |
| 15/24 16/10 16/12 16/15 | impact [4] 42/10 44/21 44/23 | 7/1 |
| 16/18 27/17 | 7/16 | investigation [4] 22/9 22/15 |
| highly relevant [1] 15/12 | cted [1] | 15 42/3 |
| him [1] 40/19 | impacting [1] 43/7 | invitation [1] 60/17 |
| hired [2] 40/5 61/20 | importance [1] 16/21 | invite [2] 12/14 33/4 |
| hired [2] 40/5 61/20 | important [3] 19/5 42/18 | invoke [2] 26/19 54/11 |


| I |
| :---: |
| involved [4] $14 / 19$ 30/3 $54 / 7$ |
| 66/9 |
| involvement [2] 17/6 22/9 |
| involving [1] 11/15 |
| is [211] |
| is just [1] 27/18 |
| isn't [1] 54/7 |
| isolated [1] 6/20 |
| issuance [2] 44/22 45/2 |
| issue [24] 27/2 32/21 35/2 |
| 38/1 38/2 38/9 38/11 38/13 |
| 39/25 40/2 40/4 40/7 40/12 |
| 40/20 41/10 41/13 44/18 |
| 44/20 47/16 50/18 59/4 65/8 |
| 65/21 66/10 |
| issued [8] 4/17 44/22 45/22 |
| 46/6 46/15 47/13 52/6 53/25 |
| issues [34] 5/23 8/6 25/7 |
| 25/13 25/16 25/22 26/23 |
| 29/14 38/22 41/4 41/8 46/21 |
| 50/11 50/25 54/8 55/21 56/5 |
| 56/25 57/9 59/24 60/4 60/20 |
| 62/1 63/10 63/10 63/12 63/21 |
| 64/23 65/24 66/5 66/20 66/23 |
| 66/24 68/11 |
| it [118] |
| it's [2] 26/8 40/13 |
| items [1] 9/14 |
| its [3] 42/2 44/2 45/16 |
| itself [1] 8/5 |

$\begin{array}{lllll}34 / 11 & 35 / 14 & 36 / 19 & 37 / 5 & 38 / 8\end{array}$ 39/15 40/12 41/2 41/5 48/9 $48 / 20$ 49/5 51/9 53/8 53/12 53/13 53/14 53/17 55/19 56/15 58/18 63/17 65/10 68/3 68/4

## K

Kanner [1] 2/5
KAPLAN [5] 3/4 57/10 58/11 58/13 60/21
Kaye [2] 2/22 3/1
keep [5] 22/11 24/7 29/3 41/14 56/11
key [2] 19/7 25/13
Kherkher [1] 1/15
kind [10] 7/8 20/3 22/12
30/16 39/15 41/7 58/2 60/23 63/19 64/9
Knight [1] 3/7
know [46] 7/24 8/22 11/4 12/1 12/10 18/24 19/20 21/16 $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 8 & 25 / 13 & 26 / 15 & 28 / 5 & 31 / 22\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllll}32 / 1 & 32 / 3 & 32 / 4 & 33 / 15 & 34 / 6\end{array}$ $36 / 436 / 537 / 639 / 13 \quad 40 / 14$ $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 14 & 40 / 15 & 40 / 19 & 42 / 24 & 45 / 5\end{array}$ 46/23 47/24 48/5 48/10 49/6 51/20 51/21 55/10 55/19 55/21 57/8 58/20 63/13 64/25 67/6 68/21 68/25 69/8
knowledge [1] 68/15
knowledgeable [1] 5/24
knows [2] 42/25 58/17
Kopelowitz [1] 1/22
kudos [2] 36/15 37/18
L
LA [1] $2 / 6$
landscape [1] 56/14
lap [1] 36/17
large [1] 26/16
larger [1] 14/22
LaSalle [1] 2/11
last [23] $4 / 115 / 6$ 10/4 10/4 13/22 14/21 17/6 17/10 19/6 24/4 26/16 33/17 34/4 35/6 $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 1 & 42 / 23 & 44 / 22 & 45 / 21 & 50 / 6\end{array}$ 56/13 58/6 60/23 65/14
last remaining [1] 45/21
lastly [2] 10/2 16/25
late [4] 61/6 61/13 61/16 61/25
later [1] 5/4
Law [1] 2/11
lawyers [2] 36/20 37/14
laying [1] 41/2
lead [3] 5/17 7/23 10/12
leadership [1] 51/5
learning [1] 8/13
least [14] 5/17 8/18 10/20 11/3 11/9 13/13 17/4 32/21 $40 / 9$ 40/15 44/21 52/7 58/20 59/25
leave [1] 54/9
led [1] 33/3
left [3] 23/5 23/24 23/25
legal [3] 26/18 46/21 51/25
legitimate [1] 41/10
lend [1] 8/4
length [1] 35/5
lengthy [4] 21/3 21/3 21/4 62/6
Leon [1] 1/23
less [7] 8/5 14/11 14/15 14/20 15/10 16/7 17/4
let [41] 7/9 11/13 11/17
11/20 11/23 12/13 $12 / 15$ 18/3
18/13 21/21 24/23 26/13
28/21 28/22 30/8 33/8 38/2
39/16 39/22 39/23 40/25
$\begin{array}{lllll} & 41 / 11 & 44 / 2 & 44 / 25 & 48 / 4\end{array} 48 / 10$ 49/5 $49 / 14$ 49/17 $54 / 9 \quad 54 / 14$
55/12 56/4 57/10 57/14 58/11
60/24 64/4 64/10 64/20 65/13
let's [5] 14/2 14/24 23/3
68/19 69/5
letter [1] 34/16
letting [1] 57/14
level [7] 5/25 6/21 40/4
41/15 49/22 54/9 66/24
LIABILITY [1] 1/5
liaison [3] 34/3 34/5 $36 / 17$
liaisons [1] 34/22
license [1] 21/22
lies [1] 67/13
light [2] 48/19 68/11
like [34] 6/18 8/9 9/5 9/20 10/11 12/5 12/7 14/1 20/22 23/1 23/21 24/17 26/10 26/22 27/19 31/16 31/22 32/22 $33 / 6$
35/15 37/15 38/15 38/19
39/14 $44 / 148 / 14$ 51/11 $51 / 13$
51/21 51/23 53/6 55/14 62/10 63/13
liked [1] 7/12
likely [1] 13/20
likewise [1] 32/3
limited [1] 12/20
limits [2] 31/6 31/18
list [3] 16/1 22/22 22/23
listing [1] 61/9
lists [3] 35/15 35/22 $36 / 22$
litany [1] 20/1
literature [1] 25/24
litigation [13] $1 / 5$ 4/20 6/1 13/15 25/7 25/11 38/22 42/19 50/2 56/14 65/20 66/22 67/18
litigations [1] 17/11
little [9] 21/12 24/24 26/5 36/16 37/24 40/12 49/6 63/18 65/2
LLC [1] $2 / 5$
LLP [9] 2/1 $2 / 8 \quad 2 / 14 \quad 2 / 18$ 2/22 3/1 3/4 3/7 3/10
lockdown [1] 28/11
Logan [1] 1/12
logistics [1] 37/5
logs [1] 20/21
long [4] 22/20 35/8 39/13 42/14
longer [3] 35/25 47/14 64/20
look [16] 8/9 8/18 10/18
10/25 21/7 22/25 23/3 23/7 23/10 35/12 $40 / 2$ 51/21 51/23 53/6 64/15 69/12
looking [7] 10/2 10/5 23/23

| L | 36/16 36/19 36/25 37/18 | 30/21 49/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { looking... [4] } 26 / 6 \text { 27/13 } \\ & 40 / 563 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc}37 / 20 \\ \text { md [1] } & 1 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|cccc\|} \hline \text { more [29] } & 4 / 18 & 5 / 25 & 17 / 7 \\ 18 / 19 & 21 / 5 & 21 / 12 & 32 / 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Los [2] 3/8 3/12 |  | $\begin{array}{lllll} 32 / 10 & 32 / 15 & 34 / 24 & 34 / 24 & 36 / 3 \end{array}$ |
| lot [12] 22/16 23/1 25/5 |  | $36 / 3 \quad 36 / 440 / 1340 / 1543 / 19$ $52 / 14 \text { 61/23 62/6 62/18 63/18 }$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}34 / 17 & 36 / 7 & 50 / 8 & 56 / 12 & 56 / 16 \\ 56 / 25 & 59 / 24 & 66 / 25 ~ 68 / 25\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { 11/18 } & 11 / 20 & 11 / 21 & 11 / 23 & 12 / 8\end{array}$ | $64 / 265 / 6 \quad 67 / 1167 / 2468 / 3$ |
| loud [1] 56/22 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}12 / 13 & 12 / 15 & 18 / 3 & 18 / 13 & 21 / 21\end{array}$ | 68/13 |
| loyalty [1] 54/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 22 / 6 & 24 / 23 & 26 / 13 & 28 / 21 & 28 / 22 \\ 30 / 8 & 33 / 6 & 33 / 8 & 38 / 2 & 39 / 16 \end{array}$ | Moreover [2] 13/1 15/8 <br> morning [3] 3/4 61/23 62/17 |
| lucky [1] 23/9 | $39 / 22 \text { 39/23 } 41 / 1 \quad 41 / 11 \quad 44 / 25$ | most [12] 5/13 10/15 25/11 |
