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THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. We are here for a status conference in the Zantac MDL. It is being conducted by Zoom due to COVID pandemic.

Again, as I say each time, and I just remind everyone, we are not holding any in-person proceedings, and that is why the status conference is conducted in this way. There is no one in the courtroom other than myself and the Court Reporter.

I do want to remind you if you would state your name for the record so that we can ensure that your comments are attributed to you by our court reporter.

This is the first status conference in 2021. We did two weeks ago have a discovery conference, and as you may recall, the Court had indicated, based on input from counsel, that it would be a good idea, at least during the first phase of this 2021, to try a system whereby every month we would have a discovery conference where we would take up discovery matters, and every month we would have a status conference where we would take up all other matters, not necessarily discovery matters, but other matters that were impacting the MDL, at least that was the Court's intent and the Court's vision.

However, I have included today as one of the agenda items a discussion as to whether that matches leadership's vision and whether there is anything that we needed to discuss in that regard. I know that there were a few discovery related
items that one side or the other had recommended be included on today's agenda, and the Court did not include it because the Court thought, based on the vision the court had had and the understanding with the parties, that those matters would be more appropriate for the discovery conference which would be coming up in two weeks.

So, the fact that we were having a conference each month means, as I discussed last time, that we would actually be seeing each other every two weeks because we are staggering them, that is for the conferences. You could be seeing the Court for other reasons, including hearings, which at the present time there is a discovery hearing set for next Tuesday.

With that being said, let's turn to our agenda, and the first item on the agenda, which is one that both parties had recommended be included, and I am glad to see that as it is one of the very important aspects of this MDL, and that is the census process and the registry. And so I am anxious to hear an update from counsel as to how that is going.

I understand that for the Plaintiff Mr. Pulaski will be presenting, and from the Defense Mr. Petrosinelli will be presenting. So, if you would kindly turn your videos on.

Let's see. Good afternoon, Mr. Petrosinelli and Mr. Pulaski. I hope you both are doing well.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Doing well, thank you, Judge. Nice to see you.

MR. PULASKI: Good to see you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Nice to see you as well.
Let me turn it over to both of you to give the Court an update on how the census process is going and how the registry process is going. I would say that these updates are most certainly for the Court's benefit, but in addition, it is for the benefit of all of the approximately 181 people who are attending this conference.

While certain of you are involved, I know, tirelessly day in and day out on the issues, including, but not limited to, registry and census, many of the participants in this litigation are not involved on a day-to-day basis. I want everyone to know that the reason for putting certain items on the agenda is not just for the sole benefit of informing the Court, but importantly, making sure that all of the participants in this litigation are kept apprised and aware of the pressing issues that encompass this litigation as seen by the Court and also by leadership for both Defense and Plaintiff.

With that, you may proceed with your presentation.
MR. PULASKI: Joe, do you want to start?
MR. PETROSINELLI: Sure. Good afternoon, your Honor.
This is Joe Petrosinelli.
THE COURT: Good afternoon.
MR. PETROSINELLI: A couple of things I thought we'd
bring to your attention, mainly just to give you an idea of the sequence as we see, say, the first quarter of 2021.

We -- as your Honor may recall, the last PTO related to the census was PTO 56, and that was an important PTO because it established a deadline for correcting deficiencies in the Census Plus forms. That deadine for the first tranche of forms is January 30th, so coming up pretty soon.

I can assure your Honor that Mr. Pulaski, Special Master Dodge, and I have been working tirelessly to sort of manage that process. I think we have made a ton of progress. Many, many Plaintiff firms have corrected -- upon receiving a notice from LMI about the deficiencies have corrected those deficiencies. We still have some way to go, and we will see what develops over the next ten days.

Mr. Pulaski and Special Master Dodge and I have talked about how we are going to approach things once that January 30th deadline comes and we sort of take a breath and see how many forms have come in, but we have various ideas.

I think, for the Court's benefit just sort of anticipating, I think we will have a PTO or two, a proposed PTO or two to come to the Court perhaps as early as next week, but surely in the immediate aftermath of January 30th, proposing how we might deal with some of the issues that remain.

The top line message is that things are going as we expected they would be going, meaning there are some
deficiencies that have been corrected, there are some that haven't, and we are going to keep moving down that path and get as much done as we can by January the 30 th.

So, that is what we have been spending -- since we saw your Honor in December at the December status conference, that is what we have been probably spending most of our time on relating to the census.

There is also the data analytics, obviously a hugely important piece of the census and the registry, and we continue to get reports from LMI that on my side I share with the liaison counsel for the other Defense groups so they can cascade it to their constituencies, and we sort of can implement new things as the case goes on.

For example, as your Honor knows, the Plaintiffs' leadership recently indicated the ten cancers that, at least at the moment, they are going to be pursuing in the MDL, and so that gives us some data to work with and look at the census to see how many of each of those cancers have come into the census, and how many claim forms are in the census that don't involve those cancers, and we are still looking at that data, but I think that will be useful information for the Court and parties.

I think, your Honor, once we get past this January 30th deadline, to my mind, and I think Mr. Pulaski agrees, there are some cleanup things, as I say, we will want to do and
submit proposed PTOs to the Court.
After that, though, I think where we are headed next is to figure out -- I think Mr. Pulaski has called it Defendant mapping, I call it Plaintiff mapping, but we both agree on the point, which is, now that we have -- if you have a non-deficient form we will be collecting proof of use and proof of injury records so that we can see whether the boxes that the claimants checked in their forms about which product they took and during what period doesn't match with the records that we are seeing, and come up with a process for reconciling differences, and so that from both the Plaintiffs' side and the Defense side, we know the, quote, unquote, right parties are indicated in each form.

It's a really, really important process for the Defendants, as you might imagine given the number of Defendants in the litigation overall, but $I$ think just as important for the Plaintiffs, and so we have our medical records vendor, as the Court knows, and we will work with them to sort of figure out the best and most efficient and most cost effective way to do that for the parties.

And then finally from my perspective, Mr. Pulaski will have some things to add especially on this point, which is we have had some technical issues. We continue to have a few technical issues mainly related to the electronic nature of these submissions. It is perhaps, you know, to be expected
given the number of claims we have, but we continue to work through some of those issues.

It doesn't make our lives easier, but we are trying the best we can to troubleshoot when things come up and Special Master Dodge, obviously, has been invaluable in that effort.

I guess I did have one more thing to say. Your Honor will be happy to know -- and I want to publicly thank our LDC members who have played a huge role in this process. On the Defense side -- I am sure it is true on the Plaintiff side as well, but on the Defense side we have a team of LDC members who have been instrumental in what $I$ would call the nuts and bolts of getting Motions to Dismiss on file, I know your Honor has seen a few of those, tracking deficiencies.

It is an enormous task, it is a very important task, and I would be remiss if $I$ didn't tell the Court that that has been a great aspect from my perspective on the Defense side of having the LDC members involved in that.

So, I think I will stop there and let Mr. Pulaski add any words, but that is my report, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Petrosinelli.
MR. PULASKI: Thanks, Joe.
Your Honor, thanks, Adam Pulaski of Pulaski Kherkher for the Plaintiffs. I will address these maybe not in the exact same order that Joe did, but hopefully cover the same topics.

One is that, as Joe mentioned, we have a very large number of claimants in the registry now at this point. I have spent, along with some others on our side, and with Special Master Dodge's help, along with the help of LMI, who is our repository of choice, chosen by the Defense and the Plaintiffs, working with the Plaintiffs' Bar on the deadline that is coming up pursuant to PTO 56. It is -- while we are working with not only LMI, but also with Cerner and Epic, and some other vendors who are assisting the Plaintiffs, which was necessary because of the large number of registrants in the registry, we are doing everything humanly possible to try and meet and cure deficiencies by the end of the month deadline.

As Joe mentioned at the end, and I am going to put it at the forefront of my discussion, we have been having some technical issues involved with data transfer either from firms directly into the portal at LMI or from our vendors such as Cerner transferring data into LMI, and again, Special Master Dodge and Mr. Petrosinelli and I have been working on an almost daily basis getting through that process to ensure that we can meet all our deadlines timely.

My message to the Plaintiffs' Bar that are on this call is, I want to make sure that everybody continues until the last day of the deadline to do everything that you can to diligently cure your deficiencies and get them in at this point.

We understand completely that it is imperative to the success of the registry process and the census process to provide not only meaningful data, but complete data, because, as Mr. Petrosinelli alluded to, the data analytics portion of this, which is so important to the Defense side and the Plaintiffs' side, and hopefully for the Court as well, only works if the data works.

I think we are at a point now I can tell you that the data analytics that we look at on our side gives us a very clear picture of what this litigation looks like.

At our last conference we had 65,000 people in the registry, claimants, and now we are, obviously, well beyond that. I don't know an exact number today, but $I$ can get it for the Court should you like to know.

The data that we're looking at on our side, and I'm sure on the Defense side as well, will certainly help guide us through the bellwether selection process that is going to begin in only a few short months and also, hopefully, at some settlement negotiations sometime down the road.

I cannot tell you how meaningful it is to us, and I have not only what we call our data analytics committee, but also our bellwether committee working hand in hand to get a head start and jump on the bellwether process and be prepared for when we start in earnest in a couple of months. So, everything is going well with that.
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We have the Defendant mapping. As your Honor knows, through PTO 50 and 52 the Defense has provided us a plethora of information that has allowed us to understand what each manufacturer produced, the form it was in, the dosage it was in, the time, the start and stop dates. There was a little bit of delay because once we gathered all this information and we had to digest it, we put it into a spreadsheet, sent it back to the Defendants to approve. It took awhile to get them to approve everything that we had put in the chart because there was so much of it.

So, LMI, again who is our repository, sent a Defendant mapping spreadsheet out to each firm. They set up a separate portal in their system that only covers Defendant mapping for us to track and use, which I think is working very well. There were some changes made by the Defense to our spreadsheet, so we updated the spreadsheet and just sent it back to LMI and to the Plaintiffs' Bar as a whole. So, there are some changes being made and we are working through those changes to make sure that the portal is still accurate, and we are getting through that as quickly as we can.

I will tell you that the only other thing, really, as Mr. Petrosinelli mentioned, we are looking to introduce and deliver to you a suggested PTO that hopefully we will have agreed to by next week. This is a massive undertaking, not only because of the size of the number of registrants in the
registry, but the number of Defendants and number of products that are involved, and the length and size of the CPFs.

So, while we have worked through this process for eight or nine months, Joe and I and Special Master Dodge have found some areas that we think we can streamline and make more efficient for the Court, for the Plaintiffs and for the Defense, and while we understand we have deadlines that we need to keep and issues and PTOs that we must abide by, we feel that these are matters that would only benefit this process that is new, and it will not only help our litigation, but hopefully other litigations in the future.

So, that is everything I have with respect to the registry and census, and $I$ am certainly happy to answer any questions if you have any, or $I$ am sure Joe is as well.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you so much, Mr. Petrosinelli and Mr. Pulaski.

I do have some remarks that I want to make both for your own benefit, but as importantly, the benefit of everyone who is listening as the census and registry process is just a vitally important part of this litigation.

The Defense mapping is critical to the registry, and I am so pleased to know through the PTOs and the hard work that that is going well, albeit not without some hurdles that you have had to confront along the way.

I am delighted to hear that the LDC members are
intricately involved. I would like to hear that they are involved generally, but particularly in this area that is still relatively new to the MDL world, and so for them to get an opportunity from the ground level up to be able to not only become familiar with, but actually work on this aspect of the litigation, I think just affords them wonderful opportunities and a knowledge base that $I$ know will serve them in the future.

And while I may not see and know each and every one of you who are working on the MDL, just know that your work is appreciated, and I have always felt that when people do a very good job in their task, even when they don't know that somebody is watching or knowing exactly what they are doing, that is the greatest testament to a work ethic.

I just want to assure you that your work is being recognized and will continue to be recognized, and continuing in the way that you have been performing is not only important to this MDL, but I believe important to your growth as a lawyer and as a contributing member to the firm and organization with which you all may be and are affiliated.

The other remarks I wanted to make were that I want to commend both Mr. Petrosinelli and Mr. Pulaski for all of the time that I know you and the special master have put into working on all of these issues. I understand that this in many ways is an unprecedented process in that you have had to think quickly and adapt quickly to challenges that -- some of which
you anticipated, some of which you have not been able to anticipate.

I think it is a tribute to your work that the registry is as popular as it is. It seems to go up by the tens of thousands each time we meet and it speaks to the success of the component parts that you have put into the registry. You have also been faced, as everyone else has in all other aspects of the litigation, of course, with the pandemic which doesn't make anything easy, and none of that could have been foreseen when we embarked upon this process many, many months ago.

I do continue to be impressed by the creative solutions that you come up with and your common desire to effectuate justice and your willingness to work through the difficult issues and not give up on it, because $I$ think at any given moment it could be easy to give up and abandon the process.

I know from the beginning that the deficiency process has been one that has been fraught with certain issues, and may be more contentious than some of the other registry issues. Now that we have seen that play out, however, I think from what I have come to understand at least from the filed case process, that the deficiency process has worked very well.

I have seen the process of deficiencies being cured and therefore cases not being dismissed where Plaintiffs have done the right thing and cured the deficiencies, and I have
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also issued orders where it is clear that the deficiencies have not been cured, the order to show cause has been issued, and there has not been a response or a response that provided good cause to the Court and there have been dismissals.

Again, all of this is in the context of the larger purpose of what $I$ see the census and registry accomplishing, which is, among other things, the sharing of information and a winnowing of claims and of parties both from the Plaintiff and the Defense.

Given how large and complex this case is, the fact that this can be going on both in the filed cases and in the unfiled claims continues, to me, to be a very, very important part of narrowing parties, claims, and this benefits, in the Court's view, both sides, the Plaintiffs and the Defense.

To the Defendants, $I$ do understand the importance of working through this in the same way that we have worked through filed cases, in other words, working through the claims and the registry. However, given the volume of the claims compared to at least the filed cases, and there is a great disparity in the number, of course, I do expect that it will take LMI longer to do their reporting, and in turn, for coordinating counsel to do the review and to have the five-day notices issued.

And with all of the work, $I$ know that there is a forthcoming PTO, so I look forward to seeing that. I do
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encourage you, as I think you have done in some of the PTOs, and the Court has adopted that recommendation, to consider whether you clarify the special master's authorization to create tranches of the rolling five-day notices so they are all not coming at you at once given, again, the volume of claims that Mr. Pulaski reports at each status conference.

It seems to the Court that this would be very helpful to all of the parties, but whether you adopt that approach or any other approach, I ask that all of you be patient, this is all counsel, particularly in this instance on the Defense side. There are many, many Defendants in this case. Be patient with coordinating counsel, be patient with LMI, be patient with the special master.

I have been made aware that they are working pretty much around the clock on these matters and will continue to do so in an expeditious manner, but that it will inevitably take a little bit longer than some of you may feel. There are technical and practical complexities involved in the process and then there is just the sheer volume of claims, so it does take time, but it is being worked on, and it is important. It is important to the Court, it is important to leadership, and the end result is one that will benefit all of the parties.

To the Plaintiffs, $I$ understand that there have also been a variety of challenges that you have worked through with these deficiencies, and that is why PTO 56 gave you a longer
period for this tranche of deficiencies. And I know that some of you may have been uniquely impacted by the technical issues, and it may be those of you who have larger dockets and may have felt the impact of some of the technical difficulties more than others.

I do want to encourage Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' counsel to, particularly those with large dockets, but even those who have smaller dockets, to continue to work with Mr. Pulaski and the special master, and particularly with the upcoming deadline, you know, picking up the phone tomorrow and early next week so that there can be a discussion about where you are in the process, and assistance can be provided to you where needed to facilitate curing the deficiencies.

I do want to remind the Plaintiffs' Bar that we do have in the PTO a good cause provision. So, if a client has had an extraordinary circumstance with cancer and perhaps experiencing COVID and just simply unable to help in completing the forms, then, this would seem to me to be the kind of exceptional circumstance that coordinating counsel and Plaintiffs' counsel would work together with the special master to provide an extension, but $I$ suspect that -- I hope those are more of the exceptional cases and that the majority of the cases are not experiencing any difficulties as it relates to illnesses and things of that nature.

In that regard, Plaintiffs' counsel must be diligent
in completing the deficiencies in the CPF because $I$ will not be issuing any global deficiency extension, but will be following the deadline that is set forth in the PTO.

We are about a week from the deadline, so it is important that we are having this status conference now, and for the Plaintiffs' counsel that are on this call and for Mr. Pulaski, who $I$ know is a zealous advocate for all Plaintiffs' counsel and values the importance of communication, and is always putting forth the position that he feels is in the best interest of the Plaintiffs, but recognizing that he needs to work with the Defense -- and he and Mr. Petrosinelli have really had a wonderful working relationship where they respect and regard each other's views, but know that there is a larger process in play that needs to be accomplished in order for the registry to be a successful component of this litigation.

```
So, for those Plaintiffs' counsel, I strongly
```

encourage you to, if you have not already, or if you have, but
you have not gotten all of the answers that you need to cure all of the deficiencies, to get on the phone with your clients and begin going through your files to provide the answers to as many questions as possible. If you have six deficiencies now and you are able to cure five of them, that is better than not curing any of the six. Continue to take a hard look at what can you do to correct those deficiencies.

Ultimately, it is your responsibility and while you
may leave certain obligations to your client, at the end of the day, if the deficiency isn't cured there may be repercussions that will adversely impact your client, so you do need to be diligent in these matters.

The registry was not created to see anybody fail. It was not designed to have everybody enter it only to be deficient in their forms and then have to exit the registry. Nobody would have put in the time and the cost in this process if they thought that was really what was going to be the end result. It was never intended as a gotcha. Every effort, through the PTOs and through counsel, have been put forth in giving every reasonable opportunity to ensure that people can meaningfully participate, but you all have to do your part of the work that is involved.

To Mr. Pulaski and Mr. Petrosinelli, you two have really done a terrific job, as I said, in balancing the competing concerns and trying to find just outcomes and paths through all of these issues. I have no doubt that you will continue to do so working with Special Master Dodge and I just encourage you to keep up the good work. I really do appreciate it.

I know it is frustrating, $I$ know it is long, $I$ know it is arduous, and you have not necessarily seen the big outcomes. You have seen maybe little results, but not sort of the real meaningful results, and this is one of those examples where
hard work does pay off and patience will see its way through to the results that we are all hoping for with the registry.

So, I have no further comments or questions unless there was anything that $I$ said that you wanted to respond to.

MR. PETROSINELLI: Not for me, your Honor. Thank you for your comments, and we will keep working through the process.

MR. PULASKI: Yes, Judge, I appreciate the kind words, and all $I$ can say in response is that, $I$ know you are aware, I know Mr. Petrosinelli is aware, the Plaintiffs' Bar has been spending a very large amount of time, in addition to money, trying to make sure that everything is entered properly in the registry, all claims are entered in the registry timely, and we will continue to do so. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you both so much.
MR. PETROSINELLI: Good to see you, your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: Good to see you as well.
The next matter on the agenda is that of the State and Federal liaison designations. I understand that for Plaintiff we have Mr. Pulaski, and for Defense we have Mr. Agneshwar.

If you want to come on to the screen, Mr. Agneshwar. How are you doing?

MR. AGNESHWAR: I am doing fine. How are you, your Honor?

THE COURT: Good, great. Mr. Pulaski, good to see you again.

I understand this also, if $I$ am not mistaken, was a jointly suggested topic that be put on the agenda. We talked about State and Federal liaison before, and you have been so good each time as I get an update as we prepare for these status conferences, although the report doesn't necessarily make its way into the opening remarks, but you do update the Court on the level of activity that is going on in State Court, and it is very helpful to the Court in knowing that.

And I take it that you both, both Defense and Plaintiff, have arrived at a point where you believe designations for liaison for the Defense side and Plaintiffs' side to help coordinate, and the communication that goes on between Federal and State litigation is important, but I would like to hear from you about that, and to the extent that you have persons in mind, $I$ would like to know that as well.

In some instances we have a number of liaisons that have been already appointed in this case, and some have come by way of agreement, and so a notice of agreement has been filed. Perhaps this is something you want to do on your own and you just want to apprise the Court of the designation, and in other instances, there has not necessarily been an agreed upon process and we have sought through one of the PTOs, I think 16, applications.

So, I look forward to hearing from you how you intend the process to work.

MR. PULASKI: Thank you, your Honor.
So, just to give you a brief background, Mr. Agneshwar and I spoke early this morning to make sure that we are all on the same page, and I will let him speak on behalf of the Defense.

As far as the Plaintiffs are concerned -- and I have asked Dave Matthews to pop on real quick if that is okay with you, your Honor. He is an attorney that has been working with the MDL outside of the PSC, he has been assisting us with science committee issues and other issues, and has been practicing for a very long time. I wanted to introduce him as the person that we are going to designate and working with me on the State/Federal liaison coordination side of things.

This week we had several phone calls already with litigants in Illinois and Tennessee, California, New Mexico, Texas, and I believe in New York, so we have begun the process unofficially, and officially $I$ just wanted to let you know that Dave Matthews is the person that we felt would best fit this role on behalf of all Plaintiffs in this litigation to be the liaison for State and Federal on our side.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Matthews, it is nice to see you.

MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you, your Honor. Good afternoon.
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THE COURT: Just a couple of questions and then $I$ will hear from Mr. Agneshwar as to the Defense side of the State/Federal coordination.

Mr. Pulaski, is this something that you envision you would submit a notice of agreement and would you envision a PTO being entered, as the Court has done with other liaison positions, or not necessarily, and was it simply a matter that you wanted to bring to the Court's attention?

MR. PULASKI: Correct. At this point, I don't think that it is necessary unless the Court believes that it is so. I just wanted to apprise the court of the fact that we did all feel -- it was unanimous among the coleads that Dave was the right person for the job, and that we wanted you to be aware and we would like Dave to, obviously, be able to present information to you at status conferences.

If we need to go a more formal route, we are happy to do so, but for now, we were very comfortable just letting you know that we had selected Dave to handle this on our behalf and it's up to you.

THE COURT: Okay, terrific. I appreciate that.
Mr. Matthews, was there anything that you wanted to let the Court know at this point in your new role? I don't know how long you have had it, but congratulations.

MR. MATTHEWS: I would only say this, Judge, I have reached out to each and every claim that I think I know about
currently, and will be able to communicate to the Court once I get my arms around this just a little bit better. I have a lot of experience in State Courts across the country, I filed in many State Courts over 35 years in this arena.

I can than only say this, that $I$ will do my very best to get my arms around this as fast as I can and will be able to respond to you in any shape or form that you request. THE COURT: I appreciate that, and I appreciate you bringing the wealth of knowledge and experience that you have both in State and Federal. As a former State Court Judge, I do understand the State Court system, at least in our circuit, and appreciate the hard work that State Court Judges face. They don't have nearly the resources that we are fortunate to have as Federal Judges, and so, having someone such as yourself on behalf of the Plaintiffs serve a coordinating role, a role that will facilitate communication, $I$ think will be very, very important, knowing how heavy the dockets are in State Court. So, just being informed at the status conferences about what is happening in the State Court litigation will be helpful to the Court, but also if there is anything that you think we can do in this litigation, or $I$ can do as the presiding Judge in this case to make it an overall effective and efficient process not only for the litigants and claimants in our case, but for other litigants litigating in other venues, I would be most interested and appreciative of hearing
of that.

MR. MATTHEWS: Understood, and I will plan on being on all of the CMCs from this point forward.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you came in just in time because we are having a lot of them, so mark your calendar.

How about from the Defense?

MR. AGNESHWAR: Thank you, your Honor, Anand
Agneshwar, I represent Sanofi, but I am speaking on behalf of all the Defendants.

I agree with Mr. Pulaski and Mr. Matthews that there does not need to be a formal order. We really wanted to apprise you of what we are doing. I am playing the part for the Defendants, although $I$ intend to rely heavily on LDC members and other lawyers at the firms to provide the Court updates as we move forward, as we have done in the past.

This area has been an opportunity for us to get LDC members to report on the activities. Many of our more junior lawyers are very involved with keeping track of what is going on in the various jurisdictions.

Candidly, the less I have to talk about it and present issues to your Honor, the better, because as long as things are coordinated -- I understand there is going to be state court litigation. As much as we'd like everything to be in the MDL, we know that is not going to happen, but our interest is in coordination, in communication, in making sure that, you know,
when there is opportunities for depositions, for hearings that might affect others, that we're coordinated and to bring things to this Court's attention and to the State Court Judges' attention, and it is really when -- I think most judges are ones who want to coordinate. There is a lot of learning from this Court.

What we are finding so far is that judges are interested in what is going on in the MDL and are interested in the updates and want to stay coordinated. It is when we have issues with depositions or other things that I think the liaisons can get together and see if we can break through it and come up with a solution, and at that point, seek the Court's intervention.

Fortunately, there is nothing to report just now, so we don't have a report on the activity in State Court even at this time. I suspect in the coming CMCs we will need to dig a little deeper. But for right now, it is just telling you that we have these structures in place and intend to keep track of everything and get back to the court on an as-needed basis.