| LUHANA [15] 2/7 2/8 11/17 | 48/4 $49 / 14 \quad 49 / 17 \quad 54 / 14 \quad 56 / 4$ | 31/23 31/24 32/2 33/22 42/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 17 & 21 / 10 & 23 / 13 & 26 / 14\end{array}$ | 57/10 58/11 60/18 60/19 | 44/22 48/14 64/24 68 |
| 26/25 27/24 28/4 | 60/24 64/4 64/8 64/20 65/13 | mostly [1] 9/15 |
| Luhana's [1] 19/25 | ann [3] 46/4 53/14 68/6 | $\begin{array}{rllll} \text { motion } & {[6]} & 43 / 10 & 47 / 16 & 51 / 7 \\ 52 / 13 & 58 / 5 & 58 / 19 & & \end{array}$ |
| M | meaningful [1] 52/ | motions [13] 4/16 9/22 44/23 |
| made [5] 6/25 45/16 62 | means [1] 22/13 | 45/3 45/4 45/19 48/19 50/ |
| 62/7 67/13 | meant [1] 12/12 | 51/17 53/2 55/5 56/15 59/1 |
| MAGISTRATE | meantime [1] 24/1 | move [5] 31/7 43/7 43/ |
| mainly [2] 29/15 62/1 | measures [1] 40/17 | 53/1 54/4 |
| maintain [1] 58/8 | mechanics [1] 34/ | moving [3] 24/7 29/9 56/20 |
| majority [1] 60/1 | mechanism $36 / 3$ | Ms [24] 11/23 |
| make [17] 12/5 19/9 21/1 | medical [3] 25/23 61/6 61/10 | $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { M } \\ 23 / 13 & 24 / 16 & 24 / 17 & 24 / 19 & 26 / 7\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 35 / 22 & 38 / 15 & 42 / 9 & 42 / 25 & 48 / 1\end{array}$ | meet [36] 15/11 16/9 18/17 | 27/24 30/7 48/4 49/10 51/2 |
| 57/3 62/11 63/15 68/5 | 18/23 24/9 26/21 29/8 29/10 | 52/19 54/18 55/13 55/18 56/4 |
| makes [1] 36/7 | 29/24 33/22 39/2 $46 / 13$ 48/8 | 57/5 58/10 60/21 61/1 63/24 |
| making [3] 7/15 26/3 31/17 | $48 / 2451 / 3$ 51/5 52/1 52/9 | 64/1 |
| management [11] 4/21 10/6 | 1 55/20 56/6 56/17 56/24 | Ms. [29] 11/1 |
| 10/20 19/6 37/9 45/18 50/19 | 61/24 62/1 62/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 2 & 19 / 17 & 19 / 25 & 21 / 10 & 26 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 51/1 51/14 68/7 69/5 | 62/18 63/5 65/16 66/4 68/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}26 / 14 & 26 / 25 & 28 / 4 & 28 / 22 & 30 / 12\end{array}$ |
| managers [2] 64/25 65/24 | 9/1 69/3 69/6 | $30 / 21$ 31/15 32/24 47/22 50/7 |
| managing [1] 66/22 | meet and [1] 16/9 | $\begin{array}{lllllllll}54 / 13 & 54 / 15 & 55 / 1 & 55 / 6 & 55 / 10\end{array}$ |
| manner [1] 68/9 | meeting [6] 8/8 25/20 25/23 | 55/22 57/10 57/13 60/25 |
| manufacturer [1] | $6 / 11$ 67/20 | $62 / 2363 / 3$ |
| manufacturers [1] 27/15 | memorialized [1] 47/1 | Ms. Finken [4] 28/22 30/12 |
| manufacturing [2] 13/8 50/24 | memos <br> [1] <br> 20/10 | $30 / 21 \quad 32 / 24$ |
| $\operatorname{many}[9]$ $10 / 12$ $23 / 25$ $26 / 22$  <br> $30 / 21$ $37 / 9$ $48 / 8$ $48 / 24$ $49 / 2$ <br> $49 / 4$     | Mensey [1] 16/17 <br> mentioned [3] 21/10 50/7 | Ms. Goldenberg [3] 47/22 50/7 54/13 |
| March [2] 11/1 24/9 | 51/2 | Ms. Horne [1] 26/10 |
| March 15th [1] 24/9 | mere [1] | Ms. Johnston [4] 54/15 55 |
| MARK [3] 2/14 16/11 64/6 | met [5] 14/7 18/24 18/25 | 55/6 55/22 |
| market [3] 13/17 14/19 21/25 | 30/13 54/25 <br> Miami [1] 1/24 | Ms. Johnston's [1] 55/10 <br> Ms. Luhana [9] 11/17 11/ |
| marketing [2] 13/9 29/20 | MICHAEL [1] 1/18 | 12/15 18/2 19/17 21/10 26/14 |
| MARLENE [1] 2/10 | might [6] 7/14 20/20 23/4 | 26/25 28/4 |
| Massachusetts [1] 2/22 massive [1] 23/9 | 28/8 32/3 39/19 | Ms. Luhana's [1] 19/25 |
| master [5] 7/23 | million [3] 13/13 13/17 20/5 | Ms. Whiteley [2] 60/25 62/23 |
| 18/11 68/24 | millions [3] 17/11 17/12 | Ms. Whiteley's [1] 63/3 |
| materials [3] 11/11 23/10 | 22/14 | Ms. Y [1] |
| 25/21 | mimic [1] | much [18] 4/18 7/9 8/11 |
| matter [5] 4/6 20/1 20/23 | mind [2] 22/11 65/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 11 & 23 / 21 & 26 / 7 & 28 / 20 & 32 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 43/13 69/17 | mindful [1] 53/1 | 32/24 40/13 40/15 41/23 |
| matters [7] 6/7 6/19 20/11 | minds [1] $8 / 8$ | 44/11 47/2 56/3 62/24 65/1 |
| 47/20 68/14 69/3 69/9 | Minneapolis [1] 2/ | 66/13 |
| may [24] $4 / 2$ 4/11 $4 / 19$ 9/8 | minutes [2] 25/21 25/23 | multiple [2] 31/4 33/22 must [1] 41/18 |
| 9/9 9/9 9/10 9/11 9/14 12/12 | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { missing [1] } & 27 / 11 \\ \text { mistaken [2] } & 43 / 23 & 43 / 23 \end{array}$ | must [1] $41 / 18$ <br> mute [1] $11 / 19$ |
| 19/25 28/1 $30 / 3 \quad 35 / 25 \quad 38 / 22$ | mistaken [2] $43 / 23 \quad 43 / 23$ <br> mitigate [1] 39/4 | $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { mute [1] } & 11 / 19 \\ \text { my [10] } & 11 / 7 & 18 / 14 & 18 / 17 \end{array}$ |
| 41/9 41/9 43/9 59/21 59/21 $62 / 2265 / 1966 / 867 / 16$ | MN [1] 2/12 | 21/20 24/13 39/23 43/22 |
| maybe [12] 7/12 10/9 22/19 | moment [1] 35/14 | 52/20 55/10 60/17 |
| 23/10 31/12 34/16 39/17 54/1 | nitoring | N |
| 64/10 65/2 65/4 66/23 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { month [5] } & 4 / 24 & 4 / 25 & 5 / 5\end{array}$ | name [3] 13/9 42/23 63 |
| McGLAMRY [12] $1 / 18$ 1/18 | 13/13 57/24 | named [1] 63/14 |
| 11/17 11/23 $33 / 4$ 33/8 36 | months [5] 10/24 10/25 11/4 | names [6] 14/8 22/22 22/23 |


| N | $20 / 4 \text { 21/14 21/18 21/18 29/25 }$ | 53/5 55/20 56/14 59/1 59/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| names... [3] 30/13 30/19 | numbers [6] 13/19 16/21 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { 59/23 } \\ \text { Orleans [1] } \end{array}$ |
| 35/18 | $17 / 19 \text { 20/25 26/6 65/22 }$ | Orlean [1] Ostrow |
| narrow [1] | NW [2] $2 / 22$ 3/5 | other [25] 5/20 6/6 10/6 |
| nature [2] 7/4 67/19 | NY [2] 2/9 3/2 | 16/9 19/5 $20 / 19$ 20/19 $22 / 1$ |
| NDA [1] 21/22 | 0 | 26/2 $29 / 17$ 30/25 37/5 40/3 |
| NDMA [2] 25/15 25/22 | objection [3] 53/21 53/24 | 53/12 56/16 58/3 60/18 63/10 |
| NE [1] 1/19 | $54 / 3$ (3) 53/21 53/24 | 63/11 63/17 67/7 |
| necessary [3] 29/21 57/3 | objections [2] 53/22 62/7 | others [2] 32/8 58/20 |
| $62 / 21$ | obligation [1] 46/18 | otherwise [1] 62/8 |
| need [26] 6/24 7/1 9/1 26/16 | obligations [8] 19/24 46/ | our [68] 4/15 5/8 9/20 10/4 |
| 29/17 30/3 30/19 31/5 31/6 |  | 10/16 $11 / 8$ 12/19 $13 / 2115 / 11$ |