THE COURT: Wonderful. I appreciate that, Mr. Agneshwar, and appreciate that although you are formally serving in the role, that you have made it clear, and you always do at each of the conferences, that you rely heavily on the LDC members, and this is yet another very, very critically important point.

Sometimes the LDC members may think, gee, it is not at the forefront of the litigation, maybe my work is not being seen or heard about, but let me just tell you that even though I may not see your face at this particular moment, I understand the importance of what you are doing, and just as $I$ said about the work of the LDC members on the registry and the census, just do your work well.

There are tremendous benefits from just doing a good job. Whether you think the role is small or large, whether you are seen or not seen, it does pay off, and in any event, this is a vitally important role.

The parties have a right, if there is a legal basis, to litigate in one forum versus another. While I do understand that coordination and consolidation for some, and perhaps many, is desirable, but then again, at the end of the day, people do have a choice as to where they litigate and if the law provides for such, that's where they can.

It doesn't mean that even if there are separate litigations going on, Federal and State, and you know, the State is different parts of the country, that there can't at least be efforts to communicate and to coordinate, because at the end of the day, if there to be efficient use of resources, of your time, of your money, that helps everybody, of the judicial resources.

I go back to what I started earlier with Mr. Mathis, I
know how busy state Courts are and state Court judges are, and quite frankly, the Federal Courts as well, and the pandemic has not helped because it has backlogged a lot of things, so we are laboring under our own difficulties.

All of that is to say that when you communicate and coordinate, it does not mean you are usurping or taking away someone else's authority or rights; it just means you are trying to be smart and practical and efficient about how you manage litigation.

I try to do that as a judge, and clearly counsel in this litigation are trying to do that as leaders of the litigation, so $I$ appreciate it, and thank you for the update on this agenda item.

MR. PULASKI: Thank you, Judge.
MR. AGNESHWAR: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The next issue on the agenda is the New Mexico motion for leave. When I say that I mean the State of New Mexico filed an unopposed motion for leave to file a motion to remand pursuant to amended pretrial order 24, and that's at Docket Entry 2567.

Let's first begin by having counsel who I understand are Kyle McGee and Daniel Pariser.

MR. PARISER: Exactly right, your Honor.
THE COURT: I got it?
MR. PARISER: You got it.

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

THE COURT: We have Mr. Pariser and Mr. McGee. Nice to see you, new faces.

MR. MCGEE: Nice to see you as well.

MR. PARISER: Good afternoon, your Honor, it is a pleasure to appear in front of you virtually.

THE COURT: Thank you.
I tried to make it clear that $I$ was not taking this up on the merits. In other words, this wouldn't typically be how the Court would take a matter up on the merits. I am very particular and methodical about that. I wait for something to be fully briefed which, by the way, this is, so not only has the motion come in, but the response has come in, and then we had the reply which came in, and I have read them.

I thought we might as well take advantage of the fact that we had a status conference and this motion ripened at the time that we were having this status conference, giving you an opportunity to introduce yourselves to me and vice versa.

Sometimes I find these matters lend themselves to kind of just a practical discussion. So, in my non MDL cases, I love having status conferences on matters that seem so difficult sometimes to understand on the paper, not the merits of it, but just the practical implications of something. If you could just talk to the lawyers you would have a better feel for what the right thing to do is, in other words, what is the most sensible thing to do.

This seemed to be a good occasion to have you address the issue. I will just say I always kind of like to size up what I understand the issue to be, and then have you clarify or correct anything that $I$ have misstated.

In essence, my understanding is that we have the New Mexico case that has already been transferred through the JPML to this litigation and now we have counsel for the State of New Mexico, with no opposition, except maybe a conditional opposition, wanting to file a motion for leave to file a motion for remand, and you followed the procedures, and I thank you for that, amended pretrial order 42, so you got the agreement of Plaintiffs' leadership to do so.

The only hangup I guess I am understanding -- not hangup, sort of like when do we have this briefed out.

First of all, I noted that in the motion it was indicated at paragraph two that the District Court from which this case came, so the transferor Court, didn't resolve the motion to remand prior to the State's case being transferred here, but that it is fully briefed.

One question $I$ had was by "fully briefed," do you mean motion, response, reply, and would you envision that the same motion, response, and reply would be filed in this Court? In which case, does that mean your briefing is all done and you are just waiting for permission to file it, or has anything changed such that maybe a different motion might be filed here
or a different response or a different reply?
Then, I guess I wanted to more fully understand the City of Baltimore relationship. I understand the City of Baltimore is not here yet and it is opposing, at least as of now, the transfer, the conditional transfer, and to the best of your knowledge, you think that that would be taken up at the next JPML meeting which, to the best of your knowledge, is at the end of March.

At that point, we will see what happens, but if it goes the same way that the State of New Mexico went, it would be transferred here and I guess counsel for state of New Mexico is also counsel for City of Baltimore, so you can represent to the Court what $I$ glean from the papers which -- I think I glean from the papers that a similar motion would be filed, but it might be a little different because we are talking about state law in Maryland versus State law in New Mexico.

So, that is my understanding of the issues. You can fill in the blanks and let's try to figure out the best way to handle this procedurally, not getting into the merits.

MR. MCGEE: Right. Thank you, your Honor. If it is okay with you, I will launch.

A couple of things to clarify. It is true that the motion to remand that the state of New Mexico filed in the District of New Mexico Court is fully briefed, and by that we mean the motion was filed, the opposition filed, and the reply
was filed, and there was a notice of completion of briefing, which is a procedural item that was filed in the District of New Mexico. The Court had the ability to take that issue up, and did not, so the JPML transferred the case.

So, in our view, it would be, you know, completely economical and sensible to take that briefing and have your Honor consider it at her earliest opportunity.

And I don't have any reason to think that that would not be acceptable to Defendants. It is not a question I have raised with them, but given that we adhered to a traditional briefing schedule and briefed that issue in real time, I don't see why we couldn't take those papers and have them considered by your Honor.

With respect to the Baltimore representation, I think it is important to clarify that there are a number of different issues in play there, some of which we flagged in our brief, in the reply brief. One of them that wasn't flagged, though, is that I am counsel to both of these Governmental Plaintiffs, that is true, but I am not the only counsel. I have co-counsel in both cases.

My client is -- unlike a traditional private Plaintiff, my client is the lead counsel in those cases. The New Mexico Attorney General makes decisions in that case. The City Solicitor and City Law Department make decisions in the Baltimore case. I answer to them.

I think it is important that your Honor understands that while I am counsel to both of those Governmental entities, in terms of decision making, I answer to higher authorities in both instances, as is customary in Government public/private relationships.

And so, in addition to that, an important nuance, the reply brief that we put in did also acknowledge that there are different issues of state law. There is a diversity issue raised in the Baltimore motion which is not present in the New Mexico motion, so there are some differences that $I$ think are potentially consequential and meaningful, in addition to the fact that the Baltimore case, of course, is not before your Honor, and is subject to a pending motion to remand in the District of Maryland.

For all of those reasons, we don't really see the commonality or overlap that Defense counsel purports to see. We don't think it is really appropriate to make decisions about what happens in New Mexico's case, which is before your Honor, based on speculation and hypotheticals about what may happen in March regarding the Baltimore matter.

We have a motion that is fully briefed, let's move forward with that. That is our view.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I appreciate that and I will hear from Mr. Pariser.

I will say just, you know, I do have an inkling about
when you are counsel for a Governmental entity, I have worked in Government both at the Federal level, but also at the city levels. I was in the City of West Palm Beach Attorney's Office, so I do have an appreciation for the dynamic of counsel representing Governmental entities and authority that is needed from those Governmental entities as it relates to what outside counsel does.

So, what say you, Mr. Pariser?
MR. PARISER: Thank you, your Honor. Daniel Pariser, I represent Sanofi, but speaking on this issue on behalf of all Defendants in the New Mexico case. Thank you for getting my name right twice in a row, so I appreciate that.

First, to answer your question about whether new briefing is in order, $I$ agree to a certain extent with counsel for the Plaintiff in general, the issues that were previously briefed before the New Mexico Court are going to be the same issues. I don't imagine major differences, but the Federal law that will govern the removal standards at issue here is Eleventh Circuit law, and that will differ.

So, typically in MDLs, when this procedural posture is -- exists, the practice is to rebrief the issue so that we can be sure that we are addressing the Eleventh Circuit precedent that governs your Honor's decision. I don't anticipate that will be a major reworking of the briefing papers, but typically does require some degree of further
briefing.
So, putting that question to the side, just to address the point about commonality, I think your Honor actually put it exactly right, because there are different State laws at issue here, there is a little difference in the issues being briefed, but there is an overriding commonality with respect to one of the central removal theories that the Defendants urge in this case.

I am mindful of your Honor's direction not to get into the merits of that issue, but just at a very high level, the question is whether or not the highly regulated nature of the pharmaceutical industry is such that Plaintiffs have to prove as an affirmative element of their State law claims non-compliance with FDA regulations, and while State law does bear on that question to a certain degree, Federal precedent is going to be cited.

There is going to be a question of whether or not that issue is substantial within the meaning of the Grable case and other Federal precedent to justify Federal question jurisdiction, and I think from my perspective, what is not as important are the differences, because there are some, but whether efficiencies would be realized if the Court were to wait and address the common issues together.

Really our intention in bringing this matter to the Court's attention was just to apprise the Court of those common
issues and the prospect that there might be some efficiency and economy gains in doing so.

To address your Honor's point about the practicalities of this situation, the one thing that $I$ want to flag here is that with respect to the timing, the -- how quickly this Court could rule on the City of Baltimore motion really is an issue that is entirely within the Plaintiffs' control.

As your Honor indicated, right now the City of Baltimore is opposing transfer of that case to the MDL, and that is why, with that posture, the case wouldn't be transferred until probably the end of March. If the City of Baltimore were to withdraw that opposition, then the case would be in front of your Honor essentially in no time.

The posture here is such that the judicial panel on multi-district litigation has already rejected the New Mexico Plaintiffs' argument that the case was not suitable for transfer to the MDL. For all intents and purposes, the arguments about suitability of transfer are identical between the New Mexico case and the City of Baltimore case.

So, at least based on my experience, it is really unfathomable to me that the panel would not ultimately transfer the City of Baltimore case.

So, at least from the Defense perspective, speaking in practical terms, the most efficient and expeditious way to resolve this issue would be for the City of Baltimore to
recognize the inevitability of transfer, consent to transfer, and then your Honor could promptly and expeditiously address both motions and gain some efficiencies in the process.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much for your perspective.

Let me ask a couple of questions.
So, while Plaintiffs may feel that the briefing is the same, I think it is fair to say that if one party or the other doesn't believe that the briefing is the same -- so, for example, Mr. Pariser gave at least one example, that he would need to look at Eleventh Circuit law in re-evaluating his response -- certainly $I$ believe it is incumbent upon the Court to afford that opportunity to both sides, and I would hope that neither side would disagree with that.

If the Court were to consider, whether it is at this juncture or at a later juncture, let's just talk about what you anticipate the briefing schedule looking like.

So, if the Court were to permit -- again, let's not talk about when the Court permits it, but at some point a motion for leave for the Plaintiff to file -- the State of New Mexico to file a motion to remand, how soon after such an order would you be prepared to file your motion?

MR. MCGEE: We are prepared to file the motion as soon as your Honor allows us to, and we have already updated it to reflect Eleventh Circuit law if that is the direction that your

Honor wishes to go.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, it is not the direction the Court wishes to go, it is your motion. You would file a motion in whatever form you felt was appropriate given it would be heard before me. But you are saying it is ready to go?

MR. MCGEE: Yes.
THE COURT: Would Defense anticipate then just the standard time under the local rules for a response?

MR. PARISER: While I hesitate to speak for whoever might be doing the drafting, which may not be me, I think that the time period under the local rules seems like an appropriate time.

THE COURT: So, that gives you time either to refile what you have already done in New Mexico or to tweak it, as you say, but for all intents and purposes it would be within the time contemplated by the local rules.

And then, presumably the reply period would also come within the local rules by the Plaintiff?

MR. MCGEE: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: So, it looks like it would be fully briefed out sometime in early February if the Court were to grant it, let's say, tomorrow. You'd get it filed on Monday and you are looking at sometime mid to end of February it would be fully briefed out, as opposed to if the City of Baltimore is not successful in its opposition to the transfer, and that
didn't get transferred until the end of March, you would then be looking at the end of April. So you are looking at a two-month difference of time.

On the issue of overlapping, but not identical issues, why wouldn't it be the case, from the Defense standpoint, if we had it briefed out and the Court were to rule on it, wouldn't the Court's ruling be helpful to the parties, so if and when -if, and then if so, when City of Baltimore makes it here, you might have the benefit of a Court ruling that would help you narrow the issues, if there are still issues to present, in a motion for remand and there really wouldn't be duplicative work because the overlapping issues would presumably have been addressed by the Court in its initial order, and then you would just conform your briefing accordingly.

Wouldn't that be another efficient way to go about it?
MR. PARISER: Your Honor, again this is Daniel
Pariser. I think we are actually really less concerned about efficiency from our perspective, but just wanted to bring these commonalities to the Court's attention in case the Court believed that there's efficiencies.

Speaking for myself, I think seeing the full body of case law and how it is applied and plays out in both of the similar cases at the same time, again from my perspective, would be helpful for the Court, and help the court see the big picture and address these issues holistically, but obviously
that is entirely within the Court's discretion and is based on how the Court perceives it.

We wanted to make sure the Court understood there were significant commonalities here, and from our perspective, it would be appropriate to address them at one time.

We hoped we could get the Baltimore case here more quickly and address it all at one shot. If we can't, I still think the length of time that we are talking about is a fairly modest time period.

THE COURT: Okay. I guess two more questions.
Do you anticipate that the briefing -- was the briefing all done within the page limit proscribed by the New Mexico local rules, which I imagine are probably similar to the Southern District of Florida? In other words, were they reasonable page numbers? Not like what we just saw in our Motions to Dismiss, not that they were unreasonable, but they obviously needed more pages to do what they needed to do in their Motions to Dismiss.

Did you keep yours within your page limits?

MR. MCGEE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. PARISER: We will be mindful of briefing the issue concisely, your Honor.

THE COURT: It wasn't -- I was just thinking in terms of when the Court might be able to tackle the motion, so I was just trying to get a little insight into it.

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

Let me just be very clear, the Motions to Dismiss were all very well done and concise, but concise in a lot of pages just because there was a lot to say, and the orders were long, too. So they may say I could have been more concise as well.

The second question is, I want to ask from the Plaintiffs' perspective, what prejudice, if any, is there in waiting what we agree may be two months, if it plays out the way it might play out, in having the Court have the benefit of not only hearing what you have to say about your motion for remand, but maybe what your esteemed co-counsel from the City of Baltimore may also say and Mr. Pariser's co-counsel -- maybe not co-counsel, but Defense counsel in the City of Baltimore, you know, is -- maybe there is some value in hearing -- getting the best of what everyone has to present at once.

What, if any, prejudice is there to the Plaintiff in waiting maybe, at most, two months to have it briefed out -- to begin the briefing, I should say.

MR. McGEE: I actually wanted to, if I may, direct your attention back to a comment that $I$ made in an email that $I$ attached to the reply where we had an email exchange between Mr. Petrosinelli and myself.

We actually offered that we could have a stipulation of sorts, you know, in the event that there is a ruling on the State's remand motion and it addresses these issues of a Federal question arising through Grable and its progeny case
law, that could be held applicable for other Government entities.

So, that was sort of the way $I$ was thinking that we could maximize efficiency without losing time, and that was not acceptable for reasons that remain unarticulated, I think. So, I think that still makes a lot of sense, that your Honor is given a chance to rule on these Federal question jurisdiction arguments. That will, in fact, have some commonality for other Government Plaintiffs, not only Baltimore.

Ultimately, where you end up on this is that, what happens if another Governmental entity files a case, then are we waiting another two months? Where does this end?

From our perspective, we filed our case in June of 2020, in the State of New Mexico and we have had very little progress to date because the case was removed, and then we were briefing CTO, we briefed remands.

And so, procedurally we feel like we have been in limbo now since that time, and waiting more is -- I understand it is not the worst form of prejudice in the world, but that is the nature of the prejudice that we are looking at and I am worried that there is no limiting principle. If another city or state files a case, are we going to be revaluating the timing? I am not sure there is a principled way around that.

THE COURT: Okay. I think I understand.
Was there anything more that either side wanted to
add? This has been very helpful to understand the context of the briefing.

MR. PARISER: Your Honor, this is Daniel Pariser. Very, very briefly, I want to address the sort of parade of horribles comment.

Your Honor can address that situation if and when it comes up, but I don't foresee that being a significant issue here, I think the Court should make the best decision based on the Court's own views of what is the most efficient way to manage the Court's docket.

THE COURT: All right. It was a pleasure to meet both of you. The Court will turn its attention anew to this matter now that it has had the benefit of your practical input.

MR. MCGEE: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. PARISER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Take care. Be well.

The next topic is the topic of monthly status and discovery conferences, and I believe we have Mr. Gilbert for the Plaintiff, Mr. Bayman for the Defense.

This was a topic that $I$ put on -- you kind of did, but then $I$ made it a different kind of agenda item. Let's first have counsel introduce themselves.

MR. GILBERT: Good afternoon, your Honor. May it please the Court, Robert Gilbert, Plaintiffs' colead counsel. Always good to see your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Good to see you, too, Mr. Gilbert.

MR. BAYMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor, Andrew Bayman, counsel for Boehringer Ingelheim, appearing on behalf of all Defendants. You are about to hear from two old faces, your Honor, in more ways than one.

THE COURT: In my comment I was going to say something that -- since it was good to see new faces, that it was not good to also see old faces, meaning not old in any way other than we have been seeing each other for the better part of a year. We are almost going on our year anniversary, actually.

So, I didn't want anyone to feel put out, any message to get misconstrued, or read more into what the court did than sort of what is at face value that $I$ want to explain, and that is that when $I$ saw the two proposed agendas, I think it was Plaintiffs' counsel had requested that certain status updates on discovery be provided to the Court.

Make no mistake, I am all ears when it comes to hearing about anything and everything related to this case. I can't hear enough because there is so much going on and I benefit when I am informed, for sure. I like being informed in any event.

However, we began the year, coming off of 2020 , with kind of a new process that we were going to try, with the understanding that loosely we were going to see how it went for
about three months, not hard and fast, but you know, to see if there were ways in which the Court could improve its management, its oversight, allow for greater communication channels, and allow you to see more of me and vice versa, and make sure things don't slip through the cracks as we were entering a new phase of the litigation.

With that being said, $I$ think we all had agreed, so it was a shared vision is the way $I$ remember it, that we would have a status conference every month, which we were trying to do last year, and I think for the most part did. Maybe it was every other month. I know it slipped at the end because of the Motions to Dismiss and when we ultimately got the hearings scheduled, but we couldn't account for COVID for sure, so there was some adjustment on the front end with that, and getting used to Zoom.

In any event, it ended up being either once a month or every other month, but the Court has made certainly a concerted effort to say, starting this year, that we would have a status conference every month, and that we would have something new. So, that was old, but we are continuing it on a more regular basis and a consistent basis, and what was new was monthly discovery conferences, and that we would have the discovery conferences staggered with the status conferences so that we were really seeing each other every two weeks.

If $I$ wasn't explicit about it, $I$ thought it might be
implicit that the discovery conferences would be for discovery, and then the status conferences would be for matters that did not relate to discovery.

As you can see, we already had three very important matters. Census and registry probably could consume a whole status conference if we really allowed it to, I suppose. Federal/State is really important. I imagine that those issues will continue to, you know, take up time and reporting. And then we have the motion from New Mexico, we may have a different one next month, and there may be unexpected issues.

I just wanted to make sure that $I$ was allotting sufficient time, while not taking too much of your time. The idea of the status conferences is not to elongate them and just fill the time because $I$ am very sensitive of your own dockets, I mean your time and expense in appearing, and when you are here, you are not doing something else.

It is not just being here, you do a lot of work to prepare to be here, I know you do. You put the agenda together, you want it to be meticulous. You are trying to anticipate is it what $I$ want, what $I$ don't want.

I know that also must be stressful, and I don't want that to be the case. This is supposed to be a situation where this is facilitating your ability to do your work, not interrupting your ability to do your work.

So, I took the discovery matters off -- when I say
"discovery" I mean the updates, because the way I read them they were updates, and I figured, well, I just heard an update two weeks ago, and I am going to hear one in two weeks, let's hear about non-discovery matters and let me hear the updates in two weeks.

So, that is how I envisioned our discovery conferences to be, I would get discovery updates at the discovery conferences, I would get non-discovery updates at the status conferences, and at all times there is the hearing process available. If there is a discovery dispute, pursuant to PTO 32, you have a dispute, you try to resolve it, you can't resolve it, boom, you file your motion and you are heard and that's a hearing. That is where relief is sought, there is an actual and real dispute, it has been briefed or it has been teed up per the instructions.

So, if it is heard by the Magistrate Judge, Judge Reinhart has his own set of instructions, and it is teed up, and the argument is heard and relief presumably will be awarded based on -- or afforded, you know, based on what the arguments are that are presented either to Judge Reinhart or to me.

So, in that regard, I wanted to explain what my understanding of setting the status conferences and discovery conferences are and why I took the discovery updates out. I did not want it to be misconstrued as the court not understanding it to be important, counsel not wanting to tell
the Court. I didn't want to signal anything other than what I am saying in a very transparent way.

I put it as an agenda item so you could be heard, too. I could have said that's the way it is and just move on to point number five, which is one of my favorite points always on the status conferences, hearing from the LDC members. I think it is everybody's highlight, that is why we always end on a good note.

But I put it as an agenda item because $I$ believe that you should be heard as well, and if you have a different view of it, let me know.

With that, I will turn it over to counsel.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you, Judge. If it is okay with Mr. Bayman, $I$ will go first. This is Robert Gilbert, Plaintiffs' colead counsel.

First of all, we appreciate your explanation of why you took the matters off. I would like to spend a couple of minutes with you trying to articulate from the Plaintiffs' counsel perspective why we believe -- what we understand the purpose of both of these conferences to be and why we believe that, while they are both different, they are very complimentary and can work hand in hand together.

With the Court's permission, I will proceed. Thank you.

First I will discuss the discovery conferences. As
your Honor will recall from two weeks ago when we got together on January 6th for the first conference, you articulated your vision that the purpose of the monthly discovery conferences are for informational conferences only, just like you said now, they are not to replace the PTO discovery relief mechanisms that are in place, they are so both sides can report ongoing discovery progress.

You did on January 6th ask for our suggestions on how we might change or improve that process, and we have one suggestion that we would like to present to the Court about how to facilitate the forthcoming discovery conferences beginning in early February.

It relates to something said by your Honor at the last one in terms of what would go onto the agendas.

In addition to having a set of topics on the agenda for each discovery conference that both sides agree on, and that both sides speak to in their respective two-page submissions, we think it is critical to allow both sides, it might be Plaintiffs one month, it might be Defendants another month, to include and report on an informational basis about topics that we may not agree on, or do not agree on, on an informational basis only.

We think it is important to do that in the context of discovery conference because it relates to discovery, because these are topics that while they may not have ripened into a
formal dispute where relief would be sought per PTO 32, they are nevertheless brewing, and we don't want the Court to first hear about these when a motion for formal relief is filed and have the Court say to us, as you told us and encouraged us many times earlier in this litigation, if there is something brewing, I want to hear about it as early as possible.

So, we would respectfully recommend to the Court, suggest to the Court per your invitation, that these discovery conferences allow both sides to address the agreed upon topics on an informational basis only, as well as any topics relating to discovery that one or both sides do not agree upon, where relief is not being sought, but we are reporting on it to the Court so that you are aware of it, as was the case on January 6th when the subject of the Sanofi email destruction came up.

Clearly it was not something that both sides agreed upon, but we believed it was critical at that juncture for the Court to be aware of that brewing issue.

So, that is the suggestion we have for the discovery conferences. We understand their purpose. We appreciate the Court taking up our recommendation that they be scheduled and we look forward to participating in them going forward.

I would just close on the discovery conference issue by saying this: If we limit it to only those topics that are agreed upon on both sides, the Court will never hear about a
brewing issue on an informational basis that one side or the other doesn't agree to, and that would mean that the first time the Court would ever hear about it is when a formal motion is filed.

We think that, given your Honor's desire to be involved intimately in making sure that this MDL moves forward on an efficient and timely basis, that that wouldn't be the best way to handle it.

With the Court's permission, I will turn to the monthly CMCs.

From our perspective, the monthly CMCs serve dual purposes. First, as you noted earlier in this hearing, they provide the Court and the Zantac legal community at large with updates on issues like the census registry, the status of the State Court litigation, and other topics of general interest, but they also serve another very important purpose that is fundamentally different than the discovery conferences.

We believe, your Honor, respectfully, that scheduling issues should be discussed, not a discovery dispute about documents that weren't turned over, or a deposition notice that somebody is objecting to, but we believe that scheduling issues in the overarching scheme of things should be discussed at the monthly CMCs so the Court is aware when, like now, we believe the trains are off schedule, the court can discuss with counsel at the CMC why the trains are off schedule and whether and how
they can be put back on schedule and whether an adjustment to the schedule needs to be contemplated.