| 31/13 32/18 32/23 38/24 39/9 | 51/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 11 & 17 / 14 & 19 / 10 & 19 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 48/15 51/12 54/10 60/5 60/13 | observation [1] | $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 24 & 20 / 13 & 22 / 14 & 24 / 5 & 24 / 8\end{array}$ |
| 60/18 60/19 62/14 66/6 66/21 | observations [1] 18/13 | 25/24 25/25 28/7 29/13 30/5 |
| 67/16 68/9 | obviously [6] 10/12 35/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 15 & 31 / 10 & 33 / 14 & 33 / 16\end{array}$ |
| needed [4] 40/20 42/21 45/14 | 42/1 45/12 46/21 54/22 | $33 / 17$ 34/19 35/5 37/8 37/8 |
| 69/9 [4] | occasions [1] 55/1 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}38 / 9 & 40 / 16 & 42 / 11 & 42 / 16 & 43 / 7\end{array}$ |
| needs [3] 25/6 26/4 42/6 | occurs [1] 64/8 | 43/13 $43 / 15$ 48/12 $50 / 4 \quad 50 / 9$ |
| new [13] $2 / 6$ 2/9 $3 / 2$ //8 | October [3] 61/8 61/13 61/16 | 50/9 50/24 51/4 51/8 51/11 |
| 4/12 4 4/13 $4 / 2012 / 18$ 18/7 | of research [1] 14/17 | 52/25 53/4 55/3 55/3 55/13 |
| 39/24 50/18 52/3 63/15 | off [5] 4/3 20/10 37/21 | 55/24 56/17 56/25 58/20 |
| news [1] 33/7 | 37/24 59/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}59 / 25 & 60 / 6 & 61 / 18 & 61 / 19 & 61 / 25\end{array}$ |
| next [20] 10/17 10/20 10/21 | $\bigcirc$ | 62/2 62/7 62/10 65/3 65/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 4 & 11 / 14 & 16 / 3 & 18 / 21 & 28 / 14\end{array}$ | offered [1] 49/2 | ourselves [1] |
|  | Official [2] 3/15 69/20 | out [33] 6/17 6/19 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 1 & 40 / 4 & 40 / 10 & 44 / 18 & 44 / 20\end{array}$ | Okay [2] 4/1 53/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 2 & 13 / 1 & 18 / 12 & 18 / 20 & 19 / 4\end{array}$ |
| 65/17 68/24 | old [1] 52/5 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 23 / 17 & 28 / 5 & 28 / 13 & 33 / 12 & 34 / 22\end{array}$ |
| Nice [1] 56/10 | Once [1] 8/14 | 35/9 36/2 36/23 36/23 37/19 |
| night [1] 64/1 | one [45] $1 / 12$ 4/17 $5 / 5$ 6/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 37 / 22 & 39 / 3 & 39 / 6 & 39 / 7\end{array}$ |
| nine [1] 55/9 | 6/23 8/15 9/16 11/9 11/10 | 41/2 $41 / 2143 / 2444 / 3 \quad 45 / 1$ |
| no [9] $1 / 3 \mathrm{~L} / 1 / 5$ 37/22 $47 / 14$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 15 & 14 / 5 & 14 / 10 & 14 / 25 & 15 / 10\end{array}$ | 45/6 46/5 67/15 68/7 69/3 |
| $58 / 25$ $59 / 8$ $62 / 23$ $63 / 25$ <br> 18    |  | outlined [2] 45/17 68/19 |
| non [1] $35 / 3$ non-brands [1] | 20/17 22/19 25/2 27/2 27/3 | outset [3] 18/8 25/9 64 |
| non-brands [1] 35/3 | 27/5 27/16 30/16 31/12 34/21 | over [6] 5/14 11/13 24/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { nonbrand [1] } & 47 / 20 \\ \text { noncustodial } & {[8]} & 12 / 9 & 13 / 2\end{array}$ | $36 / 17 \quad 42 / 18 \quad 43 / 23 \quad 44 / 12$ | 35/5 39/22 47/19 |
| noncustodial [8] 12/9 13/2 | 44/25 45/15 46/18 49/1 50/22 | overly [1] 52/12 |
| $13 / 4$ $24 / 9$ | 56/5 61/14 62/18 63/13 64/2 | overwhelmingly [1] 22/18 |
| 24/9 | 64/9 64/10 | own [2] 24/14 30/5 |
| noncustodial documents [1] $15 / 1$ | one-off [1] | P |
| none [2] 46/4 | ongoing [5] 42/10 49/24 50/1 |  |
| nonparties [1] 53/20 | ongoing $58 / 5 \quad 67 / 20$ | $\text { PA [2] } 1 / 13 \quad 2 / 20$ |
| nonparty [1] | only [18] 6/20 12/25 15/17 | page [2] 8/16 8/17 |
| tably [1] | 16/16 21/16 22/5 22/9 23/17 | pages [11] 8/20 8/25 |
| note <br> [1] $53 / 12$ | 27/1 27/8 27/9 29/8 35/3 | 13/13 13/17 20/4 20/5 21/19 |
| noted [1] | 35/8 41/23 45/7 49/1 63/11 | 22/6 22/14 64/ |
| nothing [4] 46/2 $47 / 7$ 59/8 65/9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { open [5] 7/13 26/22 } 32 / 14 \\ & 32 / 1668 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PAIGE [4] } 2 / 1 \text { 2/21 } 25 / \\ & 57 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| notice [6] 48/23 50/23 | opened [1] 57/ | PALM [3] 1/2 1/5 3/1 |
| 59/8 59/9 59/10 | opening [2] 11/7 23/16 | Palmetto [1] |
| notices [2] 34/8 48/25 | OpenText [1] 17/14 | paper [3] 19/2 27/10 28/10 |
| notify [1] 43/14 | opportunity [10] 5/2 5/20 | Park [2] 2/15 3/11 |
| notifying [2] 38/12 41/17 | 12/8 17/23 $33 / 11$ 41/13 $44 / 5$ | part [2] 5/13 7/6 |
| notwithstanding [1] 66/2 | 47/25 48/2 57/9 | participants [1] |
| November [3] 61/13 61/16 | options [1] 65/4 | participating [2] 5/13 10/15 |
| 61/17 | order [16] 4/17 6/12 13/14 | particular [3] 9/12 53/21 |
| November 6th [1] 61/17 | 19/4 44/25 45/1 45/15 45/21 | 69/8 |
| November we [1] 61/13 | 46/20 $47 / 12$ 47/12 $48 / 14$ | particularly [2] 33/18 46/3 |
| now [15] 14/1 14/24 18/20 | 51/25 52/24 58/8 66/2 orderly [1] 64/17 | parties [31] 5/1 5/9 5/21 <br> 6/8 6/14 6/16 6/18 7/23 8/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll}19 / 16 & 35 / 13 & 40 / 3 & 40 / 8 & 42 / 1\end{array}$ | $\text { orders [24] } 4 / 17 \text { 19/23 } 44 / 22$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll} 12 / 12 & 12 / 14 & 15 / 1 & 32 / 12 & 33 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 42 / 24 \text { 43/6 51/8 51/15 57/2 } \\ & 66 / 1067 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 45 / 2 & 45 / 5 & 45 / 6 & 45 / 9 & 45 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllllll} & 38 / 17 & 44 / 9 & 45 / 17 & 46 / 12 & 46 / 15\end{array}$ |
| number [9] 6/20 9/1 20/2 | 45/10 45/14 45/16 45/19 46/4 | 46/22 46/24 47/6 47/9 53/12 |
| number [9] 6/20 9/1 20/2 | 46/6 46/14 47/17 50/6 53/2 | 53/17 54/1 54/4 54/10 66/19 |


| P | please [4] 9/19 47/23 57/16 | $38 / 20 \quad 38 / 20 \quad 39 / 9 \quad 39 / 13 \quad 39$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| parties... [2] 67/3 67/8 | pleasure [1] 24/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 39 / 18 & 41 / 3 & 41 / 6 & 44 / 2 & 44 / 5 \\ 54 / 24 & 56 / 17 & 56 / 19 & 56 / 20 \end{array}$ |