By hearing about the scheduling issues at the monthly CMCs, the Court will be able to give important feedback to -that provides insight to both sides about how the Court views those scheduling issues and their overarching impact on the litigation before formal motion practice takes place.

It may winnow the scope of motion practice. It may alleviate the need for motion practice. It may help guide one side or the other in the positions they are staking out that affect the schedule for this case.

So, I would suggest, on behalf of my fellow coleads, that these scheduling discussion at our monthly CMCs are one of an MDL transferee judge's tools for keeping the MDL litigation on track or adjusting it when circumstances warrant.

We believe for that reason that the monthly CMCs are the appropriate forum for these types of discussions because when scheduling impacts the overall litigation and the schedule that this Court adopted back in June of last year, this Court needs to know about it and understand it and work with both sides in a collaborative fashion to try and figure out how to either put that schedule back on track or to adjust it.

So, my final -- our final suggestion about the CMCs is the following: In the spirit of what $I$ have just laid out, we suggest, your Honor, that -- by the way, before I lay this out,
we appreciate, and $I$ am sure $I$ can say this on Mr. Bayman and Defense counsels' behalf as well, we appreciate your sensitivity to not imposing any greater burden on us in preparing for these conferences than we already have. We do appreciate that, but this is so important that even if there is a small additional burden for us, it will help us and help the Court in managing this litigation going forward.

So, with that in mind, our suggestion would be that the parties submit, with Special Master Dodge's assistance, a proposed joint agenda five days before the CMC, including both agreed and non-agreed topics, similar to what we have been doing up until now, a little bit earlier; that separate and apart from the joint agenda, that two days before the CMC that both sides submit a single letter from their respective sides, copying the other, to the Zantac email address setting forth our respective positions on those topics that are either agreed upon or disputed in the joint agenda; and that the Court then meet with colead counsel in advance of the actual CMC, the morning of, the afternoon before, after your Honor has had an opportunity to receive and digest not only the agenda itself, but our respective views in our two, or three, or four-page written submissions about our respective views about these issues so you are not hearing about them for the first time in the context of a hearing with 180 participants.

We think that would be very helpful, it would allow
the Court to digest the parties' respective positions before the CMC takes place and allow the Court to meet with us in advance of the CMC to try to either resolve, or narrow, or further understand those issues and ultimately expedite the CMC itself.

Lastly, and you made reference to it just a moment ago before you called Mr. Bayman and I up, we would urge the Court, given that folks' schedules for 2021 are filling up -- and I know the Court's schedule is busy as well. We would urge the Court to issue a schedule soon setting forth the dates for the next several monthly discovery conferences, which we know from prior discussions with you are going to be held the first week of every month, and for the several monthly CMCs, which we understand are going to be held in the middle of each month, so that all counsel on both sides can block those dates on our calendars and we can then set the deadines on our calendars for submitting the joint agendas and our corresponding or respective submissions in advance of those conferences.

I know making the dates firm will help everybody in planning and preparing to make those submissions timely and more efficient.

I am happy to answer any questions you have for me now or after Mr. Bayman makes his presentation.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Gilbert. Yes, let's hear from Mr. Bayman.
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MR. BAYMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Andrew Bayman, King and Spalding, lead counsel for Boehringer Ingelheim, but speaking on behalf of all the Defendants.

Your Honor, this is the first that $I$ have heard of some of these suggestions from Mr. Gilbert, so I am kind of responding on the fly, but $I$ would say at the outset that the Defense's vision is entirely consistent with the vision you articulated about what the discovery conferences were to be about and what the case management conferences were to be about.

We don't think it is appropriate at a case management conference to have discovery issues on the agenda given that the Court has said you want to try, at least in the beginning, this system where we have monthly discovery conferences and monthly CMCs.

Frankly, in my experience, CMCs that did not involve discovery that occur on a monthly basis can be as short as 30 minutes or an hour. They do not need to be long conferences. Your Honor has pointed out that all of these conferences are expensive. We have 172 attendees on this Zoom conference today.

It takes time to prepare the agendas. We are very careful and very meticulous about that. It takes time to prepare the arguments and the presentations and these are very expensive to a lot of our clients.

My concern with Mr. Gilbert's proposal is that he is suggesting we add more complexity and more expense to the process rather than making them more efficient.

As your Honor mentioned, there is a process in place for resolving discovery disputes under Pretrial Order 32. That process requires the parties to meet and confer, including to have a final meet and confer with Special Master Dodge. We believe that system has worked. There have only been two discovery issues that have come to hearing so far, there is one coming next week, so the parties do have an opportunity to avail themselves of Pretrial Order 32 and its processes.

We think it would be inappropriate to allow these discovery conferences to become forums for the parties arguing their respective positions before the issue has been joined. There is often a great benefit to having continuing meet and confers before the parties' positions get hardened, and we don't think it is helpful to have even a preview of the dispute at the discovery conferences.

Both you and Judge Reinhart made it very clear when you announced this new system that these discovery conferences were to be for updates and not as forums for people to air their complaints and their grievances. We believe that is the right approach. We believe that approach is working, and we believe that the discovery conferences should be for discovery issues.

The CMCs should be for the kind of issues that we have discussed here today, and we don't feel that it would be helpful to add more complexity and more time and more expense such as been suggested by Mr. Gilbert.

So, I think that is an overview of where we are, your Honor. I am happy to answer any questions or elaborate further if need be.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me walk through what $I$ think I heard because I think, to some extent, the answer was maybe broader than the question, but I do welcome the input because I did ask for feedback at the last conference, and it is fair to say I always, you know, welcome feedback.

I do think it is important, you know, the parties be able to talk about the feedback so that they are not having to necessarily respond on the fly, because then $I$ will get the most meaningful feedback from both sides.

With that being said, I started off with a question of my understanding that, for the most part, updates on discovery wouldn't be heard at a status conference, it would be heard at the discovery conference, explaining that is why $I$ took it off.

I know, Mr. Gilbert, you spoke about but we want to be able to talk about timing issues on the status conferences. I don't think $I$ have ever said you can't talk about timing issues, but if it is timing issues related to discovery I would -- and by the way, in looking back over the joint
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submission of the letter that was sent, it really wasn't couched under proposed topic number two as a timing issue. It was discovery, general discussion of discovery schedule, and then update on status and continued viability of PTO 30 discovery schedule, and then it broke it down by brand, generic, retailer.

Are we all in agreement that -- I look at that as sort of an update on discovery. And so, that is what $I$ meant by that is what $I$ envision being on a discovery status conference and not on a status conference.

If there was a timing issue, let's say that there were concerns of -- let me see, it is hard to keep all of the -- PTO 30, the schedule and if there is a timing issue non-discovery, because that really does not relate to discovery, it relates to disclosure of cancers and experts and things of that nature, that is, to me, a timing issue, but it is not a discovery timing issue.

Are we all in agreement that until we find it is not working, that -- we had a conference two weeks ago, we are having one in two weeks -- that just general status updates on discovery should be given at the discovery status conference and not at the case management status conference?

MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, Robert Gilbert. Of course we are in agreement that general updates on discovery should be given at what you called or titled the discovery conferences.

As I was saying, as long as we have an opportunity to, in an informational setting, to share with the court the impact that some of these discovery issues are having on our overall schedule under PTO 30 -- if you say, Mr. Gilbert, I want the Plaintiffs and the Defendants to tell me that at the monthly discovery conferences, you may have different views about it, but I want to the hear from you about it at the monthly discovery conference, then we will provide it to the Court at the monthly discovery conference and not at the status conference.

I was simply -- we need, and I know that there will be a time that Defense feels that they do as well, we need an opportunity at one of these conferences to be able to address issues on an informational basis that you -- that may be or will be impacting the overall PTO 30 schedule, even if my colleague on the other side doesn't agree that they impact.

THE COURT: Okay, that is the second issue. Issue number one, then, discovery matters are heard at the discovery conference, informational status update, every month we will have them for the time being. We all agree that is the process in place until someone suggests that you feel it is not working or the Court feels it is not working.

Consistent with that, that is why I took that piece of the proposed agenda out, where it began with discovery and went down right before presentation, it was for that reason and that
reason only. It looked to me like it was a status update, exactly the kind of update that would go on the discovery conference. I didn't see anything problematic about it and so I would just say you cut and paste it and that would be part of the two pager that you present in advance of the discovery conference.

That is issue number one. It sounds like we agree on that.

MR. GILBERT: Yes.
THE COURT: Secondly, I don't think I ever said -- I know I didn't say it for the status conference, and I don't think I said it for the discovery conference, and if I did, I apologize if $I$ am not remembering correctly, but clearly $I$ didn't say it for the status conference because, in fact, you both submitted different agendas, proposed agendas, and I think what I have made clear is that the Court sets the agenda for the conferences, but the Court wants your input.

I could not get your input and just talk about what I wanted to talk about, but I don't think that is very productive because I wouldn't know all of the things that you wanted to talk about that $I$ would just not be aware of.

So, I envision the input process to be educational for the Court. As you can see, I selected most everything, and there was a reason why I didn't select the other; it was that you are going to be heard, but you are going to be heard in two
weeks, let's use this for the other items. You don't have to agree on the agenda items.

So, I guess to your point, Mr. Gilbert, yes, you can submit -- we do have the two-page process in place for the discovery conference. We thought for the status conference we would make it a little more streamlined and it would just be sort of topical issues with maybe a brief explanation, a line or two of what would go under the topic. Again, I didn't want to overload anybody.

But you don't have to agree on the items. You didn't agree on the items here and the court picked the ones that it wanted to hear about and actually added its own, which is what this part of it is.

So, if I didn't make that clear, or if it sounds like I am changing, maybe $I$ didn't articulate it clearly last time, you don't have to agree. Then, yes, you arguably would never be heard on an informational update basis. I still strongly require and believe for the reasons I have articulated why you should confer and explain to the other side what you are putting on the agenda so no one is unfairly surprised, so people have a chance to consider the issues so they can give a meaningful response, and so the court gets a meaningful update and not just a one-sided update.

It is hard for people sometimes to think on the spur of the moment, some are better than others. It is always
better, I think, when you have some advance notice, which is why I put the one day in advance process in place, or the two day in advance process in place for the discovery and for the status conference.

So, you don't have to agree. If you thought you had to agree, you don't.

I think the two page -- let's give it another month. We were going to do it in two weeks. I thought the last two pager was really helpful. Let's see what this two pager looks like.

So, I hope that answers the second point that you brought up, that you don't have to agree, and that the Court will ultimately decide. You have to trust the Court that when it reads both two pagers, and one side has put forth one issue, and the other side hasn't, or neither side has put forth an issue, that there is usually a rhyme or reason why the Court has not included something or the Court has included something you haven't proposed. Then $I$ will try to explain, like I am doing now, why I didn't include something.

And as far as disputes, I don't hear anyone disagreeing, disputes are heard in the way the disputes should be heard. It is an untenable position to put the court in. You can be assured that if the Court is being updated every two weeks on discovery and non-discovery matters that nothing should shock the Court or so surprise the Court when it hears
of a discovery dispute, or any other kind of dispute pursuant to PTO 32. If so, then the court is not paying attention, and shame on the Court.

You are giving the Court updates regularly and so if a dispute comes in, it just tells the Court that something was not able to be resolved that it is either big or small, but of enough significance that the dispute process needs to go forward and go to a hearing and that it what the hearings are.

You don't want to put the Court in a position of opining, surmising, saying things off the cuff. You know that is not how the Court operates. If there truly is a dispute, I want it to be fully teed up, I say briefed because I am using sort of traditional language of motion practice, but we know the discovery process has its own teeing up language in terms of the process in PTO 32.

And then either $I$ or Judge Reinhart will give you a full opportunity to be heard on the nitty-gritty details of the dispute because that is what is required when a Court hears a dispute, not -- it is not a general update, it is truly this is the dispute, here are all the factors, and the court is then applying the law to the dispute, to the facts, and affording or not affording relief that is being sought.

So, we don't want to get into any kind of a situation where it is a quasi, $I$ am not really asking for relief, but I am previewing something that might or might not happen in a
dispute.
I just think if we stick with the updates, the court is going to be informed and let the dispute process play out the way the dispute process was intended per the PTO.

I don't think $I$ heard anyone say anything differently. I just want to reiterate why that is so important to the court. I don't want to be in an uncomfortable position, I don't want you to be, and I don't want you to put me in an uncomfortable position of speculating or saying something.

I don't write down everything $I$ am going to say at a status conference, so I don't want you to take something that I say and attribute it to a pending dispute and say, well, I think this is what she meant as to this dispute. It can't be what I meant because I am not hearing a dispute, or at least it is not my intention to hear of a dispute at a status conference.

I think the only remaining matter, Mr. Gilbert, was the proposal that maybe you tweak the way you prepare for the status conferences a bit, whereas right now, unlike the discovery conference where you send in the two-page summary, you are just sending in topical items for the agenda with a one or two liner, and then the Court will select and/or include its own agenda items.

You were suggesting, I think, five days in advance that maybe there is a summary, a one-page summary of what is
going to go on the status conference agenda, and then two days in advance the parties meet, and then there is also an in chambers.

Did I understand that as being the remaining issue? MR. GILBERT: Almost, Judge. First, thanks for your guidance, much appreciated.

What I was suggesting with regard to the agenda modification for the status conferences was as follows: The parties submit to the Court five days before a scheduled status conference the proposed joint agenda. It doesn't necessarily even have to be in the form of a letter, it can be five to ten bullet points, whatever. Some of them will be agreed and they can be flagged as agreed, some of them can be flagged as not agreed, Plaintiff request or Defendant request.

Whatever those bullet points are, both agreed and not agreed, that two days before the actual conference the Plaintiffs would submit a two or three-page letter to the Court, copy the other side, the Defendants submit a two or three-page letter to the Court, copy our side, and we would present to the Court in those letters our respective views, rather than it being just a bullet point, a little bit of color, a little bit of explanation about what our respective positions are on those bullet points on the agenda.

So that when your Honor thinks about what you want to keep on that agenda, and what you may choose not to include on
the agenda, you will be more fully informed about why we or they think it is important to keep on the agenda and what our view is on it.

Then, before we actually come in for the actual CMC, the Court could choose, if it felt comfortable, to have an in-chambers meeting with colead counsel to discuss these issues that you have chosen to put on the agenda and to try to work through them in advance of the formal hearing. That was my recommendation.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bayman, any opportunity to reflect?

MR. BAYMAN: Yes, your Honor. As I said previously, I think this is adding more complexity and costs than is needed. We not only as leads, we represent our clients, but we also represent the other Defendants, and a lot of time and expense is spent having to confer with the other Defendants in a litigation.

You are trying this new system, your Honor. It worked well the first time. I think we should stick with it, it is not broken. Mr. Gilbert, what he is suggesting is adding more complexity and more cost with more of these submissions that I am concerned become pieces of advocacy rather than updates about what the differences are.

And also, your Honor, bear in mind we have Special Master Dodge, she is involved in this process, she is
conferring with both sides. She can apprise your Honor if there are issues that you need to be aware of, whether it be scheduling or otherwise. And so, there is a -- this is an interactive process, and your Honor has the ability to get that information as Special Master Dodge confers with both sides or confers with us together.

So, my reaction is this is just more complexity and more cost that is not warranted and runs the danger of just becoming a vehicle for advocacy.

THE COURT: Okay. I thank you both.
It is definitely consistent with giving me feedback, which is what I want. I would encourage you not only to give me the feedback, but as you come to certain conclusions about new and improved ways of doing things, to share it with the other side. Even if the other side disagrees, I will then get the benefit of your thinking, you know, with some advance knowledge and preparation, and maybe even your ability to confer with coleads.

So, Mr. Bayman presumably would need to confer with other coleads. He is speaking now and I guess is comfortable enough doing so even though -- I guess if he is hearing it for the first time, arguably he didn't have a chance to speak with coleads, just as if Mr. Bayman were to say something, it wouldn't be fair to Mr. Gilbert to not have the ability to speak with his coleads.

With that being said, it is all in, you know, I believe in the interest of communication and what is in the best interest of the litigation and that is how $I$ am viewing the input.

I would say on a going forward basis what I would like to do for the next status conference is stick with what we have done for this status conference. Again, I have the letter in front of me. I don't believe that $I$ put a limitation. Again, I could be corrected if I am wrong, I don't have the transcript from the last status conference.

To be clear, there is no limitation on the issues, that is, you don't have to agree, so that nobody feels muzzled, nobody feels they can't be heard unless the other side -because that gives the other side always a veto over what you might want to update the court on and that was never the intention.

The other side might not like it, they might think it is not important, they might feel they're on the defense, but look, if the other side wants to put it on the agenda, they have the right to put it in the proposed agenda items and then the Court makes the ultimate call.

With respect to a little descriptive, I think your bullet points worked quite well, Mr. Gilbert, in this one. So, I would like to just stick with this format. I don't think I have a page limit, but you put the topic, and then you explain
what the issue is underneath, and that is perfectly fine.
That gives the Court an understanding of what you want to go on the agenda and then the Court -- if the Court had a question about what you meant $I$ could go through Special Master Dodge, or if $I$ am concerned about an issue, I could decide that I wanted to have an in chambers. I am not saying in chambers are not possible, we have had them and we most certainly will again.

I guess I am reluctant at this point, so new into the new system, to institute yet another standardized meeting, if you will. And I think you even suggested, Mr. Gilbert -- in the second iteration of your comments, you said -- I think I heard you say, if the Court thinks it is necessary.

Why don't you assume that any time $I$ feel that it is necessary $I$ will certainly let you know, and if anyone feels that an in chambers is necessary, you should let the Court know, and you can let the Court know through the special master so that I know you feel one is necessary separate and apart from these other two conferences we are having every month, and if the Court feels that it needs one, it certainly has had them and will continue to have them.

For the next status conference let's have an agenda like you have done now. You can give me a couple of lines, or on some issues it was a paragraph, of what you think the Court should hear.

It shouldn't be argument, it shouldn't be advocacy. It is, again, informational, update, status. And then the Court will ultimately conclude what goes on the agenda in the interest of what the Court thinks it should hear, what the public needs to hear, and, quite frankly, in the interest of being sensitive to time, which I am right now.

So, I would like to, unless there are any further comments, move on to the final agenda item.

I hope that everyone feels the process will enable you to be heard. Nobody can have a veto over other's issues. The Court might make a decision based on seeing two agendas and why one side thinks an issue should be on and why one side thinks it shouldn't be on, to conclude that it shouldn't be on. Just because you put it on the agenda does not mean it is on the agenda, but you certainly have the right to put it forth to the Court.

So, in that regard, I hope that that satisfies everyone's interest in feeling that they have been heard, which is an important part of the process in the Court's view.

MR. GILBERT: We appreciate and understand the Court's thinking, your Honor. As it relates to timing of scheduling, I understood from your Honor, I want to make sure I am a hundred percent clear, that issues relating to the schedule as it is impacted by ongoing discovery issues should be raised on an informational basis during the discovery conferences.

THE COURT: Yes. If they are discovery related matters they would be heard.

MR. GILBERT: I apologize, I am struggling with this. If a particular issue that is occurring related to discovery or issues are impacting the overall schedule, the topic of the schedule and the impact of those matters on the overall schedule, you would prefer that we raise them at the discovery conference.

THE COURT: If they are integrally linked to discovery. The status of $X, Y$, and $Z$ discovery is not proceeding as we had anticipated, and this is why, and this is what the implications of the discovery not going according to how we had envisioned it might play on the overall schedule, I would put that as a discovery matter.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you.
THE COURT: That impacts an overall schedule as opposed to a non-discovery matter that might impact the overall case management schedule.

I think it is easier for us. First of all, we always -- I know Judge Reinhart is on, but his face is not on the Zoom, so you are not seeing him, but obviously he is integrally involved with discovery and I would hate for discovery related matters -- there he is -- to come on without making sure that he was teed up and had the ability to be fully present as well, even though he already is fully present.
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Yes, Mr. Gilbert, if that answers your question, if it is a discovery matter that impacts the schedule, let's call it a discovery matter.

Just like today, $I$ will tell you, so if you aren't quite sure and you put it on your status conference and $I$ see it as a discovery matter, I am going to send a communication back and say, gee, I really see this as a discovery matter, so we will see each other in two weeks.

MR. GILBERT: Understood, and I appreciate it.

THE COURT: Did you want to say something, Mr. Bayman?
MR. BAYMAN: No thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. I appreciate the input and the feedback. Thank you so much.

MR. GILBERT: Have a good afternoon.
MR. BAYMAN: Thank you

THE COURT: You, too.

The final matter that we have on the agenda are the presentations by the LDC members. Today we are going to hear from Mr. Krause and Ms. Insogna.

Let's have you all say hello and state your names for the record.

MR. KRAUSE: Good afternoon, this is Adam Krause for the Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. INSOGNA: Good afternoon, your Honor, this is
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Katie Insogna for Defendants, I represent Sanofi in this case.
THE COURT: Insogna. Sorry, I didn't get it right. It is great to see you both. I am going to turn my mic off so $I$ can hear from you. Tell me what you are doing, how you are doing, and then anything else.

MR. KRAUSE: May it please the Court, I appreciate you letting me speak today. The last time we spoke was in May, I think, during my interview and I think it would be accurate to say that a lot has occurred since then.

You recall my law firm primarily focuses its time and attention on mass torts, in fact, many of the same adversaries that we have in this litigation. I also litigated against a hernia mesh and some of the environmental torts that my firm is actively involved with.

My particular interest has been in pharmaceutical mass torts because of the previous employment at Eli Lilly and Company, a pharmaceutical company. Over the last eight months or so I have worked closely with Mr. Watts and the other team members on trial strategy and the bellwether team. That same team has worked closely with Mr. Pulaski and the data analytics team to better understand the cases that have been filed in this Court.

Now that the document production has started to come in, I have been working on preparing for upcoming depositions with Ms. Finken and many others on the PSE team as well. The
group of individuals that are assembled to lead this litigation are extremely talented. The culture within our PSE is one in which we can volunteer for any aspect of the case and freely use our talents to develop the case.

My actual individual firm currently represents more than one thousand individuals who are suffering from cancer. We have hired a grief counselor to extend emotional support to those that need it. We have dedicated paralegals, legal assistants, and case managers that work exclusively on this case.

My firm and I and my team are excited to continue to work on such a righteous case, and kind of on a personal note, I do enjoy Zoom meetings, but $I$ cannot wait to come into court and meet the Court in person.

Thank you again for letting me speak today.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Krause, thank you for your work. I do remember you from your May interview. You obviously made a very positive impression on the Court which is why you were appointed to a leadership position. I am glad that you have been afforded the many opportunities that you have.

I always like to credit lead counsel in making the new structure that the court put in place with the LDC actually work, so that it is not in name only, but that they are fully integrating you, mentoring you, not that you don't come with
your own set of experience, clearly you do having been in-house, but being able to operate from the inner workings of this case and at every part of that aspect of the case that you want to volunteer, so it is terrific.

I am just so pleased that you are fully participating and I am sure that you are making a very positive contribution to not only the Plaintiffs' team, but I am sure to the Defense team as well, and to your fellow LDC members, as I recall hearing in prior updates that you have conferences with one another and have been able to provide a nice support network and I think that that is important to the litigation.

You see people as human beings, even though they are adversaries, but when you can see someone as a colleague, as a professional, as a human being, you tend to treat them a little bit better and you tend to listen to them a little bit more, and it tends to bring out the best in you and the best in them, which is good for the overall litigation.

We, too, took look forward to seeing you one day here in court and we hope it will be soon. We are spending a lot of time in our court implementing safety measures to ensure that nobody walks through a courthouse who will endanger her own safety or the safety of others. So, we meet weekly.

Actually, it is a big part of what $I$ do when $I$ am not doing MDL work, which is working on many, many different committees that are CoVID related as it relates to the
functioning of this courthouse and the judicial system overall, civil and criminal.

So, thank you.
MR. KRAUSE: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Ms. Insogna.
MS. INSOGNA: Thanks again, your Honor, good afternoon. Like I mentioned before, my name is Katie Insogna, I am a recently elevated partner at DLA Piper in Boston, and I represent Sanofi in this case.

Just by way of background about myself, I went to college at Georgetown, I went to law school at USC in Los Angeles, and then $I$ practiced in California for several years before moving with my family to Boston.

I have been involved in a number of other product liability MDLs, but am honored to be a part of the LDC in this matter. I have been working on the case from the very beginning, but most recently and extensively on science issues and also in preparation for Sanofi's 30(b)(6) depositions, I look forward to participating in those and many other aspects of the case.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to introduce myself to you today.

THE COURT: A.bsolutely, it is a pleasure to meet you and congratulations on your new title, your new status in the firm as a partner. That is not an easy thing to come by. I
know it takes a lot of hard work and dedication and commitment, so it clearly reflects very well on you.

It is a pleasure to have you as part of this litigation and to be able to see you here today, and I thank you for all of the work that you are doing.

Hopefully you are not questioning your move from the West Coast to the East Coast. Are you from the West Coast originally or are you from the East Coast?

MS. INSOGNA: I am originally from Cincinnati, but the weather in Boston is hard to --

THE COURT: It is not L.A.
MS. INSOGNA: -- hard to reconcile. It is not L.A., exactly, yes. I miss it for that purpose.

THE COURT: But Boston is a great city. I love
Boston. Good. Thank you so much.
Unless there is anything further -- Judge Reinhart, did you want to the say anything?

MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: No, I think you have covered it all. I appreciate everyone's time today, and I look forward to seeing some of you next Tuesday.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, everyone. I apologize that we have gone as long as we have. I hope you don't feel it is too long or a waste of your time.

It is two hours, I want to say that is shorter than our status conferences in the past, but honestly, I don't have
a metric here of keeping track of all of them. I feel that they are important, we covered a lot of ground, we covered census and registry, we covered state/Federal, we covered the New Mexico litigation. We flushed out a little bit more the monthly status and discovery conferences.

Again, it is a new process, let's give it some time. Everybody be patient. There is always an opportunity to be heard. I don't want you to be nervous, I don't want you to feel frantic, I don't want you to feel stressed out about how you get an issue before the court. I hope I have opened up more avenues for you informational wise and then you always have your dispute process available to you as your right under the Federal rules.

The Court is never intending to abandon Federal or local rules, just, as you know, really promotes cooperation, and compromise, and resolution where possible. You know that that is where $I$ come from, it is just my orientation, but $I$ am a realist, and $I$ know that if you can't resolve things, you belong in court to have them heard, and that is what we are here for.

I want you to know Judge Reinhart and I are always here. We are actively engaged in the case. We follow it closely both from the status conferences, and the filings, and interactions with our special master, but we couldn't pretend to walk in the shoes that you are walking and the work that you
are doing day in and day out, and $I$ guess it is fair to say we can never know as much as you do, but don't worry about that.

You will have all of the right opportunities to ensure the Court hears what the Court needs to hear and support you in what you are doing to move the case along, to adhere to the schedule. I alluded loosely to, gee, if you had an issue that affected the case management schedule, if its discovery, it goes on the discovery schedule, as conference if it is non-discovery, but $I$ guess what $I$ should say is that $I$ really would like you to stick to that case management schedule of Pretrial Order 30.

I think it was a well thought out schedule. I think it is an ambitious one, it is an aggressive one, but it is one that is doable. With all of the procedures that we have put in place in this case, it is absolutely doable, and $I$ am a firm believer that it is a good thing for both Plaintiffs and Defense to move cases more quickly than not. The issues ripen, it keeps the costs down, it keeps you sharply focused.

You put the schedule in place and I am here to support you and make sure that you fulfill the deadlines that are in that schedule. I think you would be serving your clients well by doing so and encourage you to just keep your eye on the ball and, you know, work hard like you are doing, but at the same time I also say that you need a balance in life and don't burn out, take a break. I hope everybody did over the holidays,
they feel rejuvenated.
You have other clients, $I$ am sure, so it is a balancing act. We signed up for a profession that isn't always easy, and this case is certainly not an easy case, so I admire all of you for the work you do, the dedication, the commitment to your clients. It is so abundantly evident to the Court and it should be evident to each other.

So, when you -- in moments of frustration with each other or cynicism at times, just remember that -- put yourself in that person's shoes, they are doing what they think is in the best interest of their client and appreciate -- that may give you a greater appreciation of why they are doing what they are doing.

If you communicate in an appropriate way so that they can understand your position, even though you represent different clients, you both understand how the process works, both sides, and that compromise can sometimes be the right outcome just in the interest of getting to that next step in the litigation.

So, rather than mountains, look at them as hills. When there is a true mountain, treat it like a mountain and bring out all the forces, but not every matter, every issue, every obstacle, necessarily has to be a mountain.

With that, I wish you well. Everybody stay safe, and we will be seeing each other soon.


Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2021[6] \quad 1 / 5 \quad 3 / 11 \quad 3 / 15 \quad 6 / 2 \\ & 55 / 882 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 58 / 14 & 58 / 22 & 60 / 13 & 64 / 6 & 76 / 2 \\ 76 / 10 & 78 / 4 & & & \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAGISTRATE JUDGE REINHART: $\text { [1] } 78 / 17$ | 21 [1] 1/5 | about [73] 6/12 $6 / 16$ 8/8 |
| MR. AGNESHWAR: [3] 21/23 | 212-836-8011 [1] 2/6 | 18/11 19/4 22/5 22/16 $24 / 25$ |
| 26/6 29/14 | 23 [1] 82/6 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}25 / 19 & 26 / 6 & 26 / 20 & 28 / 3 & 28 / 5\end{array}$ |
| MR. BAYMAN: [5] 45/2 55/25 | 24 [1] 29/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 8 & 30 / 10 & 32 / 15 & 34 / 17 & 34 / 19\end{array}$ |
| 67/11 73/10 73/14 | 250 [2] 1/24 2/5 | $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 25 & 35 / 13 & 36 / 3 & 37 / 3 & 37 / 18\end{array}$ |
| MR. GILBERT: [10] 44/22 | 2567 [1] 29/20 | 38/16 38/19 40/15 40/17 41/8 |
| 49/12 59/22 61/8 66/4 71/19 | 26th [1] 2/14 | 42/9 $45 / 5$ 45/19 $46 / 146 / 25$ |
| 72/2 $72 / 14$ 73/8 $73 / 13$ | 2700 [1] 1/25 | 48/4 50/10 50/20 51/3 51/6 |
| MR. KRAUSE: [3] 73/21 74/5 | 2800 [1] 1/20 | 51/25 52/3 52/19 53/3 53/5 |
| M7/3 KRAUSE: [3] $73 / 21$ 74/5 | 2925 [1] 1/13 | 53/20 53/23 54/22 54/22 |
| MR. MATTHEWS: [3] 23/24 | 3 |  |
| $24 / 23 ~ 26 / 1$ MR MCGEE: | 30 [7] 56/17 59/4 59/13 60/4 | 60/7 61/3 61/18 61/19 61/21 |
| MR. McGEE: [8] 30/2 32/19 <br> 38/22 39/5 39/18 41/19 42/17 | 60/15 77/18 80/11 | 62/12 66/22 66/24 67/1 67/23 |
| $38 / 22 \text { 39/5 39/18 41/19 42/17 }$ $44 / 13$ | 302-276-0147 [1] 1/17 | 68/13 70/4 70/5 77/10 79/9 |
| MR. PARISER: [9] 29/22 | 30309 [1] 2/8 | 80/2 |
| 29/24 30/3 35/8 39/8 40/15 | 305-384-7270 [1] 1/21 | above [1] 82/4 |
| 41/20 44/2 44/14 | 30th [5] 6/7 6/17 6/22 7/3 | absolutely [2] 77/23 80/15 |
| MR. PETROSINELLI: [5] 4/23 | 7/24 | abundantly [1] 81/6 |
| 5/21 5/24 21/4 21/15 | 32 [6] 48/11 51/1 57/5 57/11 | acceptable [2] 33/9 43/5 |
| MR. PULASKI: [7] 4/25 5/20 | 64/2 64/15 | accomplished [1] 19/14 |
| 9/20 21/7 23/2 24/8 29/13 | 33 [1] 2/14 | accomplishing [1] 16/6 |
| MS. INSOGNA: [4] 73/24 77/5 | 33134 [1] 1/21 | according [1] 72/12 |
| 78/8 78/11 | 35 [1] 25/4 | accordingly [1] 40/14 |
| THE COURT: [51] $2 / 18$ 5/1 | 4 | account [1] 46/13 |
| 5/23 9/19 13/14 21/14 21/17 | 404-572-4600 [1] 2/9 | acknowledge [1] 34/7 |
| 21/25 23/22 23/25 24/19 25/7 | 42 [1] 31/11 | across [1] 25/3 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}26 / 3 & 27 / 19 & 29 / 15 & 29 / 23 & 29 / 25\end{array}$ | 4555 [1] 1/14 | act [1] 81/3 |
| $30 / 5$ 34/22 38/3 39/1 39/6 | 4600 [1] 2/9 | actively [2] 74/14 79/22 |
| 39/12 $39 / 19$ 41/9 41/22 43/23 | 4717 [1] 1/23 | activities [1] 26/17 |
| 44/10 44/15 44/25 45/6 55/23 |  | activity [2] 22/9 27/15 |
| 58/7 60/16 61/9 67/9 68/9 | 5 | actual [5] 48/14 54/18 66/16 |
| 71/25 $72 / 8$ 72/15 $73 / 9 \quad 73 / 11$ | 50 [1] 12/2 | 67/4 75/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}73 / 15 & 73 / 23 & 74 / 1 & 75 / 15 & 77 / 4 \\ 77 / 22 & 78 / 10 & 78 / 13 & 78 / 20\end{array}$ | 52 [1] 12/2 | actually [11] 4/8 14/5 36/3 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}77 / 22 & 78 / 10 \quad 78 / 13 & 78 / 20\end{array}$ | 5567 [1] $2 / 3$ | $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { 40/17 } & 42 / 18 & 42 / 22 ~ 45 / 11\end{array}$ |
| / | 55th [1] 2/5 | 62/12 67/4 75/23 76/23 |
| /s [1] 82/7 | 56 [3] 6/4 10/7 17/25 | ADAM [4] 1/12 1/22 9/22 |
| 0 | 6 | adapt |
|  | 601 [1] 2/11 | add [5] 8/22 9/18 44/1 57/2 |
| 0147 [1] 1/17 | 6046 [1] 2/15 | 58/3 |
| 02110 [1] 2/15 | 617-406-6046 [1] 2/15 | added [1] 62/12 |
| 1 | 6216 [1] 2/12 | adding [2] 67/13 67/20 |
| 10019 [1] $2 / 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64112 \\ & 65,000 \end{aligned}\left[\begin{array}{ll} {[1]} & 1 / 24 \\ 6 & 11 / 11 \end{array}\right.$ | addition [5] 5/6 21/11 34/6 <br> 34/11 50/15 |
| 1100 [1] 1/20 | 6th [3] 50/2 50/8 51/14 | additional [1] 54/6 |
| 1180 [1] $2 / 8$ | 7 | address [14] 9/23 31/1 36/2 |
| 12th [1] $2 / 2$ |  | $36 / 23$ 37/3 38/2 40/25 41/5 |
| 16 [1] $22 / 24$ | 713-664-4555 [1] 1/14 | 41/7 44/4 44/6 51/9 54/15 |
| 1600 [1] 2/8 | 725 [1] 2/2 | 60/13 |
| 172 [1] 56/20 | 7270 [1] 1/21 | addressed [1] 40/13 |
| 1725 [1] 1/13 | 77098 [1] 1/14 | addresses [1] 42/24 |
| 180 [1] 54/24 | 772.467 .2337 [1] 2/18 | addressing [1] 35/22 |
| 181 [1] 5/7 | 8 | adhere [1] 80/5 |
| 19720 [1] 1/17 | 8011 [1] 2/6 | adhered [1] 33/10 <br> adjust [1] 53/22 |
| 2 | 816-760-2700 [1] 1/25 | adjusting [1] 53/15 |
| 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG [1] | A | adjustment [2] 46/14 53/1 |
| 1/3 |  | adopt <br> [1] 17/8 |
| 20001 [1] 2/11 | $\text { abide [1] } 13 / 8$ | adopted [2] 17/2 53/19 |
| $20005[1] ~ 2 / 2$ $202-434-5567$ [1] $2 / 3$ | ability [7] 33/3 47/23 47/24 | advance [11] 54/18 55/3 |
| 202-434-5567 [1] $2 / 3$ | 68/4 68/17 68/24 72/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}55 / 18 & 61 / 5 & 63 / 1 & 63 / 2 & 63 / 3\end{array}$ |
| 202-942-6216 [1] 2/12 | able [15] 14/4 15/1 19/22 | 65/24 66/2 67/8 68/16 |
| 2020 [2] 43/14 45/23 | 24/14 $25 / 1 \quad 25 / 6 \quad 41 / 24 \quad 53 / 4$ | advantage [1] 30/14 |


| A | 56/3 56/19 59/7 59/12 59 | pating [1] 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| adversaries [2] 74/11 76/13 | 60/20 61/20 64/20 69/1 72/19 | anxious [1] 4/17 |
| adversely [1] 20/3 | 73/20 78/5 78/19 78/21 | any [28] 3/5 9/19 13/ |
| advocacy [3] 67/22 68/9 71/1 | all of [1] 59/12 | 19/23 25/7 28/10 33/8 42/6 |
| advocate [1] 19/7 | alleviate [1] 53/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 42 / 15 & 45 / 9 & 45 / 12 & 45 / 22 & 46 / 16\end{array}$ |
| affect [2] | allotting [1] 47/11 | 51/10 54/3 55/22 58/6 64/1 |
| affiliated [1] 14/19 | allow [7] 46/3 46/4 50/18 | 64/23 67/10 $70 / 14$ 71/7 75/3 |
| affirmative [1] 36/13 | 51/9 54/25 55/2 57/12 | anybody [2] 20/5 62/9 |
| afford [1] 38/13 | allowed [2] 12/3 47/ | anyone [4] 45/12 63/20 65/5 |
| afforded [2] 48/19 75/20 | allows [1] 38/24 <br> alluded [2] 11/4 | $4$ |
| affording [2] 64/21 64/22 | almost [3] 10/18 45/11 66/5 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 24 / 21 & 25 / 20 & 31 / 4 & 31 / 24 & 43 / 25\end{array}$ |
| affording or [1] 64/21 | along [4] 10/3 10/4 13/24 | 45/19 49/1 $61 / 3 \quad 65 / 5 \quad 74 / 5$ |
| $\text { after [4] } 8 / 238 / 2$ | 80/5 | 78/16 78/17 |
| 55/23 | already [10] 19/17 22/19 | apart [2] 54/13 |
| aftermath [1] 6/22 | 23/16 $31 / 6$ 37/15 $38 / 2439 / 14$ | apologize [3] 61/13 72/3 |
| afternoon [17] 3/1 4/22 5/22 | 47/4 54/4 72/25 |  |
| 5/24 23/23 23/25 30/4 44/23 |  | ppear [1] 30 |
| 45/1 $45 / 3 \quad 54 / 19$ 56/1 $73 / 14$ | $25 / 20 \quad 32 / 12$ | appearing [2] 45/4 |
| 73/22 73/24 73/25 77/7 | 39/17 42/11 45/9 47/21 52/16 | applications [1] 22/25 |
| again [18] $3 / 4 \begin{array}{llll} & 10 / 17 & 12 / 11\end{array}$ | 66/2 67/14 67/24 74/12 77/18 | applied [1] 40/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 5 & 17 / 5 & 22 / 2 & 28 / 15 & 38 / 18\end{array}$ | 80/24 | applying [1] 64/21 |
| 40/16 40/23 62/8 69/7 69/8 | although [3] 22/7 26/13 | appointed [2] 22/19 75/19 |
| $\begin{array}{cc}70 / 8 & 71 / 2 \\ \text { against [1] } & 75 / 15 \\ 74 / 12\end{array}$ | 27/21 | appreciate [22] 20/20 21/8 |
| against [1] $74 / 12$   <br> agenda [42] $3 / 22$ $4 / 2$ $4 / 13$ | always [16] 14/10 19/9 27/23 | 24/20 25/8 25/8 25/12 27/20 |
| 4/14 5/14 21/19 22/4 29/13 | 31/2 44/25 49/5 49/7 58/12 | 27/21 29/12 34/23 35/12 |
| 29/16 $44 / 21$ 47/18 $49 / 3$ 49/9 | 62/25 69/14 72/20 75/22 79/7 | 49/16 51/20 54/1 54/2 $54 / 5$ |
| 50/15 54/10 54/13 54/17 | 79/11 79/21 81/3 | 71/20 73/9 73/12 74/6 78/19 |
| 54/20 56/12 60/24 61/16 62/2 | am [60] $4 / 15$ 4/17 $9 / 9$ 10/13 | 81/11 |
| 62/20 65/21 65/23 66/1 66/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 13 & 13 / 14 & 13 / 22 & 13 / 25\end{array}$ | appreciated [2] 14/10 66/6 |
| 66/10 66/23 66/25 67/1 67/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 24 & 22 / 3 & 26 / 8 & 26 / 12 & 30 / 9\end{array}$ | appreciation [2] 35/4 81 |
| 67/7 69/19 69/20 70/3 70/22 | $31 / 13$ 33/18 $33 / 1934 / 2 \quad 36 / 9$ | appreciative [1] 25/25 |
| 71/3 $71 / 8$ 71/14 $71 / 15$ 73/17 | $43 / 20$ 43/23 45/18 45/21 | apprise [5] 22/22 24/11 |
| agendas [7] 45/15 50/14 | 56/5 58/6 61/13 62/15 63/18 | apprised [1] 5/16 |
| 55/17 56/22 61/15 61/15 | 64/12 64/24 64/25 65/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { approach [5] } & 6 / 16 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 9\end{array}$ |
| 71 | 65/14 67/22 69/3 69/9 70/5 | 57/23 57/23 |
| aggressive [1] 80/13 | 70/6 70/9 71/6 71/22 72/3 | appropriate [8] 4/5 34/17 |
| AGNESHWAR [7] 2/4 21/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll}73 / 6 & 74 / 3 & 75 / 19 & 76 / 5 & 76 / 6\end{array}$ | $39 / 439 / 1141 / 553 / 1756 /$ |
| 21/22 23/4 24/2 26/8 27/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}76 / 7 & 76 / 23 & 77 / 8 & 77 / 15 & 78 / 9\end{array}$ | $81 / 14$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} \text { ago [6] } & 3 / 12 & 15 / 10 & 48 / 3 & 50 / 1 \\ 55 / 6 & 59 / 19 \end{array}$ | 79/17 80/15 80/19 81/2 | approve [2] 12/8 $12 / 9$ |
| agree [20] 8/4 26/10 35/14 | ambitious [1] 80/13 | approximately [1] 5/7 |
| 42/7 50/16 50/21 50/21 51/11 | amended [2] 29/19 31/11 | April [1] 40/2 |
| 52/2 60/16 60/20 61/7 62/2 | among [2] 16/7 24/12 | Arch [1] 2/14 |
| 62/10 62/11 62/16 63/5 63/6 | amount [1] 21/11 | arduous [1] 20/2 |
| 63/12 69/12 | analytics [5] 7/8 11/4 11/9 | are [199] |
| agreed [14] 12/24 22/23 46/7 |  | are actually [1] area [2] 14/2 26 |
| 51/9 51/16 51/25 54/11 54/11 | and non-discovery [1] 63/2 | areas [1] 13/ |
| 54/16 66/12 66/13 66/14 | and/or [1] 65/22 | aren't [1] 73/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}66 / 15 & 66 / 16 \\ \text { agreement [7] } & 22 / 20 & 22 / 20\end{array}$ | ANDREW [3] 2/7 45/3 56/1 | arena [1] 25/4 |
| agreement [7] 22/20 22/20 $24 / 5 \text { 31/11 59/7 59/18 59/24 }$ | anew [1] 44/12 | arguably [2] 62/16 68/22 |
| agrees [1] 7/24 | Angeles [1] 77/ | arguing [1] 57/13 |
| air [1] 57/21 | anniversary [1] | argument [3] 37/16 48/18 |
| albeit [1] 13/23 | announced [1] 57/20 | 71/1 |
| all [69] 3/18 5/7 5/15 10/20 | another [11] 27/24 28/13 | arguments [4] 37/18 43/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllll}12 / 6 & 13 / 15 & 14 / 19 & 14 / 21 & 14 / 23\end{array}$ | 40/15 $43 / 11$ 43/12 43/21 | 48/19 56/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 7 & 16 / 5 & 16 / 24 & 17 / 4 & 17 / 8\end{array}$ | 50/19 52/16 63/7 70/10 76/10 | arising [1] 42/25 |
| 17/9 17/10 17/22 19/7 19/18 | ther and [1] 76/10 | arms [2] 25/2 25/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 19 & 20 / 13 & 20 / 18 & 21 / 2 & 21 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { answer [7] } & 13 / 13 & 33 / 25 & 34 / 3 \\ 35 / 13 & 55 / 22 & 58 / 6 & 58 / 9\end{array}$ | Arnold [2] 2/4 2/10 around [4] 17/15 25/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 13 & 23 / 5 & 23 / 21 & 24 / 11 & 26 / 3\end{array}$ | answers [4] 19/18 19/20 | $43 / 23$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}26 / 9 & 29 / 5 & 29 / 16 & 31 / 15 \\ 31 / 15 & 31 / 23\end{array}$ | 63/11 73/1 | arrived [1] 22/12 |
| 34/15 35/10 37/17 39/15 41/7 | anticipate [6] 15/2 35/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { articulate [2] } & 49 / 18 & 62 / 15\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}41 / 12 & 42 / 2 & 44 / 11 & 44 / 16 & 45 / 5 \\ 45 / 18 & 46 / 7 & 48 / 9 & 49 / 16 & 55 / 15\end{array}$ | 38/17 39/7 41/11 47/20 | articulated [3] 50/2 56/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 45 / 18 & 46 / 7 & 48 / 9 & 49 / 16 & 55 / 15\end{array}$ | anticipated [2] 15/1 72/11 | 62/18 |


| A |
| :---: |
| as [154] |
| as-needed [1] 27/19 |
| ask [5] 17/9 38/6 42/5 50/8 |
| 58/11 |
| asked [1] 23/9 |
| asking [1] 64/24 |
| aspect [4] 9/16 14/5 75/3 |
|  |
| aspects [3] 4/16 15/7 77/19 |
| assembled [1] 75/1 |
| assistance [2] 18/12 54/9 |
| assistants [1] 75/9 |
| assisting [2] 10/9 23/11 |
| assume [1] 70/14 |
| assure [2] 6/8 14/14 |
| assured [1] 63/23 |
| Atlanta [1] 2/8 |
| attached [1] 42/20 |
| attendees [1] 56/20 |
| attending [1] 5/8 |
| attention [10] 6/1 24/8 27/3 |
| 27/4 36/25 40/19 42/19 44/12 |
| 64/2 74/11 |
| attorney [2] 23/10 33/23 |
| Attorney's [1] 35/3 |
| attribute [1] 65/12 |
| attributed [1] 3/10 |
| authorities [1] 34/3 |
| authority [2] 29/7 35/5 |
| authorization [1] 17/3 |
| avail [1] 57/11 |
| available [2] 48/10 79/12 |
| Avenue [3] 1/13 1/23 2/11 |
| avenues [1] 79/11 |
| awarded [1] 48/18 |
| aware [10] 5/16 17/14 21/9 |
| 21/10 24/13 51/13 51/18 |
| 52/23 61/21 68/2 |
| away [1] 29/6 |
| awhile [1] 12/8 |

awhile [1] 12/8

## B

back [10] 12/7 12/16 27/19
28/25 42/19 53/1 53/19 53/22 58/25 73/7
background [2] 23/4 77/10
backlogged [1] 29/3
balance [1] 80/24
balancing [2] 20/16 81/3
ball [1] 80/22
Baltimore [20] 32/3 32/4
$32 / 12 \quad 33 / 1433 / 25 \quad 34 / 9 \quad 34 / 12$ $34 / 20 \quad 37 / 6 \quad 37 / 9 \quad 37 / 12 \quad 37 / 19$ 37/22 37/25 39/24 40/8 41/6 42/11 42/12 43/9
Bar [5] 10/6 10/21 12/17 18/14 21/10
base [1] 14/7
based [9] $3 / 13$ 4/3 $34 / 19$
37/20 41/1 44/8 48/19 48/19 71/11
basis [16] 5/12 10/19 27/19 28/12 46/21 46/21 50/20 50/22 51/10 52/1 52/7 56/17 60/14 62/17 69/5 71/25
BAYMAN [13] 2/7 44/19 45/4