| parts [1] 33/24 | pled [1] 60/9 | 60/11 61/24 62/6 62/17 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { party } & {[12]} & 46 / 18 & 46 / 22 & 47 / 9 \\ 53 / 13 & 54 / 3 & 64 / 5 & 64 / 7 & 64 / 21\end{array}$ | plenty [1] 60/18 | processes [8] 26/15 28/17 |
| $65 / 8 \quad 65 / 18 \quad 65 / 24 \quad 65 / 25$ | PLLC [2] 1/15 2/11 | 28/18 28/19 42/5 44/10 46/24 |
| passed [1] 55/5 | point [27] 4/3 25/2 25/2 | 69/10 |
| passing [2] 20/4 43/6 | 25/6 27/4 39/6 40/14 40/16 | produce [8] 13/13 |
| past [1] 31/7 | 40/18 40/21 41/6 45/25 48/12 | 19/21 23/18 23/18 24/6 25/10 |
| path [1] 29/12 | 48/24 49/1 $49 / 5$ 50/12 50/2 | produce at [1] 13 |
| patience [1] 61/3 | 52/11 52/13 53/1 53/7 | produced [31] 12/25 13 |
| Pauline [2] 3/15 69/20 | 54/22 64/18 66/9 66/12 | 13/22 14/4 14/24 15/4 |
| payor [1] 29/20 | points [2] 8/10 11/6 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 8 & 16 / 3 & 16 / 7 & 16 / 25 & 17 / 3\end{array}$ |
| payors [7] 64/5 64/7 64/21 | Ponce [1] 1/ | 17/7 17/8 17/12 20/2 20/5 |
| 65/8 65/19 65/24 66/1 | Pope [1] 1/18 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}20 / 12 & 25 / 4 & 25 / 12 & 25 / 14 & 25 / 16\end{array}$ |
| PBMs [3] 64/25 65/4 66/1 | Porter [2] 2/22 | 25/19 25/20 25/22 26/6 27/5 |
| Peachtree [1] 1/19 | position [14] 11/12 31/ | 27/9 42/15 64/22 66/1 |
| pencil [1] 11/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 35 / 4 & 39 / 20 & 40 / 11 & 42 / 1 & 43 / \\ 46 / 17 & 55 / 11 & 55 / 11 & 55 / 13 \end{array}$ | producing [2] 58/21 65/19 <br> product [17] 13/17 20/8 21/3 |
| pending [3] $13 / 15$ 44/23 $59 / 8$ | 55/22 55/24 66/8 | product $21 / 17121 / 12 \quad 21 / 16$ 21/21 |
| Pennsylvania [1] 3/5 people [6] 22/7 22/24 29/14 | possession [2] 61/20 61/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 21 / 23 & 21 / 24 & 21 / 24 & 22 / 1 & 22 / 12\end{array}$ |
| people [6] 22/7 22/24 29/14 <br> 34/17 34/20 35/15 | possible [1] 56/2 | 25/17 25/25 49/19 54/24 65/9 |
| $[6] \quad 13 / 3 \quad 1$ | possibly [1] 7/17 | production [25] 12/11 13/11 |
| $17 / 2152 / 2360 / 13$ | post [1] 52/22 | 16/6 17/15 24/9 26/16 27/13 |
| percent [1] 17/2 | postpone [1] 42 | 27/18 27/22 28/5 30/1 31/7 |
| perfect [1] 9/1 | potential [3] 50/1 51/19 | 32/9 36/4 54/23 55/2 55/8 |
| perhaps [6] $5 / 23$ 8/5 $10 / 10$ | 60/4 | 55/16 55/25 57/25 61/14 |
| 45/8 67/15 67/23 | practical [1] 37/ | 61/18 62/3 62/12 65/22 |
| period [1] 62/2 | predecessor [1] 25/18 | production in [1] 26/16 |
| periods [1] 65/7 | preface [1] 38/9 | productions [18] 12/9 12/20 |
| permissible [1] | prejudge [1] 44/2 | 12/24 13/3 13/4 13/19 14/2 |
| permitted [1] 53/1 | prejudice [2] 51/18 60/2 | 14/22 16/23 17/21 17/22 |
| person [2] 31/14 34/4 | prejudicial [1] 41/5 | 19/10 19/17 20/9 21/9 22/1 |
| perspective [7] 20/1 20/23 | prepare [3] 7/7 11/10 42/16 | 26/3 58/22 |
| 25/8 30/16 33/14 47/7 63/6 | prepared [3] 9/5 11/12 67/12 <br> preparing [2] 5/10 7/12 | $\underset{\text { productive [5] }}{67 / 568 / 18} 51 / 20$ 5/9 $48 / 8$ |
| pertinent [2] 31/24 32/2 | prescription [1] 54/25 | PRODUCTS [1] 1/5 |
| $\begin{array}{\|cllll} \text { Pfizer } & {[7]} & 13 / 5 & 16 / 25 & 16 / 25 \\ 18 / 24 & 21 / 10 & 21 / 10 & 21 / 15 \end{array}$ | present [4] 6/9 15/17 15/21 | progress [3] 7/11 57/3 67/13 |
| fizer's [1] 17/6 | 15/25 [1] 67/8 | promoting [2] 21/21 21 |
| pharmaceutical [1] | presentation [1] 67/8 | promptly [2] 38/12 41/17 |
| pharmacies [1] 61/10 | presented [2] 7/19 67/12 | proportional [4] 52/3 52/ |
| pharmacovigilance [2] 13/8 | presenters [1] 64/18 | 59/19 60/8 |
| 29/16 | presenting [2] 10/13 27/2 | proposed [2] |
| pharmacy [3] 56/9 | preside [1] 5/14 | protective [1] 66/ |
| 65/23 | presumably [1] | protocol [1] |
| phase [3] 4/12 4/20 5/25 | pretrial [3] 6/12 46/6 50/6 | proud [1] 18/16 |
| Philadelphia [2] 1/13 2/20 | pretty [2] 19/14 28/14 | provide [7] |
| Phillip [1] 16/14 | previously [2] 32/7 47/11 | 35/15 35/16 42/3 57/21 62/15 |
| phon [5] 14/17 15/19 15/23 | primarily [1] | provided [6] |
| 16/14 16/17 | inciple [1] 31/21 | 50/8 59/10 61/8 66/3 |
| pick [2] 47/20 62 | prior [2] 29/11 | providers [1] |
| pieces [1] 37/16 | rioritized [1] 52/10 | provides [2] 6/14 68/1 |
| Pierce [1] 3/16 | privilege [1] | providing [3] |
| Pierce/West [1] 3/16 | probably [4] $22 / 24$ 25/8 | 58/5 |
| place [8] 6/12 35/17 36/18 |  | provision [1] |
| 41/22 46/5 46/9 46/24 68/18 | $42 / 24$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Pro [29] } & 6 / 12 & 12 / 10 & 13 / 3\end{array}$ |
| Plaintiff [4] 22/25 60/24 61/9 61/11 | problematic [1] 41/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 5 & 16 / 24 & 17 / 21 & 17 / 25 & 18 / 18\end{array}$ |
|  | procedure [1] 53/21 | 26/19 $29 / 5$ 34/2 $34 / 16$ 35/13 |
| PLAINTIFFS [70] | procedures [5] 26/19 38/24 | 39/9 45/17 46/25 49/18 $49 / 19$ |
|  | 40/24 53/20 54/11 | 50/5 50/5 50/14 50/14 52/21 |
| $45 / 12 \text { 49/24 51/12 52/11 }$ | proceed [4] 45/25 48/18 | 53/8 54/11 56/21 57/20 60/11 |
| 56/18 61/19 61/21 | 48/20 67/25 | 60/17 |
| plan [2] 11/5 36/17 | proceeding [2] 47/8 53/19 | PULASKI [7] 1/15 $1 / 15$ 54/15 |
| play [1] 44/2 | proceedings [1] 69/17 | 54/20 56/4 56/5 56/23 |
| playing [1] 64/9 | process [31] 6/3 6/13 7/15 | pulling [1] 23/16 |
| pleadings [1] 53/4 | 23/12 $23 / 12$ 26/17 28/8 $29 / 11$ | purpose [7] 5/16 5/18 6/10 |


| P | d [1] 69/1 | $\text { report [19] } 8 / 17 \text { 8/17 } 9 / 16$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| purposes [3] 5/20 38/18 42/9 | ds [1] 54/25 | $12 / 14 \quad 12 / 19 \quad 13 / 21 \quad 26 / 14$ |
| pursuant [9] $12 / 9$ 29/4 $46 / 8$ | recover [1] $\mathrm{redaction} \mathrm{[1]} 63$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 26 / 23 & 33 / 24 & 35 / 2 & 40 / 22 & 42 / 3 \\ 43 / 11 & 47 / 24 & 47 / 25 & 54 / 20 & 63 / 3 \end{array}$ |
| 46/25 $49 / 18$ 51/24 $55 / 3$ 58/1 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { redactions [4] } & 62 / 3 & 62 / 11\end{array}$ | 63/22 65/10 |
| $58 / 23$ | 62/11 62/13 | reported [2] 20/16 23/13 |
| pushing [1] 28/13 | redactions and [1] 62/11 | Reporter [5] 3/15 49/15 |