49/14 54/1 55/7 55/23 55/25 56/2 67/10 68/19 68/23 73/10
be [203]
BEACH [4] 1/2 $1 / 5$ 2/18 $35 / 3$
bear [2] 36/15 67/24
because [40] 4/2 4/9 6/4
10/9 11/3 12/6 12/9 12/25
15/14 19/1 $26 / 5$ 26/21 28/21 29/3 32/15 36/4 36/21 40/12 42/3 43/15 45/20 46/11 47/14 48/1 49/9 50/24 50/24 53/17 58/9 58/10 58/15 59/14 61/14 61/20 64/12 64/18 65/14 69/14 71/14 74/16
because I [1] 61/20
become [3] 14/5 57/13 67/22 becoming [1] 68/9
been [53] 6/9 $7 / 1 \quad 7 / 4 \quad 7 / 6$ 9/5 9/11 9/16 10/14 10/18 $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 16 & 15 / 1 & 15 / 7 & 15 / 9 & 15 / 18\end{array}$ 15/18 $16 / 2$ 16/2 $16 / 316 / 4$ 17/14 17/24 18/2 20/11 21/10 22/5 22/19 22/20 22/23 23/10 23/11 23/12 26/16 31/6 40/12 42/4 43/17 44/1 45/10 48/14 48/14 54/11 57/8 57/14 58/4 $\begin{array}{llll}71 / 18 & 74 / 15 & 74 / 21 & 74 / 24\end{array}$
75/20 76/1 76/10 77/14 77/16
before [22] $1 / 9 \quad 22 / 5 \quad 34 / 12$ 34/18 35/16 39/5 53/7 53/25 54/10 54/13 54/19 55/1 55/7 57/14 57/16 60/25 66/9 66/16 67/4 77/7 77/13 79/10
began [2] 45/23 60/24
begin [4] 11/17 19/20 29/21 42/17
beginning [4] 15/17 50/11 56/13 77/17
begun [1] 23/18
behalf [10] 23/6 23/21 24/18 25/15 26/8 35/10 45/4 53/12 54/2 56/3
being [30] 3/2 4/13 12/17
14/14 15/23 15/24 17/20 24/6 25/18 26/2 28/2 31/18 36/5 44/7 45/21 46/7 46/16 47/17 51/12 58/17 59/9 60/20 63/23 64/22 66/4 66/21 69/1 71/6 76/2 76/14
beings [1] 76/12
believe [20] 14/17 22/12
23/18 38/9 38/12 $44 / 18$ 49/9
49/19 49/20 52/18 52/21
52/23 53/16 57/8 57/22 57/23
57/24 62/18 69/2 69/8
believed [2] 40/20 51/17
believer [1] 80/16
believes [1] 24/10
bellwether [4] 11/17 11/22 11/23 74/19
belong [1] 79/19
benefit [14] 5/6 5/7 5/14 6/19 $13 / 9 \quad 13 / 18 \quad 13 / 18 \quad 17 / 22$ 40/9 42/8 44/13 45/21 57/15 68/16
benefits [2] 16/13 28/8
best [15] 8/19 9/4 19/9
23/20 25/5 32/5 32/7 32/18

42/14 44/8 52/8 69/3 76/16 76/16 81/11
better [9] 19/22 25/2 26/21
30/23 45/10 62/25 63/1 74/21
76/15
between [3] 22/15 37/18 42/20
beyond [1] 11/12
big [4] 20/23 40/24 64/6 76/23
bit [10] 12/5 17/17 25/2 54/12 65/19 66/21 66/22 76/15 76/15 79/4
blanks [1] 32/18
block [1] 55/15
body [1] 40/21
Boehringer [2] 45/4 56/2
bolts [1] 9/11
boom [1] 48/12
Boston [6] 2/15 77/8 77/13 78/10 78/14 78/15
both [52] 4/14 4/23 5/3 5/18 8/4 8/11 13/17 14/21 16/8 $16 / 11$ 16/14 21/15 22/11 22/11 25/10 33/18 33/20 34/2 34/4 35/2 38/3 38/13 40/22 $44 / 11$ 49/20 49/21 50/6 50/16 50/17 50/18 51/9 51/11 51/16 51/25 53/5 53/20 54/10 54/14
$55 / 15$ 57/19 58/16 61/15 63/14 66/15 68/1 68/5 68/10 74/3 79/23 80/16 81/16 81/17
Boulevard [1] 1/20
boxes [1] 8/7
brand [1] 59/5
break [2] 27/11 80/25
breath [1] 6/17
brewing [4] 51/2 51/6 51/18 52/1
brief [5] 23/4 33/16 33/17 34/7 62/7
briefed [16] 30/11 31/14 31/19 31/20 32/24 33/11 $34 / 21 \quad 35 / 16 \quad 36 / 5 \quad 39 / 21 \quad 39 / 24$ 40/6 42/16 43/16 48/14 64/12
briefing [17] 31/23 33/1 33/6 33/11 35/14 35/24 36/1 $38 / 7$ 38/9 38/17 40/14 41/11 41/12 41/21 42/17 43/16 44/2
briefly [1] 44/4
bring [6] 6/1 24/8 27/2 40/18 76/16 81/22
bringing [2] 25/9 36/24
broader [1] 58/10
broke [1] 59/5
broken [1] 67/20
brought [1] 63/12
BRUCE [1] 1/10
bullet [5] 66/12 66/15 66/21 66/23 69/23
burden [2] 54/3 54/6
burn [1] 80/24
busy [2] 29/1 55/9

## C

calendar [1] 26/5
calendars [2] 55/16 55/16
California [2] 23/17 77/12

| C | chance [3] 43/7 62/21 68/22 | 8/10 9/4 15/12 15/21 21/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| call [7] 8/4 9/11 10/22 | change [1] 50/9 | $22 / 19 \quad 27 / 12 \quad 30 / 12 \quad 30 / 12$ |
| 11/21 19/6 69/21 73/2 | Changed [1] $31 / 2$ <br> changes [3] $12 / 1$ | $68$ |
| called [3] 8/3 55/7 59/25 | $12 / 18$ |  |
| Callow [1] 1/16 | changing [1] 62/15 | comes [4] 6/17 44/7 45/18 |
| calls [1] 23 | channels [1] | 64/5 |
| $51 / 15$ | chart [1] 12/9 | comfortable [3] 24/17 67/5 |
|  | checked [1] | / 20 |
| 7/12 8/7 9/4 10/19 10/23 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { choice [2] } & 10 / 5 \\ \text { choose [2] } & 66 / 25\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { coming [7] } & 4 / 6 & 6 / 7 & 10 / 6 & 17 / 5 \\ 27 / 16 & 45 / 23 & 57 / 10 & & \end{array}$ |
| 11/8 11/13 12/20 13/5 16/11 | $\text { chosen [2] } 10 / 5$ | 16 45/23 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 11 & 18 / 12 & 19 / 24 ~ 20 / 12 ~ & 21 / 9\end{array}$ | Cincinnati [1] 78/9 | comment [3] 42/19 44/5 45/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}25 / 5 & 25 / 6 & 25 / 21 & 25 / 21 & 27 / 11 \\ 27 / 11 & 28 / 17 & 32 / 12 & 32 / 17\end{array}$ | circuit [5] 25/11 35/19 | comments [5] 3/9 21/3 21/6 |
| $35 / 22 \quad 44 / 6 \quad 47 / 4 \quad 49 / 22 \quad 5$ | 35/22 38/11 38/25 | 70/12 71/8 |
| 52/24 53/1 $54 / 155 / 15$ 55/16 | circumstance [2] 18/16 18/19 | commitment [2] |
| 56/17 61/23 62/3 62/21 63/23 | nces [1] 53/15 | committee [3] 11/21 |
| 66/11 66/13 66/13 68/1 70/17 | city [20] 1/24 32/3 32/3 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}70 / 23 & 71 / 10 & 74 / 4 & 75 / 3 & 76 / 13\end{array}$ | $32 / 12 \quad 33 / 24 \quad 33 / 24 \quad 35 / 2 \quad 35 / 3$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { committees } \\ \text { common [3] } & 15 / 12 & 36 / 23 & 36 / 25\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{rllll} 80 / 2 & 81 / 15 & 81 / 17 \\ \text { can't }[8] & 28 / 20 & 41 / 7 & 45 / 20 \end{array}$ | 37/6 37/8 $37 / 11 \quad 37 / 19$ 37/22 | commonalities [2] 40/19 41/4 |
| can't [8] 28/20 41/7 45/20 $48 / 1158 / 23 \quad 65 / 1369 / 13$ | 37/25 39/24 40/8 42/10 42/12 | commonality [4] 34/16 36/3 |
| $79 / 18$ | 43/21 78/14 | 36/6 43 |
| an't be | civil [1] | communicate [4] 25/1 28/21 |
| cancer [2] 18/16 75/6 | claim [2] 7/19 24/25 | 29/5 81 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { cancers [4] } & 7 / 15 & 7 / 18 & 7 / 20\end{array}$ | claimants $25 / 23$ | communication [7] 19/8 22/14 25/16 26/25 46/3 69/2 73/6 |
|  | claims [10] 9/1 16/8 16/12 | community [1] 52/13 |
| not [2] | 16/13 16/17 16/18 17/5 17/19 | company [2] 74/17 74/17 |
| $\text { are [1] } 44 / 16$ | 21/13 36/13 | compared [1] 16/19 |
| careful [1] | clarify [4] 17/3 31/3 32/22 | competing [1 |
| cascade [1] | /15 [1] | complaints [1] 57/2 |
| case [62] $1 / 3$ 7/13 15/21 | cleanup [1] | complete [1] 11/3 |
| 16/10 17/11 22/19 25/22 | clear [10] 11/10 | completely [2] $11 / 1$ 33/ |
| 25/24 31/6 31/17 31/18 31/23 | 30/7 42/1 57/19 61/16 62/14 | completing [2] 18/17 19/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 4 & 33 / 23 & 33 / 25 & 34 / 12 & 34 / 18\end{array}$ |  | completion [1] 33/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 35 / 11 & 36 / 8 & 36 / 18 & 37 / 9 & 37 / 10\end{array}$ | clearly [6] 29/10 51/16 | complex [1] 16/10 |
| 37/12 37/16 37/19 37/19 |  | mplexities |
| 37/22 40/5 40/19 40/22 41/6 | client [6] 18/15 20/1 20/3 | complexity [5] 57/2 58/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 25 & 43 / 11 & 43 / 13 & 43 / 15\end{array}$ | client is [1] | compliance |
| 43/22 45/19 47/22 51/13 | clients [7] 19/19 56/25 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}53 / 11 & 56 / 9 & 56 / 11 & 59 / 22 & 72 / 18\end{array}$ | $67 / 1480 / 2181 / 281 / 681 / 16$ | $\text { component [2] } 15 / 6 \quad 19 / 15$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}74 / 1 & 75 / 3 & 75 / 4 & 75 / 9 & 75 / 10\end{array}$ | clock [1] 17/15 | compromise [2] 79/16 81/17 |
| 75/12 $76 / 3 \quad 76 / 3 \quad 77 / 9 \quad 77 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { clock } & \text { [1] } & 1 / 15 \\ \text { close [1] } & 51 / 23 \end{array}$ | concern [1] 57/1 |
| 77/20 79/22 80/5 80/7 80/10 | closely [3] 74/18 74/20 | concerned [4] 23/8 |
| 80/15 81/4 81/4 | 79/23 | $67 / 22 \quad 70 / 5$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { cases [12] } 15 / 24 \quad 16 / 1116 / 17 \\ & 16 / 19 \quad 18 / 22 \quad 18 / 23 \quad 30 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | CMC [8] 52/25 54/10 54/13 | concerns [2] 20/17 59/12 |
| $33 / 20 \quad 33 / 22$ | 54/18 55/2 55/3 55/4 67/4 | concerted [1] 46/17 |
| 80/17 | CMCs [13] 26/3 27/16 52/10 | concise [3] 42/2 42/2 42 |
|  | 52/11 52/23 53/4 53/13 53/16 | concisely [1] 41/22 |
| cause [3] 16/ | 53/23 55/13 56/15 56/16 58/1 | conclude [2] 71/3 71/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { cause } \\ \text { census [18] } & 4 / 17 & 5 / 4 \\ \text { l }\end{array}$ | co [4] 33/19 42/10 42/11 | concluded [1] 82 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}6 / 4 & 6 / 6 & 7 / 7 & 7 / 9 & 7 / 17 & 7 / 19\end{array}$ | 42/12 | conclusions [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}7 / 19 & 11 / 2 & 13 / 13 & 13 / 19 & 16 / 6\end{array}$ | co-counsel [ | conditional [2] 31/8 32/ |
| 28/6 47/5 52/14 79/3 | 42/11 42/12 | conducted [2] 3/2 3/6 |
| central [1] 36/7 | Coast [4] | confer [6] |
| Cerner [2] 10/8 10/17 certain [8] 5/9 5/13 | colead [4] 44/24 49/15 54/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { conference [58] } & 1 / 9 & 3 / 2 & 3 / 6\end{array}$ |
| $20 / 1 \quad 35 / 14 \quad 36 / 15 \quad 45 / 16 \quad 68 / 13$ | 67/6 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}3 / 11 & 3 / 12 & 3 / 16 & 3 / 17 & 4 / 5 & 4 / 7\end{array}$ |
| certainly [10] 5/6 11/16 | coleads [6] 24/12 53/12 |  |
| 13/13 38/12 $46 / 17$ 70/7 70/15 | 68/18 68/20 68/23 68/25 | $30 / 15$ 30/16 $46 / 9$ 46/19 47/6 |
| 70/20 71/15 81/4 | collaborative [1] 53/21 | 50/2 50/16 50/24 51/23 56/12 |
| certify [1] 82/3 | colleague [2] 60/16 76/13 | 56/20 58/11 58/19 58/20 59/9 |
| challenges [2] 14/25 17/24 | collecting [1] 8/6 | 59/10 59/19 59/21 59/22 60/8 |
| chambers [5] 66/3 67/6 70/6 | college [1] 77/11 | 60/9 60/10 60/19 61/3 61/6 |
| 70/6 70/16 | color [1] 66/22 | 61/11 61/12 61/14 62/5 62/5 |
|  | come [22] 6/18 6/21 7/18 | 63/4 65/11 65/16 65/20 66/1 |


| C | costs [2] 67/13 80/ | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| conference... [9] 66/10 | could [20] $4 / 10 \quad 15 / 9 \quad 15 / 15$ | D.C [1] 2/2 |
| 66/16 69/6 69/7 69/10 70/22 | $30 / 23 \quad 37 / 6 \quad 38 / 2 \quad 41 / 6 \quad 42 / 4$ | daily [1] 10/19 |
| 72/8 73/5 80/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 42 / 22 & 43 / 1 & 43 / 4 & 46 / 2 & 47 / 5 \end{array}$ | danger [1] 68/ |
| conferences [52] 4/10 22/7 | $49 / 3$ $49 / 4$ $61 / 18$ $67 / 5$ <br> $109 / 9$    | DANIEL [5] 2/1 |
| 24/15 25/18 27/23 30/20 |  | 40/16 44/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}44 / 18 & 46 / 22 & 46 / 23 ~ 46 / 23 ~ & 47 / 1\end{array}$ | couldn't [3] 33/12 46/13 | data [13] 7/8 7/17 7/20 |
| 47/2 $47 / 13$ 48/6 48/8 $48 / 9$ | could $79 / 24$ [3] 33/12 46/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 15 & 10 / 17 & 11 / 3 & 11 / 3 & 11 / 4\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 48 / 2248 / 23 ~ 49 / 649 / 20 ~ 49 / 25 \\ & 50 / 350 / 450 / 1151 / 951 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | counsel [47] 3/13 4/18 7/11 | 11/7 11/9 11/15 11/21 74/20 <br> date [2] 43/15 82/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}52 / 17 & 54 / 4 & 55 / 11 & 55 / 18 & 56 / 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 22 & 17 / 10 & 17 / 12 & 18 / 7 & 18 / 19\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { date } \\ \text { dates [4] } & 12 / 5 & 55 / 10 & 55 / 15\end{array}$ |
| 56/9 56/14 56/18 56/19 57/13 | 18/20 18/25 19/6 19/8 19/16 | 55/19 |
| 57/18 57/20 57/24 58/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 32 / 12 & 33 / 18 & 33 / 19 & 33 / 19 \end{array}$ | Dave [5] 23/9 23/20 24/12 |
| 59/25 60/6 60/13 61/17 65/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 33 / 22 & 34 / 2 & 34 / 16 & 35 / 1 & 35 / 4 \end{array}$ | 24/14 24/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}66 / 8 & 70 / 19 & 71 / 25 & 76 / 9 & 78 / 25\end{array}$ | $35 / 7 \quad 35 / 14 \quad 42 / 10 \quad 42 / 11 \quad 42 / 12$ | day [15] 5/10 5/10 5/12 5/12 |
| 79/5 79/23 | $42 / 12 \quad 44 / 22 \quad 44 / 24 \quad 45 / 4 \quad 45 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 23 & 16 / 22 & 17 / 4 & 20 / 2 & 28 / 15\end{array}$ |
| conferring [1] 68/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}48 / 25 & 49 / 12 & 49 / 15 & 49 / 19\end{array}$ | 28/22 63/2 63/3 76/18 80/1 |
| confers [3] $57 / 16$ $68 / 5$ <br> conform [1] $40 / 14$  | 52/24 54/18 55/15 56/2 67/6 | day-to-day [ |
| confront [1] | 75/22 for [1] 3 | days [7] 6/14 54/10 54/13 |
| congratulations [2] 24/23 |  | 65/24 66/1 66/9 66/16 |
| 77/24 | counsels' [1] 54/2 | DC [1] 2/11 |
| Connolly [1] 2 | country [2] 25/3 28/20 | de [2] 1/17 1/20 |
| consent [1] | couple [7] 5/25 11/24 24/1 | deadline [10] 6/5 6/6 |
| consequential [1] 34/11 | 32/22 38/6 49/17 70/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}7 / 24 & 10 / 6 & 10 / 12 & 10 / 23 & 18 / 10\end{array}$ |
| consider [4] 17/2 33/7 38/ $62 / 21$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { course [4] } \\ 59 / 23 \end{gathered}$ | \|deadlines [4] 10/20 13/7 |
| considered | court [ | $55 / 1680 / 20$ |
| consistent [4] 46/21 56/7 60/23 68/11 | Court and [1] 16/4 | deal [1] 6/23 |
| consolidation | Court's [19] 3/20 | December [2] 7/5 7/5 decide [2] 63/13 70/5 |
| constituencies [1] 7/12 | 9 16/14 24/8 27/3 27/13 | decision [4] 34/3 35/23 44 |
| consume [1] 47/5 | $36 / 2540 / 740 / 19$ 41/1 44/9 | 71/11 [4] 31/3 35/23 |
| contemplated [2] 39/16 53/2 |  | decisions [3] 33/23 33/24 |
| contentious [1] 15/19 | courthouse [2] 76/21 77/1 | 34/17 |
| context [4] 16/5 44/1 50/23 | courtroom [1] 3/7 | dedicated [1] 75/8 |
| $54 / 24$ continue [13] | Courts [4] 25/3 25/4 29/1 | dedication [2] 78/1 81/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lrrll}\text { continue [13] } & 7 / 9 & 8 / 23 & 9 / 1 \\ 14 / 15 & 15 / 11 & 17 / 15 & 18 / 8 & 19 / 23\end{array}$ | 29/2 | deeper [1] 27/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}14 / 15 & 15 / 11 & 17 / 15 & 18 / 8 & 19 \\ 20 / 19 & 21 / 14 & 47 / 8 & 70 / 21 & 75\end{array}$ | cover [1] 9/24 | Defendant [5] 8/3 $12 / 1$ 12/11 <br> 12/13 66/14 |
| continued [1] 59/4 | covered [5] 78/19 79/2 $79 / 2$ | Defendant mapping [1] |
| continues [2] 10/22 |  | DEFENDANTS [20] $2 / 1$ 8/15 |
| continuing [3] 14/15 46/20 | covers [1] 12/13 | 8/15 12/8 $13 / 116 / 1517 / 11$ |
| 57/15 | C | 26/9 26/13 33/9 35/11 $36 / 7$ |
| contributing [1] 14/18 |  | 45/5 50/19 56/3 60/5 66/18 |
| contribution [1] 76/6 |  | 67/15 67/16 74/1 |
| control [1] 37/7 | cracks [1] 46/5 | defense [35] 4/20 5/18 7/11 |
| cooperation [1] | create [1] 17/4 | 8/12 9/9 9/10 9/16 10/5 11/5 |
| coordinate [4] 22/14 27/5 | created <br> [1] <br> 20/5 | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 16 & 12 / 2 & 12 / 15 & 13 / 7 & 13 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 28/21 29/6 [3] 26/22 27/2 | creative [1] 15 | 16/9 16/14 17/10 19/11 $21 / 21$ |
| coordinated [3] 26/22 27/2 |  | $\begin{array}{llllll}22 / 11 & 22 / 13 & 23 / 7 & 24 / 2 & 26 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 27/9 | criminal [1] 77/2 | 34/16 37/23 39/7 $40 / 542 / 12$ |
| coordinating [4] 16/22 17/12 |  | 44/19 54/2 60/12 69/18 76/7 |
| 18/19 25/15 | critical <br> 51/17 | 80/17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { coordination [4] 23/15 } 24 / 3 \\ & 26 / 2528 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | critically [1] 27/2 | ```Defense's [1] 56/7 deficiencies [17] 6/5 6/12``` |
| copy [2] 66/18 66/19 | cuff [1] 64/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}6 / 13 & 7 / 1 & 9 / 13 & 10 / 12 & 10 / 24\end{array}$ |
| copying [1] 54/15 | culture [1] 75/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 23 & 15 / 25 & 16 / 1 & 17 / 25 & 18 / 1\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { correct [4] } \\ & 82 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { cure [4] } 10 / 11 \quad 10 / 24 \quad 19 / 18$ | $\begin{array}{ccccccc} \begin{array}{llllll} 18 / 13 & 19 / 1 & 19 / 19 & 19 / 21 & 19 / 24 \\ \text { deficiency }[4] & 15 / 17 & 15 / 22 \end{array} \end{array}$ |
| ```corrected [4] 6/11 6/12 7/1 69/9``` | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { cured } \\ 20 / 2 \end{array} \text { [4] } 15 / 23 \quad 15 / 25 \quad 16 / 2$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 19 / 2 & 20 / 2 \\ \text { deficient [2] } & 8 / 6 & 20 / 7 \end{array}$ |
| correcting [1] 6 |  | definitely [1] 68/11 |
| correctly [1] 61/13 | currently [2] 25/1 75/5 | degree [2] 35/25 36/15 |
| corresponding [1] 55/17 | customary <br> [1] $34 / 4$ | delay [1] 12/6 |
| $\underset{68 / 8}{\operatorname{cost}[4] \quad 8 / 19} 20 / 8 \quad 67 / 21$ | cut [1] 61/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { delighted [1] } 13 / 25 \\ & \text { deliver [1] } 12 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |



| E | expect [1] 16/ | fellow [2] 53/12 76/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| end... [4] 43/12 46/11 46/14 | expected [2] $6 / 25$ $8 / 25$ <br> expedite [1] $55 / 4$  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { felt [5] } 14 / 10 \text { 18/4 23/20 } \\ & 39 / 467 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| endanger [1] 76 | expeditious [2] 17/16 37/24 | Ferguson [1] |
| endanger [1] ${ }_{\text {ended [1] }}$ e/16 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { expeditiously [1] } & 38 / 2 \\ \text { expense [4] } & 47 / 15 & 57 / 2 & 58 / 3\end{array}$ | few [4] 3/25 8/23 9/13 $11 / 18$ figure [4] 8/3 8/18 $\quad 32 / 18$ |
| engaged [1] 79/22 | $67 / 15$ | $53 / 21$ |
| enjoy [1] 75/13 <br> enormous [1] 9/ | expensive [2] 56/20 56/25 | figured [1] 48/2 |
| enormous [1] enough [3] 45/20 64/7 e8/21 | experience [5] 25/3 25/9 | file [11] 9/12 29/18 |
| ensure [5] 3/9 10/19 20/12 | 7/20 56/16 76/1 | $31 / 931 / 2438 / 20$ 38/21 38/22 |
| 76/20 80/3 | experiencing [2] 18/17 18/23 <br> experts <br> [1] 59/15 | filed [20] 15/21 16/11 16/17 |
| entered [3] 21/12 21/13 | explain [5] 45/14 48/21 | 16/19 22/20 25/3 29/18 31/22 |
| entering <br> [1] <br> 46/6 | 62/19 63/18 69/25 | $\begin{array}{llll}31 / 25 & 32 / 14 & 32 / 23 & 32 / 25\end{array}$ |
| entirely [3] 37/7 $41 / 1$ 56/7 | explaining [1] 58/20 | $32 / 25$ 33/1 33/2 39/22 43/13 |
| entities [4] 34/2 35/5 35/6 | explanation [3] 49/16 62/7 | 51/3 52/4 74/21 |
| 43/2 [4] 3/2 $35 / 5$ 35/6 | 66/22 | files [3] 19/20 43/11 43/22 |
| entity [2] 35/1 43/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explicit [1] 46, } \\ & \text { extend [1] } 75 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | filings [1]  <br> fill [2] $32 / 18 \quad 47 / 14$ |
| Entry [1] 29/20 | extension [2] 18/21 19/2 | filling [1] 55/8 |
| envision [5] 24/4 24/5 31 | extensively [1] 77/17 | final [5] 53/23 53/23 57/7 |
| 59/9 61/22 | extent [3] 22/16 35/14 58/9 | 71/8 73/17 |
| envisioned [2] 48/6 72/13 | extraordinary [1] 18/16 | finally [1] |
| Epic [1] 10/8 | extremely [1] 75/2 eye [1] 80/22 | find [3] 20/17 30/18 59/18 finding [1] 27/7 |
| especially [1] 8/22 |  | fine [2] 21/24 70/1 |
| ESQ [9] $1 / 12$ 1/15 $1 / 18$ 1/22 | F | Finken [1] 74/25 |
| /1 2/4 2/7 2/10 | face [4] 25/12 28/4 45/14 | firm [9] 12/12 14/18 55/19 |
|  | 72/20 | 74/10 74/13 75/5 75/11 77/25 |
| essentially [1] established [1] | faced [1] | 80/15 |
| esteemed [1] 42/10 | faces [4] 30/2 45/5 45/8 | firms [3] 6/11 10/15 $26 / 14$ |
| ethic [1] 14/13 | 45/9 | first [23] 3/11 3/14 4/14 |
| evaluating [1] 38/11 | facilitate [3] 18/13 25/16 | 6/2 6/6 29/21 31/15 35/13 |
| even [16] 14/11 18/7 27/15 |  | 21 49/14 49/16 49/25 |
| 28/3 28/18 54/5 57/17 60/15 | facilitating [1] 47/23 fact [8] 4/7 16/10 24/11 | $56 / 4 \quad 66 / 5 \quad 67 / 19 \quad 68 / 22 \quad 72 /=$ |
| 66/11 $68 / 15$ 68/17 68/21 | $30 / 14 \quad 34 / 12 \quad 43 / 8 \quad 61 / 14 \quad 74$ | fit [1] 23/20 |
| 70/11 72/25 76/12 81/15 | factors [1] 64/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { five [8] } & 16 / 22 & 17 / 4 & 19 / 22\end{array}$ |
| event [4] $28 / 10$ 42/23 45/22 | facts [1] 64/21 | 49/5 54/10 65/24 66/9 66/11 |
| ever [3] | fail [1] 20/5 | five-day [2] 16/22 17/4 |
| every [20] $3 / 15$ 3/17 4/9 | $\underset{80 / 1}{\operatorname{fair}}[4] \quad 38 / 8 \text { 58/11 68/24 }$ | FL [3] 1/5 1/21 2/18 <br> flag [1] 37/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}14 / 8 & 20 / 10 & 20 / 12 & 24 / 25 \\ 46 / 9\end{array}$ | fairly [1] | flagged [4] 33/16 33/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}46 / 11 & 46 / 17 & 46 / 19 & 46 / 24\end{array}$ | familiar [1] 14/5 | 66/13 66/13 |
| 55/13 $60 / 1963 / 23 ~ 70 / 19 ~ 76 / 3 ~$ | family [1] 77/13 | Floor [1] 2/14 |
| 81/22 81/22 81/23 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { far [4] } & 23 / 8 & 27 / 7 & 57 / 9 & 63 / 20\end{array}$ | FLORIDA [2] |
| everybody [7] 10/22 20/6 | fashion [1] 53/21 | flushed [1] 79/4 |
| 28/23 55/19 79/7 80/25 81/24 | fast [2] 25/6 46/1 | fly [2] 56/6 58/15 |
| everybody's [1] 49/7 | favorite [1] 49/5 | focused [1] 80/18 |
| everyone [8] 3/1 3/4 5/13 | FDA [1] 36/14 | focuses [1] 74/10 |
| 13/18 15/7 42/14 71/9 78/21 | February [3] 39/21 39/23 | folks' [1] 55/8 |
| everyone's [2] 71/18 78/19 | F0/12 [3] 39/21 39/23 | follow [1] 79/22 |
| everything [11] $10 / 11$ $10 / 23$  <br> $11 / 25$ $12 / 9$ $13 / 12$ $21 / 12$ | Federal [22] 21/20 22/5 | followed [1] 31/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 25 & 12 / 9 & 13 / 12 & 21 / 12 & 26 / 23 \\ 27 / 19 & 45 / 19 & 61 / 23 & 65 / 10\end{array}$ | 22/15 23/15 23/22 24/3 25/10 | followed the [1] 31/10 |
| 27/19 evident [2] | 25/14 28/19 29/2 35/2 35/17 | following [2] 19/2 53/24 |
| exact [2] 9/24 | 36/15 36/19 36/19 42/25 43/7 | follows [1] 66/8 |
|  | 47/7 79/3 79/13 79/14 82/7 | forces [1] 81/22 |
| $61 / 2 \quad 78 / 13$ | Federal/State [1] 47/7 | forefront [2] 10/14 28/2 |
| ample [3] | feedback [8] 53/4 58/11 | foregoing [1] 82/ |
| examples [1] | 58/12 58/14 58/16 68/11 | foresee [1] 44/7 |
| examples [1] | 68/13 73/13 | foreseen [1] 15/9 |
|  | feel [17] 13/8 17/17 24/12 | form [7] 8/6 8/13 $12 / 4$ 25/7 |
| exceptional [2] 18/19 18/22 | 30/23 38/7 43/17 45/12 58/2 | 39/4 43/19 66/11 |
| exchange [1] 42/20 | 60/21 69/18 70/14 70/18 | formal [7] 24/16 26/11 51/1 |
| excited [1] 75/11 | 78/23 79/1 79/9 79/9 81/1 | 51/3 52/3 53/7 67/8 |
| exclusively [1] 75/9 | feeling [1] 71/18 | formally [1] 27/21 |
| exists [1] 35/21 | feels [8] 19/9 60/12 60/22 | format [1] 69/24 |
| exit [1] 20/7 | 69/12 69/13 70/15 70/20 71/9 | former [1] 25/10 |


| F | 70/11 73/1 | dance [1] 66/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| forms [7] 6/6 6/7 6/18 7/19 | Gilbert's | guide [2] |
| 8/8 18/18 20/7 | 15/15 23/4 53/4 62/21 63/7 | H |
| forth [8] 19/3 19/9 20/11 | 64/16 68/12 70/23 79/6 81/12 | had [37] 3/13 4/1 4/3 4/3 |
| $54 / 15$ $71 / 15$ | given [14] 8/15 9/1 15/15 | 4/15 8 /23 $11 / 11 \quad 12 / 7 \quad 12 / 9$ |
| forthcoming [2] 16/25 50/11 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}16 / 10 & 16 / 18 & 17 / 5 & 33 / 10 & 39 / 4\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}13 / 24 & 14 / 24 & 18 / 16 & 19 / 12\end{array}$ |
| fortunate [1] 25/13 | 43/7 52/5 55/8 56/12 59/21 | $\begin{array}{llll}23 / 16 & 24 / 18 & 24 / 23 & 30 / 13\end{array}$ |
| Fortunately [1] 27/14 | gives [5] 7/17 11/9 39/13 | $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 15 & 31 / 20 & 33 / 3 & 40 / 6 & 42 / 20 \\ 43 / 14 & 44 / 13 & 45 / 16 & 46 / 7 & 47 / 4\end{array}$ |
| forum [2] 28/13 53/17 | 69/14 70/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}54 / 19 & 59 / 19 & 63 / 5 & 70 / 3 & 70 / 7\end{array}$ |
| forums [2] 57/13 57/21 <br> forward [14] 16/25 23/1 26/3 | giving [4] 20/12 30/16 64/4 | 70/20 72/11 72/13 72/24 80/6 |
| $\begin{array}{cccc} \text { forward [14] } & 16 / 25 & 23 / 1 & 26 / \\ 26 / 15 & 34 / 22 & 51 / 22 & 51 / 22 \\ 52 \end{array}$ | 68/11 | hand [4] 11/22 11/22 49/22 |
| 54/7 64/8 69/5 76/18 77/19 | glad [2] 4/15 75/19 | 49/22 |
| 78/20 | glean [2] 32/13 32/13 | handle [3] $24 / 18$ 32/19 $52 / 8$ |
| forward to [1] | global [1] 19/2 | hangup [2] 31/13 |
| found [1] 13/5 | go [17] 6/13 15/4 24/16 | happen [3] 26/24 34/19 64/25 |
| four [1] 54/21 | 28/25 39/1 39/3 39/5 40/15 | happening [1] 25/19 |
| four-page [1] 54/21 | $\begin{aligned} & 49 / 14 \text { 50/14 } 61 / 2 \text { 62/8 } 64 / 7 \\ & 64 / 8 \quad 66 / 170 / 370 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | happens [3] 32/9 34/18 43/11 happy [5] 9/7 13/13 24/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { frankly [3] } & 29 / 2 & 56 / 16 & 71 / 5\end{array}$ | goes [5] 7/13 22/14 $32 / 10$ | 55/22 58/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { frantic [1] } & 79 / 9 \\ \text { fraught [1] } & 15 / 18\end{array}$ | 71/3 80/8 | hard [11] 13/22 19/23 21/1 |
| fraught [1] 15/18 freely [1] 75/3 | going [47] 4/18 5/4 5/5 6/16 | 25/12 $46 / 1$ 59/12 $62 / 24 \quad 78 / 1$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { froent [4] } & 30 / 5 & 37 / 13 & 46 / 14\end{array}$ | 6/24 6/25 7/2 7/16 10/13 | 78/10 78/12 80/23 |
| 69/8 [4] 30/5 37/13 46/14 | 11/17 11/25 13/23 16/11 | hardened [1] 57/1 |
| frustrating [1] 20/22 | 19/20 20/9 22/9 23/14 26/1 | has [53] 8/3 9/5 9/12 9/15 |
| frustration [1] 81/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 22 & 26 / 24 & 27 / 8 & 28 / 19 & 35 / 16\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}12 / 2 & 12 / 3 & 15 / 7 & 15 / 18 \\ 15 / 18\end{array}$ |
| Ft [1] $2 / 18$ | 36/16 36/17 43/22 45/7 45/11 | 15/22 16/2 16/3 17/2 18/15 |
| fulfill [1] 80/20 | 45/20 45/24 45/25 48/3 51/22 | 21/10 22/20 22/23 23/10 |
| full [2] 40/21 64/17 | 54/7 55/12 55/14 61/25 61/25 | 23/11 23/12 24/6 26/16 29/2 |
| fully [14] 30/11 31/19 31/20 | 63/8 65/3 65/10 66/1 69/5 | 29/3 30/11 30/12 31/6 31/24 |
| 32/2 32/24 34/21 39/20 39/24 | 72/12 73/6 73/18 74/3 | 37/15 42/14 44/1 44/13 46/17 |
| 64/12 67/1 72/24 72/25 75/24 | gone [1] 78/22 | 48/14 48/14 48/17 54/19 |
| 76/5 | good [37] 3/1 3/14 4/22 5/1 | 56/13 56/19 57/8 57/14 63/14 |
| functioning [1] 77/1 | 5/22 5/24 14/11 16/3 18/15 | 63/15 $63 / 17$ 63/17 64/14 $68 / 4$ |
| fundamentally [1] 52/17 | 20/20 21/16 21/18 22/1 22/1 | 70/20 74/9 74/15 74/20 74/23 |
| further [6] 21/3 35/25 55/4 | 22/6 23/23 $23 / 25$ 28/8 30/4 | 81/23 |
| 58/6 71/7 78/16 | 31/1 44/23 44/25 45/1 45/1 | hasn't [1] 63/1 |
| future [2] 13/11 14/7 | 45/3 45/8 45/9 49/8 56/1 | hate |
| G | 76/17 77/6 78/15 80/16 | haven't [2] 7/2 63/18 |
| A | got [5] 29/24 29/25 31/11 | having [18] 4/7 9/17 10/14 |
| gain [1] | 46/12 50/1 | 19/5 25/14 26/5 29/21 30/16 |
| gains [1] 3 | gotcha [1] | 30/20 42/8 50/15 57/15 58/14 |
| gathered [1] 12/6 | gotten [1] 19/18 | 59/20 60/3 67/16 70/19 76/1 |
| gave [2] 17/25 38/10 | govern [1] 35/18 | he [15] 19/9 19/10 19/11 |
| gee [3] 28/1 73/7 80/6 | Government [4] 34/4 35/2 | 23/10 23/11 38/10 57/1 67/20 |
| general [7] 33/23 35/15 | 43/1 43/9 | 68/20 68/21 68/22 72/21 |
| 52/15 59/3 59/20 59/24 64/19 | Governmental [6] 33/18 34/2 | 72/23 72/24 72/25 |
| generally [1] 14/2 | 35/1 35/5 35/6 43/11 | head [1] 11 |
| generic [1] 59/6 | governs [1] 35/23 | headed [1] 8/2 |
| Georgetown [1] 77/11 | Grable [2] 36/18 42/25 | hear [26] 4/17 13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { get [31] } & 7 / 2 & 7 / 10 & 7 / 23 & 10 / 24\end{array}$ | Grand [1] 1/23 | $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 16 & 24 / 2 & 34 / 24 & 45 / 5 & 45 / 20\end{array}$ |
| 11/13 11/22 12/8 14/3 19/19 | grant [2] 1/16 39/22 | 48/3 48/4 48/4 51/3 51/6 |
| 22/6 25/2 25/6 26/16 27/11 | great [6] 9/16 16/19 22/1 | 51/25 52/3 55/24 60/7 62/12 |
| 27/19 36/9 39/22 40/1 41/6 | 57/15 $74 / 3$ 78/14 | 63/20 65/15 70/25 71/4 71/5 |
| 41/25 $45 / 13$ 48/7 48/8 57/16 | greater [3] 46/3 54/3 81/12 | 73/18 74/4 80/4 |
| 58/15 61/18 64/23 68/4 68/15 | greatest [1] 14/13 | heard [27] 28/3 39/5 48/ |
| 74/2 79/10 | grief [1] 75/7 | 48/12 48/16 48/18 49/3 49/10 |
| gets [1] 62/22 | grievances [1] 57/22 | 56/4 58/9 58/19 58/19 60/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { getting [8] } & / 12 & 10 / 19 & 12 / 19\end{array}$ | gritty [1] 64/17 | 61/25 61/25 62/17 63/21 |
| 32/19 35/11 $42 / 13$ 46/14 | ground [2] 14/4 79/2 | 63/22 64/17 65/5 69/13 70/13 |
| 81/18 | group [1] 75/1 | 71/10 71/18 72/2 79/8 79/19 |
| GILBERT [19] $1 / 18 \quad 1 / 19$ 44/18 | groups [1] 7/11 | heard unless [1] 69/13 |
| 44/24 45/2 $49 / 14$ 55/24 56/5 | growth [1] 14/17 | hearing [20] 4/12 23/1 25/25 |
| 58/4 58/21 59/23 60/4 62/3 | guess [11] 9/6 31/13 32/2 | 42/9 42/13 45/19 48/9 48/13 |
| $65 / 17 \text { 67/20 68/24 69/23 }$ | 32/11 41/10 62/3 68/20 68/21 | 49/6 52/12 $53 / 3 \quad 54 / 23 \quad 54 / 24$ |
| 65/17 67/20 68/24 69/23 | 70/9 80/1 80/9 | 57/9 64/8 65/14 67/8 68/21 |


| H | hour [1] 56/18 | 54/10 57/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hearing... [2] 76/9 82/1 | hours [1] | incumbent [1] 38/12 |
| hearings [4] 4/11 27/1 46/12 | house [1] 76/2 <br> Houston [1] 1/14 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { indicated [5] } 3 / 13 \quad 7 / 15 ~ 8 / ~ \\ 31 / 1637 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{rl}64 / 8 \\ \text { hears [3] } 63 / 25 \quad 64 / 18 & 80 / 4\end{array}$ | how [36] $4 / 18$ 5/4 5/4 6/16 | individual [1] 75/5 |
| hears [3] 63/25 64/18 80/4 heavily [2] 26/13 27/23 | 6/18 6/23 7/18 7/19 11/20 | individuals [2] 75/1 75/6 |
| heavy [1] 25/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 10 & 21 / 23 & 21 / 24 & 23 / 1 & 24 / 23\end{array}$ | industry [1] 36/1 |
| held [3] $43 / 1$ 55/12 55/14 | 25/17 $26 / 6$ 29/1 $29 / 8$ 30/8 | inevitability [1] 38/ |
| hello [1] 73/20 | $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 5 & 38 / 21 & 40 / 22 & 41 / 2 & 45 / 25\end{array}$ | inevitably [1] 17/16 |
| help [12] 10/4 10/4 11/16 | 48/6 50/8 50/10 52/25 53/5 | information [6] 7/21 |
| 13/10 18/17 $22 / 14$ 40/9 40/24 | 53/21 64/11 69/3 72/13 74/5 | 12/6 16/7 24/15 68/5 |
| 53/9 54/6 54/6 55/19 | 79/9 81/16 | informational [12] 50/4 |
| helped [1] 29/3 | however [4] 3/22 15/20 $16 / 18$ | 60/19 62/17 71/2 71/25 |
| helpful [10] 17/7 22/10 | huge [1] 9/8 | $79 / 11$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}25 / 20 & 40 / 7 & 40 / 24 & 44 / 1 & 54 / 25 \\ 57 / 17 & 58 / 3 & 63 / 9 & & \end{array}$ | hugely [1] 7/8 | informed [5] 25/18 45/21 |
| $1758 / 3$ | human [2] 76/12 76/1 | 45/21 65/3 67 |
| $\text { er [2] } 33 / 7 \quad 76 / 21$ | humanly [1] 10/11 | informing [1] 5/14 |
| here [25] 3/1 31/19 31/25 | hundred [1] 71/22 | Ingelheim [2] 45/4 56/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 4 & 32 / 11 & 35 / 18 & 36 / 5 & 37 / 4\end{array}$ | hurdles [1] 13/23 | initial [1] 40/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 14 & 40 / 8 & 41 / 4 & 41 / 6 & 44 / 8\end{array}$ | hypotheticals [1] | injury [1] 8/7 |
| 47/16 47/17 47/18 58/2 62/11 | I | $\text { [1] } 34 / 2$ |
| 64/20 76/18 78/4 79/1 79/20 | I'm [1] 11/15 | input [8] 3/13 44/13 58/10 |
| 79/22 80/19 | idea [3] 3/14 6/11 47/13 | 61/17 61/18 61/22 69/4 73/12 |
|  | ideas [1] 6/18 | insight [2] 41/25 53/5 |
| $\text { high [1] } 36 / 10$ | identical [2] 37/18 40/4 | INSOGNA [6] 2/13 73/19 |
| higher [1] 34/3 | Illinois [1] 23/17 | 74/2 77/5 77/7 |
| highlight [1] 49/7 | illnesses [1] 18/24 | instance [1] |
| highly [1] 36/11 | imagine [4] 8/15 35/17 41/13 | instances [3] 22/18 22/23 |
| hills [1] 81/20 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { him [3] } & 23 / 6 & 23 / 13 & 72 / 21\end{array}$ | impact [7] 18/4 20/3 53/6 | instructions [2] 48/15 48/17 |
| hired [1] 75/7 | 60/2 60/16 72/6 72/17 | instrumental [1] 9/11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { his [5] 38/11 48/17 55/23 } \\ & 68 / 2572 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | impacted [2] 18/2 71/24 | integrally [2] 72/9 72/2 |
| holding [1] | impacting [3] 3/19 60/15 | integrating [1] 75/2 |
| holidays [1] 80/25 | 72 | intend [3] 23/1 26/13 27/18 |
| holistically [1] 40/25 | impacts [3] 53/18 72 imperative [1] 11/1 | intended [2] 20/10 65/4 <br> intending [1] 79/14 |
| HON [1] 2/17 | implement [1] 7/13 | intent [1] 3/20 |
|  | implementing [1] 76/20 | intention [3] 36/24 65/15 |
| Honor [72] 5/1 5/22 6/3 $6 / 8$ | implications [2] 30/22 72/12 | 69/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}7 / 5 & 7 / 14 & 7 / 23 & 9 / 6 & 9 / 12 & 9 / 19 \\ 9 / 22 & 12 / 1 & 21 / 5 & 21 / 16 & 21 / 25\end{array}$ | implicit [1] 47/1 | intents [2] 37/17 39/15 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} 9 / 22 & 12 / 1 & 21 / 5 & 21 / 16 & 21 / 25 \\ 23 / 3 & 23 / 10 & 23 / 25 & 26 / 7 & 26 / 21 \end{array}$ | importance [3] 16/15 19/8 | interactions [1] 79/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 29 / 15 & 29 / 23 & 30 / 4 & 32 / 20 & 33 / 7\end{array}$ | 28/5 | interactive [1] 68/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 33 / 13 & 34 / 1 & 34 / 13 & 34 / 18 & 35 / 9\end{array}$ | important [37] 4/16 6/4 7/9 | interest [11] 19/10 26/24 |
| 36/3 37/8 $37 / 13$ 38/2 38/24 | 8/14 8/16 9/14 11/5 13/20 | 52/15 69/2 69/3 71/4 71/5 |
| 39/1 39/19 40/16 41/20 41/22 | (16 14/17 16/12 17/20 | 71/18 74/15 81/11 81/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 43 / 6 & 44 / 3 & 44 / 6 & 44 / 14 & 44 / 15\end{array}$ | 17/21 17/21 19/5 22/15 25/17 | interested [3] 25/25 27/8 |
| 44/23 $44 / 25$ 45/3 $45 / 6$ 50/1 |  | interrupting [1] 47/24 |
| 50/13 $52 / 18$ 53/25 54/19 56/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 56 / 21 & 47 / 4 & 47 / 7 & 48 / 25 & 50 / 23 \\ 52 / 16 & 53 / 4 & 54 / 5 & 58 / 13 & 65 / 6\end{array}$ | intervention [1] 27/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}56 / 4 & 56 / 19 & 57 / 4 & 58 / 6 & 59 / 23 \\ 66 / 24 & 67 / 12 & 67 / 18 & 67 / 24 & 68\end{array}$ | 67/2 $69 / 18$ 71/19 $76 / 11 \quad 79 / 2$ | interview [2] 74/8 75/17 |
| 68/4 71/21 71/22 73/11 73/25 | importantly [2] 5/15 13/18 | intimately [1] 52/6 |
| 77/4 77/6 | imposing [1] 54/3 | intricately [1] 14/1 |
| Honor's [4] 35/23 36/9 37/3 | impressed [1] 15/11 | introduce [5] 12/22 23/13 |
| 52/5 [4] | impression [1] 75/18 <br> improve [2] 46/2 50/9 | 30/17 44/22 77/21 <br> invaluable [1] 9/5 |
| HONORABLE [2] 1/9 1/10 | improved [1] 68/14 | invitation [1] 51/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { honored [1] } & 77 / 15 \\ \text { hope [10] } & 4 / 23 & 18 / 21 & 38 / 13\end{array}$ | in-chambers [1] 67/6 | involve [2] 7/20 56/16 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { hope }[10] \quad 4 / 23 \text { 18/21 } 38 / 13 \\ 63 / 1171 / 971 / 17 \quad 76 / 19 \quad 78 / 22 \end{gathered}$ | in-house [1] 76/2 | involved [15] 5/9 5/12 9/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 63 / 11 & 71 / 9 & 71 / 17 & 76 / 19 \\ 79 / 10 & 70 / 25 & & \end{array}$ | in-person [1] 3/5 | 10/15 13/2 $14 / 114 / 2$ 17/18 |
| hoped [1] 41/6 | inappropriate [1] 57/12 | 20/14 26/18 52/6 67/25 72/22 |
| hopefully [6] 9/24 11/6 | include [5] 4/2 50/20 63/19 | $74 / 14$ 77/14 |
| 11/18 12/23 13/10 78/6 | 65/22 66/25 | is [402] |
| hoping [1] 21/2 | included [5] 3/22 4/1 4/15 | is a [1] 68/3 |
| horribles [1] 44/5 | including [4] 4/11 5/10 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { issue [40] } & 29 / 16 & 31 / 2 & 31 / 3\end{array}$ |
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Kopelowitz [1] 1/19