| put [11] 9/5 9/11 $9 / 15$ 11/2 | reengage [1] 52/8 | 57/15 69/20 69/21 |
| 11/11 30/2 40/6 43/16 49/7 | refer [1] 46/8 | reports [2] 8/23 25/16 |
| 69/4 69/5 | reference [4] 20/4 21/1 | reports for [1] 25/16 |
| Q | d [1 | $61 /$ |
| QC [1] | reflect [1] 10/16 | representations [1] 14/9 |
| quality [6] 13/9 16/18 $25 / 4$ | regard [8] 34/25 42/19 43 | represented [2] 12/22 13/ |
| 27/13 51/1 51/1 | 51/19 51/25 54/20 57/6 62/10 | request [6] 32/8 39/7 41/14 |
| quantity [3] 13/11 25/5 | regarding [6] 17/22 |  |
| 27/13 |  | ted [1] 49/25 |
| quarter [1] 35/23 | regardless [1] | s [5] |
| quarters [1] 28/12 | regular [1] 67/20 | required [3] 13/12 15 |
| question [2] 27/20 68/13 | regulatory [4] 13/7 25/14 | $62 / 12$ |
| questions [6] 15/14 24/12 | $29 / 15 \quad 50 / 10$ | requirements [1] 60/14 |
| $28 / 8$ $38 / 14$ $56 / 11$ $62 / 22$ <br> quick    <br> 2$]$ $20 / 3$ $23 / 3$  | reimbursing [1] 65/9 | research [2] 14/14 14/17 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { quick [2] } & 20 / 3 \\ \text { quickly [1] } & 31 / 24\end{array}$ | REINHART [17] 1/9 5/12 $7 / 2$ | resistance [1] 65/2 |
| quickly [1] 31/24 <br> quite [8] 18/10 18/19 19/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 8 / 11 & 9 / 4 & 9 / 6 & 9 / 25 & 11 / 13\end{array}$ | resolution [9] 6/6 6/14 9/22 |
| $\begin{array}{cllll}\text { quite [8] } & 18 / 10 & 18 / 19 & 19 / 9 \\ 36 / 6 & 41 / 4 & 41 / 22 & 53 / 3 & 63 / 4\end{array}$ | 11/18 12/17 18/6 28/25 44/19 | 26/20 29/25 46/24 56/21 |
| quo [2] 46/11 58/9 | 47/19 64/15 67/11 67/21 | 66/19 67/17 |
| quote [1] 20/19 | reiterate [4] 7/1 7/5 32/12 | resolve [9] 6/23 7/3 39/10 |
| R | reject [1] 19/2 | 69/9 |
|  | relate [4] 20/7 23/4 24/1 | resolved [2] 7/2 40/23 |
| radar [2] | 46/20 | respect [8] 18/25 28/10 |
| $63 / 20$ | related [9] 13/7 14/19 25/16 | 41/23 45/18 46/3 50/14 65/21 |
| raised [7] 17/10 $33 / 18$ 56/5 | 25/20 46/21 50/24 50/25 | 66/12 |
| 59/3 59/6 65/21 65/24 | 57/22 58/17 | respecting [1] 56/13 |
| raises [1] 15/13 | relates [7] 23/11 $33 / 25$ 34/1 | respective [2] 37/19 44/9 |
| raising [1] 66/24 | 38/1 47/16 49/19 60/6 | respond [3] 18/3 28/1 52/17 |
| RANITIDINE [1] 1/4 | relating [4] 12/1 22/3 46/6 | responding [1] 61/15 |
| rather [1] 9/24 | relatively [1] 19/4 | responses [2] 18/15 61/ |
| Raton [1] 2/16 | relevance [1] 25/11 | responsive [4] 17/12 24 |
| RE [1] 1/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { relevant [24] } & 13 / 6 & 14 / 9\end{array}$ | $24 / 6 \quad 65 / 1$ |
| reach [3] 36/23 41/6 62/9 | 14/11 15/12 15/13 15/16 | result [3] 43/4 43/10 46/20 |
| ng | 15/20 15/24 16/10 16/13 | results [1] 25/15 |
| readout [2] 20/12 20 | 16/15 16/18 23/19 25/7 27/17 | retailer [1] 56/9 |
| ready [3] $24 / 7$ 24/10 30/13 | 29/14 $31 / 24$ 43/25 $44 / 1 \begin{array}{lll} & 52 / 2\end{array}$ | retailers [5] 48/2 54/14 |
| realize [2] 38/11 43/9 | 52/12 59/19 60/8 62/2 | 54/21 54/23 61/10 |
| really [24] 5/19 8/6 9/1 | relied [1] 14/9 | review [11] 9/4 9/20 13/23 |
| 18/22 19/5 19/7 19/25 24/2 | relief [7] 6/10 6/15 7/3 | 15/12 18/20 23/18 26/16 28/7 |
| 29/13 31/1 31/13 31/17 31/19 | 9/23 17/24 46/23 69/9 | 42/16 45/13 45/24 |
| 33/10 36/18 38/19 40/4 40/14 | relieved [1] 46/18 | reviewed [1] 28/12 |
| 51/12 54/7 56/21 67/2 67/21 | remain [3] 5/24 19/11 69/11 | reviewing [3] 45/9 45/9 |
| 67/24 | ${ }_{\text {remaining }}^{45 / 21}$ [3] 15/3 28/12 | 65/19 Richmond [1] 1/16 |
| ```reason [1] 53/7 reasonable [2] 31/6 31/15``` | remains [1] 50/18 | $\text { right [9] } 4 / 5 \text { 40/8 } 40 / 25$ |
| $\begin{array}{lcccc}\text { reasonable [2] } & 31 / 6 & 31 / 15 \\ \text { recall [7] } & 4 / 11 & 13 / 18 & 21 / 17\end{array}$ | remarks [2] 11/7 12/6 | 42/1 42/21 44/19 51/15 57/23 |
| recall $[7]$ $4 / 11$ $13 / 18$ <br> $22 / 8$ $22 / 9$ $33 / 17$ $50 / 11$ | remedial [2] 39/3 40/17 | 66/10 |
| receipt [1] 51/7 | remedies [1] 42/5 | rightly [1] 41/9 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { received [7] } & 12 / 21 & 48 / 20\end{array}$ | remedy [7] 26/18 $28 / 19$ 39/10 | ripe [4] 65/10 66/5 66/6 |
| 49/25 55/19 56/14 57/25 | 39/12 43/10 44/6 44/8 | 66/10 |
| 61/23 | remember [1] 30/21 | rise [1] 6/ |
| receiving [1] 9/16 | remind [2] 5/16 17/14 | risen [1] 6/21 |
| recent [1] 22/3 | render [1] 7/3 | Road [3] 1/19 2/2 2/15 |
| recently [1] 33/22 | repeatedly [1] 21/2 | roadblocks [1] 63/22 |
| recognize [6] 7/10 28/22 | replead [2] 47/4 63/14 | Robbins [1] 2/14 |
| 32/22 38/2 57/10 64/4 | repleading [3] 45/11 45/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { ROBERT [3] } & 1 / 21 & 14 / 13 & 38 / 4\end{array}$ |
| recognizing [1] 45/15 | repled [3] 47/5 47/6 47/7 | robust [1] 35/10 |



| S | suppose [1] 50 | $22 / 23 \quad 23 / 5 \quad 23 / 16 \quad 24 / 25 \quad 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stability [1] 14/15 | supposed [2] 4/4 | $30 / 14 \quad 30 / 14 \quad 35 / 4 \quad 35 / 18 \quad 35 / 22$ |
| staff [1] 18/7 | $\begin{array}{cccccc}\text { sure }[13] & 20 / 17 & 31 / 18 & 32 / 20 \\ 34 / 5 & 34 / 7 & 42 / 9 & 42 / 25 & 45 / 5\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 36 / 22 & 37 / 12 & 48 / 9 & 48 / 10 & 48 / 13 \\ 48 / 24 & 49 / 1 & 49 / 2 & 53 / 5 & 57 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| stagger [1] 4/ stand [1] 51/8 | 45/6 48/1 54/22 55/17 63/15 | 59/4 59/24 64/23 65/2 66/3 |
| standpoint [3] 37/6 43/1 | surprising [8] 21/14 21/19 | then [26] 5/4 11/3 13/24 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { sranap } \\ 45 / 12 \end{array}$ | 22/2 22/7 23/23 24/2 24/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 17 & 17 / 23 & 18 / 14 & 21 / 20\end{array}$ |
| ar [2] |  | $33 / 20$ 35/8 39/1 39/5 39/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { start [11] } & 12 / 15 & 14 / 2 & 18 / 13\end{array}$ | suspect [1] 9/15 | 40/11 40/22 43/23 43/25 |
|  | suspicion | 46/21 52/1 52/8 56/6 60/7 |
| 56/2 56/17 63/9 | sweet [1] 30/10 | 61/15 61/22 61/24 69/5 69/9 |
| started [3] 29/10 45/23 57/1 | T |  |
| starting [2] 61/6 <br> state [1] 47/17 | take [17] 6/7 7/22 10/18 | thereafter [1] 21/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { stated [3] } & 12 / 19 & 13 / 21 & 55 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 25 & 11 / 14 & 12 / 7 & 13 / 22 & 21 / 4\end{array}$ | Thereupon [1] 69/14 |
| STATES [3] 1/1 1/9 1/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 3 & 35 / 17 & 35 / 25 & 36 / 3 & 36 / 15\end{array}$ | these [39] 4/23 6/5 9/22 |
| status [31] $1 / 8$ 4/11 $4 / 25$ | 42/19 62/6 66/16 68/21 | 13/19 13/19 14/9 14/22 15/12 |
| 5/4 5/6 5/8 5/14 5/18 5/19 | taken [5] $42 / 14 \quad 43 / 12$ | 15/13 16/21 16/21 16/23 |
| 8/15 8/17 8/17 8/23 9/16 | taking [4] 32/17 35/8 55/2 | 21/9 22/7 23/4 23/7 27/15 |
| 9/17 9/18 10/4 10/5 10/17 | 56/2 [4] 32/17 35/8 55/2 | 36/5 38/21 38/23 $42 / 8 \quad 45 / 19$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 21 & 10 / 21 & 12 / 9 & 12 / 19 & 17 / 21 \\ 41 / 14 & 46 / 11 & 47 / 25 & 57 / 19 & 58 / 8\end{array}$ | talk [5] 10/23 12/1 29/3 | 53/18 63/10 63/10 63/12 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}41 / 14 & 46 / 11 & 47 / 25 & 57 / 19 & 58 / 8 \\ 58 / 16 & 65 / 10 & \end{array}$ | 48/25 56/16 | 65/10 66/4 66/5 66/5 66/18 |
| 58/16 65/10 stay [2] 27 | talked [5] 22/21 24/4 3 | 66/25 67/4 69 |
| [1] | 48/17 50/19 | they [69] 5/15 6/5 6/19 8/17 |
| steps [2] 3 | talking [6] 23/8 23/8 23 | 8/25 9/3 9/23 9/24 12/ |
| stick [2] 10/3 | 0/22 34/10 64/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 23 & 13 / 2 & 15 / 6 & 15 / 9 & 20 / 1\end{array}$ |
| sticking [1] 67/3 | task [1] 19/15 | 21/1 21/11 21/12 22/7 22/9 |
| still [8] 44/25 45/7 | team [1] 18/17 | 22/22 22/22 $24 / 13$ 26/3 27/7 |
| 45/15 46/9 47/2 49/4 67/13 | tell [4] 19/8 26/8 40/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 13 & 31 / 25 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 2 & 32 / 3\end{array}$ |
| Stipes [2] 3/15 69/20 | 55/13 | $34 / 7$ 35/22 $37 / 13$ 39/6 $39 / 7$ |
| stopped [3] 21/10 21/20 | ten [2] 15/10 48/1 | 39/12 41/21 42/21 44/4 44/6 |
| 21/23 | tens [1] 22/13 | 44/6 44/7 45/4 45/25 48/11 |
| storage [1] | terms [8] 11/7 19/13 19/1 | 48/13 48/15 48/18 49/3 49/3 |
| streamline [1] 36/18 | 20/24 21/9 27/4 30/12 37/7 | 49/6 49/25 50/22 52/2 52/3 |
| Street [5] 1/13 2/5 2/19 3/2 | test [1] 25/ | 52/6 54/2 55/19 58/4 61/11 |
| 3/8 [5] 1/13 2/5 2/19 3/2 | testing [2] 14/15 14/ | 62/8 63/14 63/15 64/21 65/7 |
| strongly [1] | Tetris [1] | 65/8 65/9 65/24 66/8 66/20 |
| stuck [1] 29/15 | than [15] 11/2 14/11 14/1 | they will [1] 44/6 |
| subject [3] 13/18 53/14 | 14/20 15/10 16/7 17/4 17/7 | thing [9] 19/5 22/11 33 |
| 53/15 [3] 13/18 53/11 | 21/12 32/8 32/15 40/13 40/15 62/18 67/7 | $\begin{aligned} & 37 / 5 \text { 53/12 63/11 63/17 63, } \\ & 68 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| jects [1] 5 | thank [57] 5/10 11/16 11/21 | things [11] 5/22 5/23 9/8 |
|  | 18/1 18/2 18/4 18/8 24/15 | 9/10 10/11 20/22 24/24 32/22 |
| submissions [1] submit [1] 9/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 7 & 26 / 23 & 27 / 24 & 28 / 4 & 28 / 20\end{array}$ | 52/10 65/10 69/7 |
| submitted [4] | $30 / 6$ 30/7 31/20 32/24 33/2 | think [76] |
|  | $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 9 & 36 / 9 & 36 / 10 & 36 / 13 & 37 / 17\end{array}$ | third [9] 2/8 54/3 64/4 64/7 |
| poena [1] | 39/23 40/25 41/12 41/12 | 64/21 65/8 65/18 65/24 65/25 |
| ubsequent <br> [1] | $\begin{array}{lllll}43 / 21 & 44 / 11 & 44 / 13 & 44 / 15\end{array}$ | this [114] |
| subsequently <br> [1] | 44/16 $44 / 19$ 47/21 $48 / 7$ 49/10 | THOMAS [2] 3/7 49/15 |
| substance [1] 26/5 | 52/16 54/13 56/3 57/5 57/7 | Thornburg [1] 3/10 |
| substantial [5] 12/11 12/12 | 57/17 58/10 60/15 60/16 | those [43] 4/4 6/16 7/3 8/20 |
| 18/23 19/14 50/4 | 60/21 61/2 63/23 63/25 64/1 | 10/9 10/13 10/24 11/6 13/5 |
| substantially [5] 12/23 15/9 | 65/12 65/15 66/13 67/2 67/7 | 14/10 26/1 26/22 28/10 28/13 |
| 16/23 27/20 61/7 | 67/10 69/13 | $\begin{array}{llll}32 / 18 & 32 / 22 & 34 / 20 & 35 / 17\end{array}$ |
| ubstantive [1] | Thanksgiving [2] 42/16 42/21 | $35 / 22$ 35/22 $41 / 6$ 41/8 $46 / 9$ |
|  | that [448] | 46/14 46/22 47/6 48/25 50/6 |
| such [5] 27/17 34/16 46/10 | that level [1] 54/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll}50 / 16 & 51 / 1 & 51 / 21 & 51 / 22 & 52 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 47/4 63/19 | that's [3] 8/24 30/23 64/18 | 53/6 55/21 57/1 57/21 60/5 |
| sue [1] 51/22 | the production [1] 13/11 | 61/17 62/11 62/15 63/8 69/3 |
| suggestion [2] | their [31] 4/2 4/3 11/25 | though [1] 66/1 |
| suggestions [2] 7/14 68/20 | 12/24 13/2 16/7 17/18 18/1 | thought [5] 4/19 19/9 22/24 |
| Suite [8] 1/13 1/16 1/19 | $\begin{array}{llll}1 / 12 & 24 / 14 & 26 / 15 & 28 / 18\end{array}$ | 23/1 63/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 1/23 } & 2 / 2 & 2 / 12 & 2 / 15 & 3 / 11\end{array}$ | $34 / 20$ 35/21 $36 / 22$ 44/5 $44 / 9$ | thousand [1] 31/2 |
| summary [1] 8/20 | 45/10 $46 / 13$ 47/23 $48 / 148 / 11$ | thousands [3] 20/20 20/21 |
| summer [2] 61/6 61/7 | 49/22 50/23 54/10 | 20/21 [4] 11/4 13/1 28/12 |
| supply [1] 50/24 | them [28] 4/25 13/24 17/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { three } \\ & 65 / 16 \end{aligned} \text { [4] } \quad 11 / 4 \quad 13 / 1 \quad 28 / 1$ |


| T | nt [2] 38/13 39/2 | up [21] 8/10 12/7 17/21 21/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| three-quarters [1] 28/12 | port [1] 13/ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 21 / 21 & 23 / 13 & 23 / 14 & 23 / 16 \\ 24 / 10 & 27 / 6 & 28 / 11 & 34 / 18 & 35 / 25 \end{array}$ |
| through [15] 1/8 5/21 23/10 | tribute [1] 6/22 | $37 / 11 \quad 38 / 9 \quad 47 / 20 \quad 48 / 9 \quad 49 / 7$ |
| 26/21 $26 / 23$ 28/7 $28 / 18$ 31/9 | tried [1] 29/13 | 62/17 63/15 65/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 13 & 40 / 20 & 44 / 5 & 49 / 5 & 54 / 23 \\ 62 / 19 & 64 / 23\end{array}$ | trouble [1] 56/25 | update [8] 10/9 13/24 17/21 |