KRAUSE [5] 1/22 1/23 73/19 73/22 75/16
KYLE [2] 1/15 29/22

\section*{L}
L.A [2] 78/11 78/12
laboring [1] 29/4
laid [1] 53/24
language [2] 64/13 64/14
large [7] 10/1 10/10 16/10 18/7 21/11 28/9 52/13
larger [3] 16/5 18/3 19/13
last [13] 4/8 6/3 10/23 11/11 46/10 50/13 53/19 58/11 62/15 63/8 69/10 74/7 74/17
Lastly [1] 55/6
later [1] 38/16
launch [1] 32/21
law [16] 28/16 32/16 32/16 33/24 34/8 35/17 35/19 36/13 \(36 / 14 \quad 38 / 11 \quad 38 / 25 \quad 40 / 22 \quad 43 / 1\) 64/21 74/10 77/11
laws [1] 36/4
lawyer [1] 14/17
lawyers [3] 26/14 26/18 30/23
lay [1] 53/25
\(\begin{array}{llllll}\text { LDC [14] } & 9 / 7 & 9 / 10 & 9 / 17 & 13 / 25\end{array}\) 26/13 26/16 27/24 28/1 28/6 49/6 73/18 75/23 76/8 77/15
lead [4] 33/22 56/2 75/1 75/22
leaders [1] 29/11
leadership [5] 5/18 7/15 17/21 31/12 75/19
leadership's [1] 3/23
leads [1] 67/14
learning [1] 27/5
least [13] 3/14 3/20 7/15 \(\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 21 & 16 / 19 & 25 / 11 & 28 / 21 & 32 / 4\end{array}\) 37/20 37/23 38/10 56/13 65/14
leave [5] 20/1 29/17 29/18 31/9 38/20
leave to [1] 29/18
legal [3] 28/12 \(52 / 13 \quad 75 / 8\) lend [1] 30/18
length [2] 13/2 41/8
Leon [1] 1/20
less [2] 26/20 40/17
let [16] 5/3 9/18 23/6 23/19 24/22 28/3 38/6 42/1 48/4 49/11 \(58 / 8 \quad 59 / 12 \quad 65 / 3 \quad 70 / 15\) 70/16 70/17
let's [19] 4/13 4/22 29/21 32/18 34/21 38/16 38/18 39/22 44/21 48/3 55/24 59/11 62/1 63/7 63/9 70/22 73/2 73/20 79/6
letter [6] 54/14 59/1 66/11 66/17 66/19 69/7
letters [1] 66/20
letting [3] 24/17 74/7 75/15
level [4] 14/4 22/9 35/2 36/10
levels [1] 35/3
liability [2] 1/5 77/15
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline L & Los [1] 77/11 & \[
y \begin{array}{llllll}
{[36]} & 3 / 12 & 5 / 20 & 6 / 3 & 1
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline liaison [7] 7/11 21/20 22/5 & \begin{tabular}{l}
losing [1] 43/4 \\
lot [14] 25/2 26/5 27/5 29/3
\end{tabular} & \[
4 / 19 \quad 15 / 18 \quad 17 / 17 \quad 18 / 2 \quad 18 / 3
\] \\
\hline 22/13 23/15 23/22 24/6 &  & 34/19 38/7 39/10 42/4 42/7 \\
\hline liaisons [2] 22/18 27/11 & \[
\begin{array}{llllll}
67 / 15 & 74 / 9 & 76 / 19 & 78 / 1 & 79 / 2
\end{array}
\] & \[
42 / 11 \quad 42 / 18 \text { 44/23 } 47 / 9 \quad 47 / 10
\] \\
\hline life [1] 80/24 & love [2] 30/20 78/14 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}50 / 21 & 50 / 25 & 53 / 8 & 53 / 8 & 53 / 9\end{array}\) \\
\hline 22/16 \(22 / 17 \quad 24 / 14\) 26/23 31/2 & M & 60/6 60/14 66/25 74/6 74/7 \\
\hline 31/14 38/17 39/11 39/20 & & 11 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}41 / 15 & 43 / 17 & 45 / 21 & 49 / 17 & 50 / 4\end{array}\) & MA [1] 2/15 & may winnow [1] \\
\hline 50/10 52/14 52/23 61/1 61/7 & made [12] 6/10 12/15 12/18 & maybe [16] 9/23 20/24 28/2 \\
\hline 62/14 63/10 63/18 69/5 69/17 & 7/14 \(27 / 22\) 42/19 44/21 & 31/8 31/25 42/10 42/11 42/13 \\
\hline 69/24 70/23 71/7 73/4 75/22 & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(46 / 17\) 55/6 57/19 61/16 75/18 \\
MAGISTRATE [2] 1/11 48/16
\end{tabular} & \[
65 / 18 \quad 65 / 25 \quad 68 / 17
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{cc}77 / 7 & 80 / 1080 / 23 ~ 81 / 21 ~\end{array}\) & mainly [2] 6/1 8/24 & McGEE [3] 1/15 29/22 \(30 / 1\) \\
\hline Lilly [1] 74/16 & major [2] 35/17 35/24 & md [1] 1/3 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llll}\text { limbo [1] } & 43 / 18 \\ \text { limit [3] } & 41 / 12 & 51 / 24\end{array}\) & majority [1] 18/22 & MDL [17] 3/2 3/20 4/16 7/16 \\
\hline mitation [2] 69/8 69/11 & make [25] 9/3 10/22 12/18 & \(\begin{array}{llllllll}14 / 3 & 14 / 9 & 14 / 17 & 23 / 11 & 26 / 23\end{array}\) \\
\hline limited [1] 5/10 & 13/5 13/17 14/20 15/8 21/12 & 27/8 30/19 37/9 37/17 52/6 \\
\hline limiting [1] 43/21 & 22/8 23/5 25/22 30/7 33/24 & 53/14 53/14 76/24 \\
\hline limits [1] 41/19 & 34/17 41/3 44/8 45/18 46/5 & MDLs [2] 35/20 77/15 \\
\hline line [2] 6/24 62/7 & 47/11 55/20 62/6 62/14 71/1 & me [30] 5/3 16/12 18/18 \(21 / 5\) \\
\hline liner [1] 65/22 & 22 80/20 & 23/14 28/3 30/17 37/21 38/6 \\
\hline lines [1] 70/23 & &  \\
\hline linked [1] 72/9 & making [9] 5/15 26/25 34/3 & \[
59 / 16 \quad 60 / 5 \quad 61 / 1 \quad 65 / 8 \quad 68 / 11
\] \\
\hline listen [1] 76/15 & \(\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 52 / 6 & 55 / 19 & 57 / 3 & 72 / 24 & 75 / 22\end{array}\) & 68/13 \(69 / 8 \quad 70 / 23 \quad 74 / 4 \quad 74 / 7\) \\
\hline listening [1] 13/19 & 76/6 & 75/15 \\
\hline litigants [3] 23/17 25/23
25/24 & manage [3] 6/10 29/9 44/ & mean [10] 28/18 29/6 29 \\
\hline litigate [2] 28/13 28/16 & management [7] 46/3 56/9 & 31/20 31/23 32/25 47/15 48/1 \\
\hline litigated [1] 74/12 & 56/11 59/22 72/18 80/7 80/10 & 52/2 71/14 \\
\hline litigating [1] 25/24 & managers [1] & meaning [3] 6/25 36/18 45 \\
\hline litigation [38] 1/5 5/12 & managing [1] 54/7 & meaningful [7] 11/3 11/20 \\
\hline 5/16 5/17 8/16 11/10 13/10 & manner [1] 17/16 & 20/25 34/11 58/16 62/22 \\
\hline 13/20 \(14 / 6\) 15/8 19/15 \(22 / 15\) & manufacturer [1] 12/4 many [22] 5/11 6/11 6/11 & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
62 \text { / } 22
\] \\
meaningfully [1] 20
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 23/21 25/19 25/21 26/23 28/2 & \[
6 / 18 \quad 7 / 18 \quad 7 / 19 \quad 14 / 23 \quad 15 / 10
\] &  \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 9 & 29 / 11 & 29 / 12 & 31 / 7 & 37 / 15\end{array}\) & 15/10 \(17 / 11 \quad 17 / 11 \quad 19 / 21 \quad 25 / 4\) & \(\begin{array}{llllll}\text { meanst [4] } & 59 / 8 & 65 / 13 & 65 / 14\end{array}\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}46 / 6 & 51 / 5 & 52 / 15 & 53 / 7 & 53 / 14 \\ 53 / 18 & 54 / 7 & 67 / 17 & 69 / 3 & 74 / 12\end{array}\) & 26/17 28/14 51/4 \(74 / 11 \quad 74 / 25\) & 70 / 4 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{lllll}
53 / 18 & 54 / 7 & 67 / 17 & 69 / 3 & 74 / 12 \\
75 / 1 & 76 / 11 & 76 / 17 & 78 / 4 & 79 / 4
\end{array}
\] & 75/20 76/24 76/24 77/19 & measures [1] 76/20 \\
\hline 75/1 76/11 76/17 78/4 79/4 81/19 & mapping [6] 8/4 8/4 12/1 & mechanisms [1] 50/ \\
\hline litigations [2] 13/11 28/19 & 12/12 12/13 13/21 & medical [1] 8/ \\
\hline little [17] 12/5 17/17 20/24 & March [4] 32/8 34/20 37/11 & meet [13] 10/11 10/20 15 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 25 / 2 & 27 / 17 & 32 / 15 & 36 / 5 & 41 / 25\end{array}\) & 40/1 & 44/11 54/18 55/2 57/6 57/7 \\
\hline 43/14 54/12 62/6 66/21 66/22 & mark [1] 26/5 & 57/15 66/2 75/14 76/22 77/23 \\
\hline 69/22 76/14 76/15 79/4 & Maryland [2] 32/16 34/14 & meeting [3] 32/7 67/6 70/10 \\
\hline lives [1] 9/3 & mass [2] 74/11 & meetings [1] \\
\hline LLC [1] 1/23 & Massachusetts [1] 2/11 & member [1] 14/ \\
\hline LLP [4] 2/4 2/7 2/10 \(2 / 13\) & massive [1] 12/2 & members [13] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}\text { LMI [10] } & 6 / 12 & 7 / 10 & 10 / 4 & 10 / 8\end{array}\) & master [18] 6/9 6/15 9/5 & 13/25 26/14 26/17 27/24 28/1 \\
\hline 10/16 \(10 / 17\) 12/11 12/16 & 10/4 10/17 \(13 / 414 / 22\) 17/13 & 28/6 49/6 73/18 74/19 76/8 \\
\hline 16/21 17/12 & 18/9 18/20 20/19 54/9 57/7 & mentioned [5] 10/1 10/13 \\
\hline local [6] 39/8 39/11 39/16 & 67/25 68/5 70/4 70/17 79/24 & 12/22 57/4 77/7 \\
\hline 39/18 41/13 79/15 & master's [1] 17/3 & mentoring [1 \\
\hline long [9] 20/22 23/13 24/23 & match [1] 8/9 & merits [5] 30/8 30/9 30/2 \\
\hline 26/21 42/3 56/18 60/1 78/22 & matches [1] 3/23 & 32/19 36/10 \\
\hline 78/23 & Mathis [1] 28/25 & mesh [1] 74/1 \\
\hline longer [3] 16/21 17/17 17/25 & matter [17] 21/19 24/7 30/9 & message [3] 6/24 10/21 45/12 \\
\hline look [13] 7/17 11/9 16/25 & \(34 / 20 \quad 36 / 24 \quad 44 / 12\) 65/17 & methodical [1] 30/10 \\
\hline 19/23 23/1 \(38 / 11\) 51/22 59/7 & 72/14 72/17 73/2 73/3 73/6 & meticulous [2] 47/19 56/23 \\
\hline 69/19 76/18 77/19 78/19 &  & \begin{tabular}{l}
metric [1] 79/1 \\
Mexico [23] 23/17 29/17
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 81/20 & matters [20] \(3 / 17\) 3/18 3/19
\(3 / 19\) 4/4 13/9 17/15 20/4 & \[
\begin{array}{|rrrrl}
\text { Mexico } & {[23]} & 23 / 17 & 29 / 17 \\
29 / 18 & 31 / 6 & 31 / 8 & 32 / 10 & 32 / 11
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline looked [1] 61/1 & \[
\begin{array}{lllll}
30 / 18 & 30 / 20 & 47 / 2 & 47 / 5 & 47 / 25
\end{array}
\] & \[
32 / 16 \quad 32 / 23 \quad 32 / 24 \quad 33 / 3 \quad 33 / 23
\] \\
\hline looking [9] 7/20 11/15 12/22 & \(48 / 4 \quad 49 / 17 \quad 60 / 18 \quad 63 / 24 \quad 72 / 2\) & \(\begin{array}{lllll}34 / 10 & 35 / 11 & 35 / 16 & 37 / 15\end{array}\) \\
\hline 38/17 39/23 40/2 40/2 43/20 & \(72 / 6\) 72/23 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 19 & 38 / 21 & 39 / 14 & 41 / 13\end{array}\) \\
\hline /25 [3] 11/ & Matthews [5] 23/9 23/20 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 43/14 } & 47 / 9 & 79 / 4\end{array}\) \\
\hline looks [3] 11/10 39/20 63/9
loosely [2] 45/25 80/6 & \[
\begin{array}{rr}
23 / 23 & 24 / 21 \\
\text { maximize [1] } & 43 / 10 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & Mexico motion [1] 29/17 Mexico or [1] 39/14 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline M & 81/ & ns \\
\hline Mexico's [1] 34/18 & mountains [1] 81/20 & neither [2] 38/14 63/1 \\
\hline Miami [1] 1/21 & move [7] 26/15 34/21 49/
\[
71 / 8 \quad 78 / 680 / 580 / 17
\] & \begin{tabular}{ll} 
nervous [1] & \(79 / 8\) \\
network [1] & \(76 / 10\)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline mic [1] 74/4 & moves [1] 52/6 & never [6] 20/10 51/25 62/16 \\
\hline mid [1] \({ }^{\text {middle [1] }} 55 / 14\) & moving [2] 7/2 77/13 & 69/15 79/14 80/2 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{lll} 
might [24] & \(6 / 23\) & \(8 / 15\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text { Mr }[74] & 4 / 19 & 4 / 20 & 4 / 22 & 4 / 22 \\
6 / 8 & 6 / 15 & 7 / 24 & 8 / 3 & 8 / 21 & 9 / 18
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
nevertheless [1] 51/2 \\
new [47] \(1 / 17\) 2/5 7/13 \(13 / 10\)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 14 & 31 / 25 & 32 / 15 & 37 / 1 & 39 / 10\end{array}\) & \begin{tabular}{llllll} 
\\
\hline\(/ 20\) & \(10 / 18\) & \(11 / 4\) & \(12 / 22\) & \(13 / 15\)
\end{tabular} & 14/3 23/17 23/18 24/22 29/17 \\
\hline 40/9 41/24 42/8 46/25 50/9 50/19 50/19 64/25 64/25 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}13 / 16 & 14 / 21 & 14 / 21 & 17 / 6 & 18 / 8\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{lllll} & 29 / 18 & 30 / 2 & 31 / 5 & 31 / 7 \\ 32 / 10\end{array}\) \\
\hline 69/15 69/17 69/17 69/18 & 19/6 19/11 20/15 20/15 21/10 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 11 & 32 / 16 & 32 / 23 ~ 32 / 24 ~ & 33 / 3\end{array}\) \\
\hline 71/11 \(72 / 13\) 72/17 & 21/21 21/21 21/22 22/1 23/4 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 23 & 34 / 9 & 34 / 18 & 35 / 11 & 35 / 13\end{array}\) \\
\hline mind [4] 7/24 22/17 & 23/23 24/2 24/4 24/21 26/10 & 35/16 37/15 37/19 38/20 \\
\hline 67/24 & 26/10 27/20 28/25 30/1 \(30 / 1\) & 39/14 41/12 \(43 / 14\) 45/8 45/24 \\
\hline indful [2] 36/9 41/21 & \(34 / 24\) 35/8 38/10 42/11 \(42 / 21\) & 46/6 46/19 46/21 47/9 57/20 \\
\hline minutes [2] 49/18 56/18 & 44/18 \(44 / 19\) 45/1 \(49 / 14 \begin{array}{llll}\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}67 / 18 & 68 / 14 & 70 / 9 & 70 / 10 & 75 / 22\end{array}\) \\
\hline misconstrued [2] 45/13 48/24 & 55/7 55/23 55/24 55/25 56/5 & 77/24 77/24 79/4 79/6 \\
\hline miss [1] 78/13 & 57/1 58/4 58/21 60/4 62/3 & next [17] 4/12 6/14 6/21 8/2 \\
\hline & 65/17 67/10 67/20 68/19 & 12/24 18/11 21/19 29/16 \(32 / 7\) \\
\hline [1] & 68/23 68/24 69/23 70/11 73/1 & \(44 / 17\) 47/10 55/11 57/10 69/6 \\
\hline & 73/10 73/19 74/18 74/20 & 70/22 78/20 81/18 \\
\hline & 75/16 & nice [6] 4/24 5/2 23/23 30/1 \\
\hline  & Ms [1] & 30/3 76/10 \\
\hline modification & Ms. [2] 73/19 74/ & nine [1] 13/ \\
\hline moment [5] 7/16 15/15 & Ms. Finken [1] & nitty [1] \\
\hline 55/6 62/25 & Ms. Insogna [1] 73/19 & nitty-gritty [1] \\
\hline moments [1] 81/8 & much [15] 7/3 9/20 12/ & no [12] 1/3 3/6 20/18 \\
\hline Monday [1] 39/22 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 15 & 17 / 15 & 21 / 15 & 26 / 23 & 38 / 4\end{array}\) & 31/8 37/13 43/21 45/18 62/20 \\
\hline money [2] 21/11 28/23 & 45/20 47/12 66/6 73/13 77/21 & 69/11 73/11 78/18 \\
\hline month [18] 3/15 3/17 \(4 / 8\) & me/15 80/2 & nobody [5] 20/8 69/ 71/10 76/21 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 12 & 40 / 3 & 46 / 9 & 46 / 11 & 46 / 16\end{array}\) & multi-district [1] 37/15 & non [10] \(8 / 6 \quad 30 / 19 \quad 36 / 14\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llll}46 / 17 & 46 / 19 & 47 / 10 & 50 / 19\end{array}\) & must [3] 13/8 18/25 47/21 & 48/4 48/8 \(54 / 11\) 59/13 63/24 \\
\hline 50/20 55/13 55/14 60/19 63/7 & muzzled [1] 69/12 & 72/17 80/9 \\
\hline 70/19 & my [43] 7/10 \(7 / 24\) 8/21 9/1 & non-agreed [1] \\
\hline monthly [18] 44/17 46/21 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { 9/19 } & 10 / 14 & 10 / 21 ~ 25 / 2 ~ 25 / 5 ~\end{array}\) & non-compliance [1] \\
\hline \(50 / 3 \quad 52 / 10 \quad 52 / 11 \quad 52 / 23 \quad 53 / 3\) & 25/6 28/2 30/19 31/5 32/17 & \begin{tabular}{l}
non-deficient \\
[1]
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\(53 / 13\) \\
\(53 / 16\) \\
\(56 / 14\) \\
\(56 / 15\) \\
\(56 / 11\) \\
\(56 / 17\) \\
\hline \(60 / 5\)
\end{tabular} & 33/21 33/22 35/11 36/20 & non-discovery [5] 48/4 48/8) \\
\hline 56/14 56/15 56/17 60/5 60/7 60/9 79/5 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 20 & 40 / 23 & 45 / 7 & 48 / 21 & 49 / 5\end{array}\) & 59/13 72/17 80/9 \\
\hline months [9] & 53/12 \(53 / 23\) 56/16 57/1 \(58 / 18\) & none [1] 15/9 \\
\hline 15/10 \(42 / 7 \begin{array}{lllll} & 42 / 16 & 43 / 12 & 46 / 1\end{array}\) & 60/15 65/15 67/8 68/7 74/3 & not [153] \\
\hline \(74 / 17\) lill & \(\begin{array}{lllll}74 / 8 & 74 / 10 & 74 / 13 & 74 / 15 & 75 / 5\end{array}\) & note [2] 49/8 75/12 \\
\hline more [39] \(4 / 5\) 9/6 \(13 / 5\) 15/19 & 75/11 75/11 77/7 77/13 79/17 & noted [2] \\
\hline 18/4 18/22 24/16 26/17 32/2 & myself [5]
\[
77 / 10 \quad 77 / 22
\] & nothing [2] 27/14 63/24 notice [6] 6/12 22/20 2 \\
\hline 41/6 41/10 41/17 42/4 43/18 & & \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}43 / 25 & 45 / 6 & 45 / 13 & 46 / 4 & 46 / 20\end{array}\) & N & notices [2] \\
\hline 55/21 57/2 57/2 57/3 58/3 & name [4] 3/8 35/12 75/24 & now [25] 8/5 10/2 11/8 11/12 \\
\hline 58/3 58/3 62/6 67/1 67/13 & \(\mathrm{n}_{7 / 7}\) & \(\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 20 & 19 / 5 & 19 / 21 & 24 / 17 & 27 / 14\end{array}\) \\
\hline 67/20 67/21 67/21 68/7 68/8 & names [1] 73/20 & 27/17 31/7 32/5 37/8 43/18 \\
\hline 75/5 76/15 79/4 79/11 80/17 & narrow [2] 40/10 55/3 & 44/13 50/4 52/23 54/12 55/22 \\
\hline morning [2] 23/5 54/19 & narrowing [1] 16/13 & 63/19 65/19 68/20 70/23 71/6 \\
\hline most [16] 5/6 7/6 8/19 8/19 & nature [5] 8/24 18/24 & 74/23 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 25 & 27 / 4 & 30 / 25 & 37 / 24 & 42 / 16\end{array}\) & \[
43 / 20 \quad 59 / 15
\] & nuance [1] 34/ \\
\hline 44/9 46/10 58/16 58/18 61/23 & nearly [1] 25/13 & number [16] \(8 / 15\) 9/1 \(10 /\) \\
\hline 70/7 77/17 & necessarily [8] 3/18 20/23 & \[
10 / 10 \text { 11/13 } 12 / 25 \text { 13/1 } 13 / 1
\] \\
\hline motion [38] 29/17 29/18 & 22/7 22/23 24/7 58/15 66/10 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 20 & 22 / 18 & 33 / 15 & 49 / 5 & 59 / 2\end{array}\) \\
\hline 29/19 \(30 / 12\) 30/15 \(31 / 9\) 31/9 & 81/23 & 60/18 61/7 77/14 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 15 & 31 / 18 & 31 / 21 & 31 / 22 \\ 31 / 25 & 32 / 14 & 32 / 23 & 32 / 25 & 34 / 9\end{array}\) & necessary [6] 10/9 24/10 & numbers [1] \(41 / 1\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 25 & 32 / 14 & 32 / 23 & 32 / 25 & 34 / 9 \\ 34 / 10 & 34 / 13 & 34 / 21 & 37 / 6 & 38 / 20\end{array}\) & 70/13 70/15 70/16 70/18 & nuts [1] 9/11 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}34 / 10 & 34 / 13 & 34 / 21 & 37 / 6 & 38 / 20 \\ 38 / 21 & 38 / 22 & 38 / 23 & 39 / 3 & 39 / 3\end{array}\) & need [16] 13/7 19/18 20/3 & NW [2] 2/2 2/11 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 21 & 38 / 22 & 38 / 23 & 39 / 3 & 39 / 3 \\ 40 / 11 & 41 / 24 & 42 / 9 & 42 / 24 & 47 / 9\end{array}\) & 24/16 26/11 27/16 38/11 53/9 & NY [1] \(2 / 5\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}48 / 12 & 51 / 3 & 52 / 3 & 53 / 7 & 53 / 8\end{array}\) & 56/18 58/7 60/11 60/12 68/2 & 0 \\
\hline 53/9 64/13 & & \\
\hline motions [6] 9/12 38/3 41/16 & needed [7] 3/24 18/13 & objecting [1] 52/21 \\
\hline 41/18 42/1 46/12 & 35/5 41/17 41/17 67/13 & obligations [1] 20/ \\
\hline mountain [3] 81/21 81/21 & \[
\begin{array}{rlrrr}
\text { needs [8] } & 19 / 10 & 19 / 14 & 53 / 2 \\
53 / 20 & 64 / 7 & 70 / 20 & 71 / 5 & 80 / 4
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
obstacle [1] 81/23 \\
obviously [8] 7/8 9/5 11/12
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline P & portal [3] 10/16 12/13 12 & \[
6 / 10 \text { 8/10 8/14 9/8 } 10
\] \\
\hline ersons [1] 22/17 & Porter [2] 2/4 2/10 & \[
11 / 2 \quad 11 / 2 \quad 11 / 1711 / 2313 / 3
\] \\
\hline perspective [12] 8/21 9/16 & \begin{tabular}{lllll} 
portion [1] & \(11 / 4\) & \\
position [7] & \(19 / 9\) & \(63 / 22\) & \(64 / 9\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{lllll}
13 / 9 & 13 / 19 & 14 / 24 & 15 / 10 & 15 / 16 \\
15 / 17 & 15 / 21 & 15 / 22 & 15 / 23
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 20 & 37 / 23 & 38 / 5 & 40 / 18 & 40 / 23 \\ 41 / 4 & 42 / 6 & 43 / 13 & 49 / 19 & 52 / 11\end{array}\) & position \(65 / 765 / 9\) 75/19 81/15 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 18 & 18 / 12 & 19 / 14 & 20 / 8 & 21 / 7\end{array}\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}41 / 4 & 42 / 6 & 43 / 13 & 49 / 19 & 52 / 1 \\ \text { ETROSINELLI [14] } & 2 / 1 & 4 / 20\end{array}\) & positions [7] 24/7 53/10 & 22/24 23/2 23/18 25/23 38/3 \\
\hline 4/22 5/23 9/20 10/18 11/4 & 54/16 55/1 57/14 57/16 66/23 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}45 / 24 & 48 / 9 & 50 / 9 & 57 / 3 & 57 / 4\end{array}\) \\
\hline \(12 / 22 \quad 13 / 1614 / 21 \quad 19 / 11\) & positive [2] 75/18 76/6 & 57/6 60/20 61/22 62/4 63/2 \\
\hline 20/15 21/10 42/21 & possible [5] 10/11 19/21 & 63/3 \(64 / 764 / 1464 / 15\) 65/3 \\
\hline pharmaceutical [3] 36/12 & 51/6 70/7 79/16 & 65/4 67/25 68/4 71/9 71/19 \\
\hline 74/15 74/17 & posture [3] 35/20 37/10 & 79/6 79/12 81/16 \\
\hline phase [2] 3/14 46/6 & 37/1 & processes [1] 57/11 \\