| 9\%hout [2] 55/6 61/22 | true [2] 22/15 30/23 | 39/17 40/1 48/22 57/19 58/16 |
| tight [1] 64/19 | Trust [1] 60/18 | updated [1] 27/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { time [30] } & 4 / 5 & 5 / 15 & 8 / 16 & 8 / 24\end{array}$ | try [18] 4/20 5/7 5/14 6/ | upon [5] $34 / 6$ 43/2 43/7 47/9 |
| 9/12 10/25 13/23 30/22 35/5 | 7/9 10/14 10/23 11/20 18 |  |
| 40/10 41/19 41/24 41/25 42/4 | $\begin{array}{llll} 26 / 19 & 36 / 23 & 3 / 1 / 13 & 391 \\ 39 / 7 & 52 / 8 & 54 / 4 & 68 / 20 \end{array}$ | us [37] 8/12 8/20 12/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}44 / 8 & 45 / 24 & 46 / 10 & 47 / 4 & 48 / 12 \\ 49 / 1 & 49 / 8 & 51 / 14 & 55 / 5 & 59 / 2\end{array}$ | trying [5] 19/20 31/9 35/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 12 & 16 / 10 & 17 / 15 & 18 / 9 & 19 / 15\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}49 / 1 & 49 / 8 & 51 / 14 & 55 / 5 & 59 / 2 \\ 59 / 5 & 61 / 3 & 61 / 18 & 62 / 2 & 62 / 6\end{array}$ | 37/15 65/1 | 19/19 22/22 27/6 30/14 30/20 |
| 65/7 | turn [24] 4/3 11/13 11/25 | 33/5 33/11 35/16 36/7 37/10 |
| timeframe [2] 45/17 68/6 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}14 / 14 / 24 & 16 / 3 & 18 / 3 & 19 / 16\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 13 & 41 / 17 & 41 / 23 & 42 / 3 & 42 / 16\end{array}$ |
| timely [3] 34/24 41/20 55/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 13 & 28 / 21 & 37 / 21 & 37 / 24\end{array}$ | 42/19 42/21 48/10 49/2 51/15 |
| times [4] 10/20 31/4 65/8 | 39/16 39/22 41/1 47/19 47/22 | 52/6 52/21 61/3 66/17 66/23 |
| 69/8 | 48/4 54/14 56/4 57/8 58/11 | 67/12 68/3 68/15 69/7 |
| timing [3] 30/1 43/22 43/24 | 60/24 65/13 | us at [1] 41/23 |
| titled [1] 38/2 | turned [1] 23/17 | use [1] 60/ |
| to as [1] 46/8 | turns [1] 43/24 | user [1] 7/16 |
| to assess [1] 17/23 | two [17] 5/3 5/4 5/4 | ilizing |
| to cede [1] 18/15 | /19 28/22 29/4 31/12 33 | V |
| to turn [1] 14/1 | 56/5 59/7 69/2 | vacuum [1] 26/6 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { today } & {[20]} & 5 / 7 & 8 / 10 & 8 / 13 \\ 18 / 9 & 28 / 5 & 33 / 16 & 38 / 18 & 38 / 19\end{array}$ | two-page [2] 8/16 8/17 | valuable [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 9 & 28 / 5 & 33 / 16 & 38 / 18 & 38 / 19 \\ 40 / 15 & 41 / 8 & 48 / 6 & 52 / 23 & 58 / 13\end{array}$ | TX [2] 1/16 2/3 | variety [1] 29/17 |
| 40/15 $41 / 8 \quad 48 / 6 \quad 52 / 23 \quad 58 / 13$ | type [1] 17/24 | various [2] 44/22 5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 58 / 15 \text { 59/3 } 59 / 17 \quad 60 / 23 \quad 61 / 3 \\ & 66 / 8 \quad 68 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | types [2] 29/16 29/20 | vast [1] 60/1 |
| today's [2] 5/11 | typical [1] 17/15 | vendor [2] 17/15 61/20 |
| together [5] 11/2 | typically [2] 17/16 59/17 | versus [1] |
| 66/12 69/2 | U | very [35] 8/11 18/16 26/7 |
| told [5] 27/6 28/11 40/3 |  | 26/24 28/16 28/20 29/3 29 |
| 42/21 67/25 | U.S [2] 14/17 22 | $32 / 9$ 32/10 $32 / 24$ 35/10 37/7 |
| tomorrow [3] 28/6 62/17 63/5 | UK [1] 28/1 | 38/8 44/11 45/16 47/2 47/2 |
| too [5] 30/11 35/8 41/15 | ultimately [6] 9/6 9/25 | 49/8 50/3 50/12 53/3 56/3 |
| 55/19 56/10 | 33/22 39/9 43/5 67/16 | 56/23 59/23 62/24 62/24 63/3 |
| took [3] 19/5 41/22 64/15 | unable [1] 6/16 | 64/16 64/18 65/15 66/13 67/5 |
| tool [3] 32/9 32/10 32/11 | unclear [1] | 67/8 68/5 |
| toolbox [1] 32/8 | under [16] 4/18 13/16 19/24 | victory [1] 36/16 |
| tools [2] 32/7 32/23 | 38/25 48/10 50/5 51/22 53/15 | video [2] 4/2 4/3 |
| topic [9] $8 / 20$ 11/7 11/14 | 53/15 53/20 53/23 53/23 | view [3] 6/2 32/7 51/11 |
| 11/14 12/7 28/21 33/3 33/4 | 54/11 56/21 57/20 58/21 | virtually [1] 68/3 |
| 60/23 | underlying [1] 25/19 | ision [7] 5/17 11/8 11 |
| topical [1] 66/21 | understand [14] 16/22 | 18/9 18/12 66/18 67/3 |
| topically [1] 8/9 | 26/2 $34 / 10$ 35/3 $38 / 14$ 38/15 | volume [2] 63/7 63/7 |
| topics [4] 8/18 $12 / 1$ 50/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}40 / 4 & 40 / 11 & 41 / 3 & 41 / 9 & 44 / 21 \\ 49 / 23 & 60 / 6 & & & \end{array}$ | voluntary [1] 22/8 |
| total [5] 12/25 13/5 15/2 | understanding [9] 9/20 | W |
| 17/17 23/14 | 31/6 46/19 48/12 52/20 |  |
| totally [1] | 53/6 55/10 | wait [1] 42/ |
| touch [1] 59/11 | understood | want [41] 4/7 5/16 7/1 7/1 |
| toward [1] 12/10 | undertaking [3] 6/23 7/13 | 8/6 9/9 10/23 10/24 11/1 |
| Tracey [1] 29 | 45/13 [2] 45/7 54/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 3 & 16 / 3 & 17 / 14 & 18 / 6 & 18 / 8\end{array}$ |
| track [2] 19/11 48/15 | underway [2] 45/7 54/23 | $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 14 & 18 / 16 & 19 / 13 & 19 / 16\end{array}$ |
| TRACY [1] 1/11 | undisclosed [1] 42/22 | 24/13 26/25 27/12 31/1 31/3 |
| tranche [15] 12/23 14/5 | unfolding [1] 43/18 | $32 / 12$ 32/20 38/8 38/11 41/ |
| 14/10 14/25 15/10 16/4 17/1 | founded [1] 62/8 | 42/7 42/9 42/25 52/2 54/2 |
| 27/5 28/21 29/4 29/5 29/7 | unified [1] 54/5 | 55/11 55/15 57/9 60/5 60/6 |
| 29/8 29/13 29/18 | UNITED [3] 1/1 1/9 1/10 | 60/16 64/14 66/8 |
| tranches [1] 29/9 | unless [1] 24/12 | wanted [18] 7/5 10/2 11/6 |
| transcript [1] 69/16 | unresponded [1] 41/ | 17/20 25/2 25/6 26/4 27/3 |
| ransfer [1] 4/15 | until [10] 14/22 32/4 37/3 | 29/3 30/2 $31 / 19$ 44/18 $47 / 15$ |
| ansferred [1] 53/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 3 & 43 / 11 & 46 / 10 & 47 / 4 & 52 / 7\end{array}$ | 48/1 49/5 56/7 67/7 67/7 |
| transit [1] 48/5 <br> translate [1] 21/5 | unusual [1] 14/2 | warehouses [1] 23/15 |


| W | which [26] 5/5 25/14 28/6 | years [6] 13/18 17/16 21/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| was... [42] 8/25 13/17 14/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}28 / 21 & 35 / 2 & 42 / 4 & 45 / 17 & 47 / 1 \\ 47 / 6 & 49 / 19 & 51 / 12 & 53 / 25 & 55 / 8\end{array}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{rrrr} 22 / 10 & 23 / 24 & 39 / 24 \\ \text { yes [3] } & 28 / 3 & 48 / 7 & 52 / 19 \end{array}\right.$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 5 & 16 / 12 & 17 / 6 & 18 / 10 & 20 / 1\end{array}$ | $47 / 6$ $49 / 19$ $51 / 12$ $53 / 25$ $55 / 8$ <br> $59 / 10$ $61 / 21$ $65 / 8$ $65 / 19$ $65 / 19$ | yes [3] $28 / 3$ $48 / 7$ $52 / 19$ <br> yet [6] $34 / 24$ $45 / 23$ $51 / 20$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 3 & 20 / 3 & 20 / 15 & 23 / 1 & 23 / 17 \\ 25 / 4 & 35 / 8 & 35 / 9 & 35 / 12 & 35 / 13\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 66/8 } & 66 / 24 & 67 / 14 & 67 / 14 \\ 67 / 15\end{array}$ | y ${ }^{\text {y }}$ (22 55/25 66/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 25 / 4 & 35 / 8 & 35 / 9 & 35 / 12 & 35 / 13 \\ 38 / 23 & 41 / 20 & 41 / 20 & 42 / 13 \end{array}$ | 67/17 67/17 67/22 | YOO [8] 3/7 47/22 48/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}42 / 18 & 42 / 20 & 42 / 23 & 43 / 13\end{array}$ | while [3] 26/1 53/3 55/24 | 49/11 49/15 52/16 54/13 |
| 43/16 50/7 52/24 55/20 56/15 | whip [1] 36/1 | 59/16 |
| 58/17 58/18 59/5 59/6 59/16 | WHITELEY [7] 2/4 2/5 60/25 | Yoo's [1] 55/11 |
| 59/25 60/8 62/23 63/4 64/15 | 61/1 62/23 63/24 64/2 | York [2] 2/9 3/2 |
| 64/24 | Whiteley's [1] 63/3 <br> who [27] 4/4 10/13 11/13 | you [235] <br> you some <br> [1] 66/24 |
| Washington [2] $2 / 23$ 3/5 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}14 / 7 & 14 / 14 & 14 / 18 & 15 / 16 & 15 / 20\end{array}$ | your [57] 6/24 8/10 10/11 |
| Watts [2] 2/1 57/18 | $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 24 & 16 / 12 & 16 / 15 & 16 / 18\end{array}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{llll}10 / 18 & 12 / 16 & 18 / 4 & 18 / 7 \\ \hline 18 / 18\end{array}\right.$ |
| way [11] 4/18 8/17 10/20 | 16/22 18/17 $22 / 5$ 22/18 $22 / 20$ | 24/20 26/11 28/1 30/2 30/4 |
| 11/4 11/20 $39 / 2$ 44/2 59/11 | 23/24 27/15 27/17 $40 / 5 \quad 49 / 23$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 9 & 32 / 8 & 32 / 13 & 33 / 2 & 33 / 9\end{array}$ |
| 67/24 68/8 68/25 | 51/21 54/6 55/19 64/10 67/12 | 33/10 33/17 35/6 36/9 36/13 |
| ays [1] 22 | whole [2] 31/21 56/25 | $37 / 18$ 37/21 37/24 38/4 38/6 |
| we [377] | why [4] 22/25 42/20 62/7 | 39/23 39/24 40/1 40/2 41/12 |
| we'll [4] 4/3 23/3 23/7 | 62/7 | 41/14 $41 / 16$ 41/16 $42 / 1$ 44/16 |
| 20 | will [115] | 48/7 48/19 49/12 52/14 52/17 |
|  | willing [2] 49/3 49/4 | 52/20 52/23 54/16 56/8 57/15 |
| week [16] 7/21 8/14 10/7 | window [3] 57/21 57/22 60/3 | 57/17 58/12 60/10 60/20 61/2 |
| 10/17 18/21 18/21 19/11 | winnowing [1] 68/10 | 61/3 63/1 63/25 64/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 16 & 28 / 14 & 28 / 14 & 37 / 10\end{array}$ | wish [2] 4/7 18/7 | yourselves [1] 68/7 |
| 50/20 57/2 58/4 58/6 65/17 | withdrawal [1] 14/19 | Yu [1] 14/17 |
| weekend [1] 56/15 | ithholding [1] 19/20 | Z |
| weeks [9] 5/3 5/4 5/4 13/22 | $58 / 2159 / 7$ | Z's [2] 31/5 31/5 |
| 37/9 40/15 62/20 69/2 69/12 | without [2] 40/23 56/25 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { ZANTAC [19] } & 1 / 4 & 4 / 6 & 4 / 11\end{array}$ |
| Weiselberg [1] 1/ | witness [3] 37/2 37/2 37/3 | 8/24 9/3 9/19 14/20 14/21 |
| Weiss [1] 1/12 | witnesses [10] 29/16 29/18 | 15/17 15/21 15/24 17/6 21/3 |
| welcome [6] 4/6 11/17 11/23 | 34/15 35/22 36/20 36/23 37/1 | 22/4 $22 / 10 \quad 23 / 11 \quad 24 / 1 \quad 25 / 14$ |
| 12/4 26/19 27/1 | $37 / 13 \quad 42 / 1249 / 7$ | 27/16 |
| well [30] 4/9 4/18 6/19 7/12 | won't [1] 9/23 | Zantac's [1] 14/15 |
| 8/11 11/8 19/3 22/25 $24 / 21$ | word [2] $33 / 6 \quad 34 / 22$ | Zoom [2] 1/8 67/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}25 / 1 & 28 / 16 & 29 / 19 & 30 / 1 & 31 / 4\end{array}$ | words [3] 5/20 6/6 10/6 | Zoom [2] 1/8 67/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 23 & 34 / 15 & 38 / 8 & 41 / 25 & 45 / 4\end{array}$ | $\text { work [29] } 6 / 16 \quad 6 / 22 \quad 7 / 11$ |  |
| 48/3 49/25 50/11 51/5 55/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 9 / 17 & 18 / 11 & 18 / 22 & 27 / 16 & 30 / 14 \end{array}$ |  |
| 56/16 56/20 60/8 66/11 67/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 36 / 8 & 36 / 21 & 36 / 22 & 37 / 12 & 37 / 13 \end{array}$ |  |
| 69/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 37 / 16 & 40 / 8 & 40 / 9 & 40 / 20 & 44 / 9\end{array}$ |  |
| went [1] 28/7 | $49 / 17$ 50/8 58/7 59/8 60/18 |  |
| were [34] 8/23 8/24 10/3 | $64 / 23 \quad 65 / 3 \quad 65 / 5 \quad 67 / 1367 / 1$ |  |
| 11/6 12/10 13/22 19/9 22/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 04 / 2 \\ & 68 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 22/24 27/5 27/6 29/5 29/14 | 68/5 |  |
| 30/17 30/21 35/7 42/15 45/4 | wo |  |
| 48/5 48/5 55/4 58/4 59/13 | 15/24 18/17 26/23 36/2 50/3 |  |
| 59/23 59/23 60/1 61/17 61/19 | working [19] 5/22 6/19 6/23 |  |
| 61/21 62/5 62/6 62/8 64/16 | 9/24 19/22 19/23 25/10 32/1 |  |
| 65/9 | $36 / 6$ 37/19 40/9 40/16 49/4 |  |
| WEST [4] $1 / 2$ 1/5 $3 / 2$ 3/16 | 55/21 66/11 67/23 68/5 68/6 |  |
| what [89] | 68/8 [2] 36/2 |  |
| whatever [1] 9/18 | works [2] 36/24 |  |
| Wheelan [1] 15/23 | world |  |
| when [22] 6/15 22/5 22/21 |  |  |
| 23/7 23/15 23/23 24/4 27/14 | worried [1] 64/15 |  |
| $30 / 2131 / 7$ 33/6 34/5 35/21 | worth [1] |  |
| 39/19 41/21 43/24 45/6 58/2 | would [75] |  |
| 59/16 63/14 64/15 69/9 | wrong [1] 19/19 |  |
| where [22] 6/3 7/3 8/4 11/4 |  |  |
| 16/10 20/14 22/17 24/24 | X |  |
| 30/17 31/3 36/3 38/20 39/15 | Xarelto [3] 13/12 21/2 21/2 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 39 / 17 & 40 / 22 & 41 / 6 & 42 / 2 & 48 / 5 \\ 48 / 15 & 51 / 8 & 67 / 12 & 67 / 21 \end{array}$ | Y |  |
| whether [13] 10/23 40/12 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll} & 40 / 13 & 43 / 4 & 46 / 13 & 46 / 16 & 48 / 10\end{array}$ | year [16] $4 / 8$ 4/13 $4 / 13$ 10/4 |  |
| 48/17 52/2 52/10 54/2 59/19 | 10/10 12/18 13/16 18/7 20/8 |  |
| 68/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 22 / 13 & 24 / 4 & 35 / 6 & 35 / 23 & 44 / 22 \\ 45 / 7 & 52 / 22 & & \end{array}$ |  |