\hline phone [3] 18/10 19/19 23/16 & potentially [1] 34/11 practical [6] 17/18 29/8 & \begin{tabular}{l}
produced [1] 12/4 \\
product [2] 8/8 77/14
\end{tabular} \\
\hline picked [1] 62/11 & Pra/19 30/22 37/24 44/13 & production [1] 74 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llll}\text { picking [1] } \\ \text { picture [2] } & 18 / 10 \\ 11 / 10 & 40 / 25\end{array}\) & practicalities [1] 37/3 & productive [1] 61/19 \\
\hline picture [2] 11/10 40/25
picture and [1] \(40 / 25\) & practice [5] 35/21 53/7 53/8 & products [2] 1/5 13/1 \\
\hline icture and [1] 40/25 & 53/9 64/13 & profession [1] 81/ \\
\hline ce [2] 7/9 60/ & practiced [1] 77/ & professional [1] 76/1 \\
\hline ierce [1] \(6 / 18\) & practicing [1] 23/13 & progeny [1] 42/25 \\
\hline Pierce/West [1] 2/18 & precedent [3] 35/23 36/15 & progress [3] 6/10 43/15 50/7 \\
\hline Piper [2] 2/13 77/8 & 36/19 & promotes [1] 79/15 \\
\hline place [13] 1/16 27/18 50/6 & fer [1] & promptly [1] 38/2 \\
\hline 53/7 55/2 \(57 / 4\) 60/21 62/4 & prejudice [4] 42/6 & proof [2] 8/6 \\
\hline 63/2 63/3 75/23 80/15 80/19 & 3/20 & properly [1] 21/12 \\
\hline Plaintiff [15] 4/19 5/19 & preparation [2] & proposal [2] 57/1 65 \\
\hline 6/11 8/4 9/9 16/8 21/20 & e [5] 22/6 47/18 56/22 & proposed [10] 6/20 8/1 \(45 / 15\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 12 & 33 / 22 & 35 / 15 & 38 / 20\end{array}\) & \[
4 \text { 65/18 }
\] & 54/10 59/2 60/24 61/15 63/18 \\
\hline 39/18 \(42 / 15\) 44/19 66/14 & 38/23 &  \\
\hline PLAINTIFFS [23] 1/12 8/17 & preparing [3] 54/4 55/20 & proscribed [1] \\
\hline 9/23 10/5 10/9 13/6 15/24 & 74/24 & prospect [1] 37/ \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 14 & 17 / 23 & 18 / 6 & 19 / 10 & 23 / 8\end{array}\) & present [11] 4/12 24/14 & prove [1] 36/12 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}23 / 21 & 25 / 15 & 33 / 18 & 36 / 12 & 38 / 7\end{array}\) & 26/20 \(34 / 9\) 40/10 \(42 / 14 \quad 50 / 10\) & \(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { provide [7] } & 11 / 3 & 18 / 21 & 19 / 20\end{array}\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 43 / 950 / 1960 / 566 / 17 \quad 73 / 23 \\
& 80 / 16
\end{aligned}
\] & \(\begin{array}{llll}\text { 61/5 } & 66 / 20 & 72 / 25 & 72 / 25\end{array}\) & 26/14 52/13 60/8 76/10 \\
\hline laintiffs' [24] 7/14 8/1 & presentation [3] 5/20 55/23 & provided [4] \(12 / 2\) 16/3 \(18 / 12\) \\
\hline 10/6 10/21 \(11 / 6 \quad 12 / 1718 / 6\) & 60/25 & 45/17 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 14 & 18 / 20 & 18 / 25 & 19 / 6 & 19 / 7\end{array}\) & presentations [2] 56/24 & provides [2] 28/16 53/5 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 16 & 21 / 10 & 22 / 13 & 31 / 12 & 37 / 7\end{array}\) & 48 & provision [1] 18/15 \\
\hline 37/16 \(42 / 6 \quad 44 / 24 \quad 45 / 16\) 49/15 & presented [1] 48/20 & PSC [1] 23/11 \\
\hline 49/18 76/7 & presenting [2] 4/20 4/21 & PSE [2] 74/25 \\
\hline plan [1] 26/2 & presiding [1] 25/22 & PTO [23] 6/3 6/4 6/4 6/2 \\
\hline planning [1] 55/20 & pressing [1] 5/17 & 6/20 10/7 12/2 12/ \\
\hline play [6] 15/20 19/14 33/16 & presumably [4] 39/17 40/12 & 17/25 18/15 19/3 24/5 48/10 \\
\hline 42/8 65/3 72/13 & 48/18 68/19 & \(50 / 5\) 51/1 59/4 59/12 60/4 \\
\hline play that [1] 19/14 & pretend [1] 79/24 & 60/15 64/2 64/15 65/ \\
\hline played [1] 9/8 & pretrial [5] 29/19 31/11 & PTOs [6] 8/1 13/8 13/22 17 \\
\hline playing [1] 26/12 & 57/5 57/11 80/11 & 20/11 22/24 \\
\hline plays [2] 40/22 42/7 & pretty [2] 6/7 17/1 & public [2] 34/4 71/5 \\
\hline please [2] 44/24 74/6 & preview [1] 57/17 & public/private [1] 34/ \\
\hline pleased [2] 13/22 76/5 & previewing [1] & publicly [1] \\
\hline pleasure [4] \(30 / 5\) 44/11 & previous [1] 74/16 & PULASKI [23] 1/12 1/13 4/19 \\
\hline 77/23 78/3 & previously [2] 35/15 67/12 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}4 / 23 & 6 / 8 & 6 / 15 & 7 / 24 & 8 / 3 & 8 / 21\end{array}\) \\
\hline plethora [1] & primarily [1] 74/10 & 9/18 9/22 9/22 13/16 14/21 \\
\hline PLLC [1] 1/13 & principle [1] 43/21 & 17/6 18/9 19/7 20/15 21/21 \\
\hline Plus [1] 6/6 & principled [1] 43/23 & 22/1 24/4 26/10 74/20 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { point [20] } & 8 / 5 & 8 / 22 & 10 / 2\end{array}\) & prior [3] 31/18 55/12 76/9 & purports [1] 34/16 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llll}\text { 10/25 } & 11 / 8 & 22 / 12 & 24 / 9\end{array} 24 / 22\) & private [2] 33/21 34/4 & purpose [6] 16/6 49/20 50/3 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 3 & 27 / 12 & 27 / 25 & 32 / 9 & 36 / 3\end{array}\) & probably [4] 7/6 37/ & 51/20 52/16 78/13 \\
\hline 37/3 38/19 49/5 62/3 63/11 & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
7 / 5
\] \\
oblemati
\end{tabular} & purposes [3] 37/17 39/15 \\
\hline 66/21 70/9 & procedural [2] 33/2 35/20 & pursuant [4] 10/7 29/19 \\
\hline pointed [1] 56/19 & \(\begin{array}{ll}\text { procedurally [2] } & 32 / 19 \\ 43 / 17\end{array}\) & 48/10 64/1 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { points [5] 49/5 66/12 66/15 } \\
& 66 / 23 \text { 69/23 }
\end{aligned}
\] & procedures [2] 31/10 80/14 & pursuing [1] 7/16 \\
\hline Ponce [1] 1/ & proceed [2] 5/20 49/23 & put [36] 10/13 12/7 12/9 \\
\hline \[
\text { pop [1] } 23 / 9
\] & proceeding [1] 72/11 & 14/22 15/6 20/8 20/11 \(22 / 4\) \\
\hline popular [1] 15/4 & proceedings [2] 3/5 82/4 & 34/7 36/3 \(44 / 20\) 45/12 47/18 \\
\hline popular [1] 15/4 & process [55] 4/17 5/4 5/5 & 49/3 49/9 53/1 53/22 63/2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline P & recommended [2] 4/1 4/15 & repository [2] \\
\hline put... [18] 63/14 63/15 & reconcile [1] 78/12 reconciling [1] 8/10 & \begin{tabular}{l}
represent [8] 26/8 32/12 \\
35/10 67/14 67/15 74/1 77/9
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 63/22 64/9 65/8 67/7 69/8 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { record [3] } & 3 / 9 & 73 / 21 & 82 / 4\end{array}\) & \[
81 / 15
\] \\
\hline 69/19 69/20 69/25 71/14 & records [3] 8/7 8/9 8/17 & representation [1] 33/14 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}71 / 15 & 72 / 14 & 73 / 5 & 75 / 23 & 80 / 14 \\ 80 / 19 & 81 / 9\end{array}\) & reference [1] 55/6 & representing [1] 35/5 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
80 / 1981 / 9 \\
\text { putting [4] } 5
\end{array}
\] & refile [1] 39/13 & represents [1] 75/5 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { putting [4] 5, } \\
& 62 / 20
\end{aligned}
\] & reflect [2] 38/25 67/11 & request [3] 25/7 66/14 66 \\
\hline Q & regard [6] 3/25 18/25 19/13 & require [2] 35/25 62/18 \\
\hline & 48/21 66/7 71/17 & required [1] 64/18 \\
\hline quasi [1] 64/2 & regarding [1] 34/20 & requires [1] 57/6 \\
\hline question [15] 31/20 33/9 & registrants [2] 10/10 12/ & resolution [1] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll} & 35 / 13 & 36 / 2 & 36 / 11 & 36 / 15 & 36 / 17\end{array}\) & registry [27] 4/17 5/5 5/ & resolve [6] 31/17 3 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 36 / 19 & 42 / 5 & 42 / 25 & 43 / 7 & 58 / 10\end{array}\) & 7/9 10/2 10/10 11/2 11/12 & 48/11 48/12 55/3 79/18 \\
\hline 58/17 70/4 73/1 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 1 & 13 / 13 & 13 / 19 & 13 / 21 & 15 / 3\end{array}\) & resolved [1] 64/6 \\
\hline questioning [1] & \(\begin{array}{lllllllll}15 / 6 & 15 / 19 & 16 / 6 & 16 / 18 & 19 / 15\end{array}\) & resolving [1] 57/5 \\
\hline questions [8] 13/14 19/21 & 20/5 20/7 21/2 21/13 21/13 & resources [3] 25/13 2 \\
\hline 21/3 24/1 38/6 41/10 55/22 & /5 52/14 79/3 & \\
\hline 58/6 & regular [1] 46/20 & respect [6] 13/1 \\
\hline quick [1] 23/9 & regularly [1] 64/4 & 33/14 36/6 37/5 6 \\
\hline quickly [6] 12/20 14/25 & regulated [1] 36/11 & respectfully [2] 51/ \\
\hline 14/25 37/5 41/7 80/17 & regulations [1] 36/1 & respective [10] 50/17 \\
\hline quite [4] 29/2 69/23 & REINHART [8] 1/10 48/17 & 54/16 54/21 54/22 55/1 55/18 \\
\hline & 48/20 57/19 64/16 72/20 & 57/14 66/20 66/22 \\
\hline quote [1] 8/12 & 78/16 79/21 & respond [3] 21/4 25/7 58/15 \\
\hline & [1] & [ [1] \\
\hline R & rejected [1] 37/1 & response [10] 16/3 16/3 21/9 \\
\hline raise [1] \(72 / 7\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
rejuvenated [1] 81/1 \\
relate [2] 47/3 59/14
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{lllll}
30 / 12 & 31 / 21 & 31 / 22 & 32 / 1 & 38 / 12 \\
39 / 8 & 62 / 22 & & &
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline raised [3] 33/10 34/9 71/24 & related [9] 3/25 6/3 8/24 & responsibility \\
\hline RANITIDINE [1] 1/4 & 45/19 58/24 72/1 72/4 72/23 & result [2] 17/22 20/10 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
rather \\
81/20
\end{tabular} & 76/25 & results [3] 20/24 20/25 21/2 \\
\hline re [2] 1/4 & relates [7] 18/23 \(35 / 6\) 50/13 & retailer [1] 59/ \\
\hline re-evaluating [1] 38/11 & 50/24 59/14 71/21 76/25 & revaluating [1] 43/2 \\
\hline reached [1] 24/25 & relating [3] 7/7 51/10 71/23 & review [1] 16/22 \\
\hline reaction [1] 68/7 & relationship [2] 19/12 \(32 / 3\) & reworking [1] \\
\hline \[
\text { read [3] } 30 / 13 \quad 45 / 13 \quad 48 / 1
\] & relationships [1] 34/5 & rhyme [1] 63/16 \\
\hline reads [1] 63/14 & relatively [1] 14/ & Richmond [1] \\
\hline \[
\text { ready [1] } 39 / 5
\] & relief [8] 48/13 48/18 50/5 & right [27] 8/12 13/15 15/2 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { ready [1] } \\
\text { real [4] } & 20 / 24 & 23 / 9
\end{array}
\] & 51/1 51/3 51/12 64/22 64/24 & 24/13 \(27 / 17\) 28/12 \(29 / 1\) \\
\hline  & reluctant [1] 70/9 & 29/23 30/24 32/20 35/12 \(36 / 4\) \\
\hline & rely [2] 26/13 27/23 & 37/8 44/11 44/16 57/23 60/25 \\
\hline  & remain [2] 6/23 43/5 & 65/19 69/20 71/6 71/15 73/12 \\
\hline \[
\text { really [26] } 8 / 14 \text { 8/14 } 12 / 21
\] & remaining [2] 65/17 66/4 & 74/2 78/21 79/12 80/3 81/17 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{rrrrr}\text { really } & \text { l26/9 } & & 20 / 16 & 20 / 20\end{array}\) & remand [9] 29/19 31/10 31/18 & righteous [1] 75/12 \\
\hline 27/4 34/15 34/17 36/24 37/6 & 32/23 34/13 38/21 40/11 & rights [1] 29/7 \\
\hline 37/20 40/11 40/17 46/24 47/6 & 42/10 42/24 & ripen [1] 80/17 \\
\hline 47/7 59/1 59/14 63/9 64/24 & remands [1] 43/16 & ripened [2] 30/15 50/25 \\
\hline 73/7 79/15 80/9 & remarks [3] 13/17 14/20 22/8 & road [1] 11/19 \\
\hline reason [7] 5/13 \(33 / 8\) 53/16 & remember [3] 46/8 75/17 81/9 & ROBERT [4] 1/18 44/24 \\
\hline 60/25 61/1 61/24 63/16 & remembering [1] 61/13 & 59/23 \\
\hline reasonable [2] 20/12 41/15 & remind [3] 3/4 3/8 18/14 & ROBIN [2] \\
\hline reasons [4] 4/11 34/15 43/5 & remiss [1] 9/15 & role [8] 9/8 23/21 24/ \\
\hline 62/18 & removal [2] 35/18 36/ & 25/15 25/15 27/22 28/9 28/1) \\
\hline ebrief & removed [1] 43/15 & rolling [1] 17/4 \\
\hline recall [5] 3/13 6/3 5 & repercussions [1] 20/ & ROSENBERG [3] \(1 / 3\) 1/9 \(2 / 17\) \\
\hline 74/10 76/8 & replace [1] 50/5 & route [1] 24/ \\
\hline eceive [1] 5 & reply [9] 30/13 \(31 / 21\) 31/22 & row [1] 35/12 \\
\hline receiving [1] 6/11 & 32/1 32/25 33/17 34/7 39/17 & rule [3] 37/6 40/6 43/7 \\
\hline recently [3] 7/15 77/8 77/17 & 42/20 & ules [7] 39/8 39/11 39 \\
\hline recognize [1] 38/1 & report [7] 9/19 22/7 26/17 & 39/18 41/13 79/13 79/15 \\
\hline recognized [2] 14/15 14/15 & 27/14 27/15 50/6 50/20 reporter [5] 2/17 3/7 3/ & ruling [3] 40/7 40/9 42/23 runs [1] 68/8 \\
\hline recognizing [1] 19/10 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { orter } \\
& 1782 / 8
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline recommend [1] 51/7 &  & S \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { recommendation [3] 17/2 } \\
& 51 / 2167 / 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \(51 / 12\)
reports [2] 7/10 \(17 / 6\) & \begin{tabular}{lllll}
\hline safe [1] & \(81 / 24\) & & \\
safety [3] & \(76 / 20\) & \(76 / 22\) & \(76 / 22\)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline S & seen [9] 5/17 9/13 15/20 & significance [1] 6 \\
\hline said [16] \(4 / 13\) 20/16 21/4 & 15/23
\(28 / 10\) & \[
\begin{array}{|llll}
\text { significant } & {[2]} & 41 / 4 & 44 / \\
\text { similar } & \text { 41] } & 32 / 14 & 40 / 23
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 28 / 5 & 46 / 7 & 49 / 4 & 50 / 4 & 50 / 13\end{array}\) & relect [2] 61/24 65/22 & similar [4] 32/14 40/23
\[
41 / 13 \quad 54 / 11
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}56 / 13 & 58 / 17 & 58 / 23 & 61 / 10 \\ 61 / 12 & 67 / 12 & 69 / 1 & 70 / 12\end{array}\) & selected [2] \(24 / 18 \quad 61 / 23\) & simply [3] 18/17 24/7 60/11 \\
\hline same [13] 9/24 9/24 16/16 & selection [1] 11/17 & since [4] 7/4 43/18 \(45 / 8\) \\
\hline 23/6 31/21 \(32 / 10\) 35/16 \(38 / 8\) & send [2] 65/20 73/6 sending [1] 65/21 & single [1] 54/14 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{cccccccl}38 / 9 & 40 / 23 & 74 / 11 & 74 / 19 & 80 / 23\end{array}\) & sense [1] 43/6 & situation [4] \(37 / 4\) 44/6 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{|ccc|}
\hline \text { Sanofi [5] } & 26 / 8 \quad 35 / 10 ~ 51 / 14 \\
74 / 1 ~ 77 / 9
\end{array}
\] & sensible [2] 30/25 33/6 & 47/22 64/23 \\
\hline Sanofi's [1] & sensitive [2] 47/14 71/6 & six [2] 19/21 19 \\
\hline satisfies [1] 71/17 & sensitivity [1] 54 & size [3] 12/25 13 \\
\hline saw [3] 7/4 41/15 45/15 & sent [4] 12/7 12/11 & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
\text { slip [1] } 46 / 5
\] \\
slipped [1] 46/11
\end{tabular} \\
\hline say [50] \(3 / 4\) 5/5 6/2 \(7 / 25\) & separate [4] 12/12 28/18 & \[
\text { smali [3] } 28 / 954 / 6
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 6 & 21 / 9 & 24 / 24 & 25 / 5 & 29 / 5 \\ 29 / 17 & 31 / 2 & 34 / 25 & 35 / 8 & 38 / 8\end{array}\) & 54/12 70/18 & smaller [1] 18/8 \\
\hline \[
39 / 15 \quad 39 / 22 \quad 42 / 3 \quad 42 / 4 \quad 42 / 9
\] & sequence [1] 6/2 & smart [1] 29 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll} & 42 / 11 & 42 / 17 & 45 / 7 & 46 / 18 & 47 / 25\end{array}\) & serve [4] \(52 / 16\) & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\text { so [159] } \\
\text { sole [1] }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline 51/4 \(54 / 1 \quad 56 / 6 \quad 58 / 12 \quad 59 / 11\) & serving [2] 27/22 80/21 & Solicitor [1] 33 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llll}60 / 4 & 61 / 4 & 61 / 11 & 61 / 14 \\ 65 / 5 & 65 / 10 & 65 / 12 & 65 / 12 \\ 68 / 23 / 23\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{llll}\text { set [7] } & 4 / 12 & 12 / 12 & 19 / 3\end{array}\) & solution [1] 27/12 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}65 / 5 & 65 / 10 & 65 / 12 & 65 / 12 & 68 / 23 \\ 69 / 5 & 70 / 13 & 73 / 7 & 73 / 10 & 73 / 20\end{array}\) & 48/17 50/15 55/16 76/1 & solutions [1] 15 \\
\hline 74/9 78/17 \(78 / 2480 / 18\) & sets [1] 61/16 & some [50] 6/13 6/23 6/25 7/1 \\
\hline 80/24 & setting [4] 48/22 54/15 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}7 / 17 & 7 / 25 & 8 / 22 & 8 / 23 & 9 / 2 & 10 / 3\end{array}\) \\
\hline saying [7] 39/5 49/2 51/24 & 55/10 60/2 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 8 & 10 / 14 & 11 / 18 & 12 / 15 & 12 / 17\end{array}\) \\
\hline 60/1 64/10 65/9 70/6 & settlement [1] 11 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 5 & 13 / 17 & 13 / 23 & 14 / 25 & 15 / 1\end{array}\) \\
\hline schedule [31] 33/11 38/17 & veral [4] 23/16 55/11 & 15/19 17/1 17/17 18/1 18/4 \\
\hline 52/24 52/25 53/1 53/2 53/11 & 13 77/12 & 22/18 \(22 / 19\) 28/14 \\
\hline 53/18 53/22 55/9 55/10 59/3 & & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}34 / 10 & 35 / 25 & 36 / 21 & 37 / 1 & 38\end{array}\) \\
\hline 59/5 59/13 60/4 60/15 71/23 & shape [1] & \(\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 19 & 42 / 13 & 43 / 8 & 46 / 14 & 56 / 5\end{array}\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllllllllll}72 / 5 & 72 / 6 & 72 / 7 & 72 / 13 & 72 / 16\end{array}\) & shared [1] 46/8 & \[
66 / 13 \quad 68 / 16 \quad 70 / 24 \quad 74 / 13
\] \\
\hline 72/18 73/2 80/6 80/7 80/8 & \begin{tabular}{l}
sharing \\
[1] \(16 / 7\)
\end{tabular} & \[
78 / 20 \quad 79 / 6
\] \\
\hline 80/10 80/12 80/19 80/21 & sharply [1] 80/18 & somebody [2] 14/11 52/21 \\
\hline \[
66 / 9
\] & she [4] 65/13 67/25 67/25 & someone [4] 25/14 29/7 60/21 \\
\hline schedules & & \(76 / 13\)
something [19] \(22 / 21 \quad 24 / 4\) \\
\hline scheduling [8] 52/18 52/21 & sheer [1]
shock [1] & \(\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 30 / 10 & 30 / 22 ~ 45 / 7 ~ 46 / 19 ~ 47 / 16 ~\end{array}\) \\
\hline 53/3 53/6 53/13 53/18 68/3 & shoes [2] 79/25 81/10 & 50/13 51/5 51/16 63/17 63/17 \\
\hline 71/21 & short [2] 11/18 56/17 & 63/19 64/5 64/25 65/9 65/11 \\
\hline scheme [1] 52/22 & shorter [1] 78/24 & 68/23 73/10 \\
\hline Scholer [2] 2/4 & shot [1] 41/7 & sometime [3] 11/19 39/21 \\
\hline science [2] 23/12 & should [21] 11/14 42/17 44/8 & 39/23 \\
\hline  & 49/10 52/19 52/22 57/24 58/1 & sometimes [5] 28/1 30/18 \\
\hline & 59/21 59/24 62/19 63/21 & 30/21 62/24 81/17 \\
\hline \[
\text { second [4] } 42 / 5
\] & 63/25 67/19 \(70 / 16\) 70/25 71/4 & soon [6] 6/7 38/21 38/23 \\
\hline \[
70 / 12
\] & 71/12 71/24 80/9 81/7 & 55/10 76/19 81/25 \\
\hline Secondly [1] 6 & shouldn't [4] 71/1 71/1 71/13 71/13 & \begin{tabular}{lllll} 
Sorry [1] & \(74 / 2\) & & \\
sort [13] & \(6 / 9\) & \(6 / 17\) & \(6 / 19\) & \(7 / 12\)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline see [46] \(4 / 15\) 4/22 \(4 / 25 \quad 5 / 1\) & show [1] 16/2 & \[
8 / 18 \quad 20 / 24 \quad 31 / 14 \quad 43 / 3 \quad 44 / 4
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lll}5 / 2 & 6 / 2 & 6 / 13 \\ 14 / 18 & 7 / 18 & 8 / 7\end{array}\) & \(\begin{array}{llllll}\text { side [40] } & 4 / 1 & 7 / 10 & 8 / 11 & 8 / 12\end{array}\) & 45/14 59/7 62/7 64/13 \\
\hline 4/8 16/6 20/5 21/1 21/16 & 9/9 9/9 9/10 9/16 10/3 11/5 & sorts [1] 42/23 \\
\hline 21/18 22/1 23/24 27/11 28/4 \(30 / 2 \quad 30 / 3 \quad 32 / 9 \quad 33 / 12 \quad 34 / 15\) & 11/6 11/9 11/15 11/16 17/10 & sought [5] 22/24 48/13 51/1 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
34 / 16 & 40 / 24 & 44 / 25 & 45 / 1 & 45 / 8
\end{array}
\] & 22/13 22/14 23/15 23/22 24/2 & 51/12 64/22 \\
\hline \(34 / 1640 / 2444 / 2545 / 145 / 8\)
\[
45 / 9 \quad 45 / 25 \quad 46 / 1 \quad 46 / 4 \quad 47 / 4
\] & 36/2 38/14 43/25 52/1 53/10 & sounds [2] 61/7 62/14 \\
\hline \[
9 / 1261 / 3 \quad 61 / 23 \quad 63 / 9 \quad 73 / 5
\] & 60/16 62/19 63/14 63/15 & SOUTHERN [2] 1/1 41/14 \\
\hline /3/7 73/8 74/3 76/12 76/13 & 63/15 66/18 66/19 68/15 & Spalding [2] 2/7 56/2 \\
\hline \[
78 / 4
\] & 68/15 69/13 69/14 69/17 & speak [7] 23/6 39/9 50/17 \\
\hline see the [1] & 69/19 71/12 71/12 & 68/22 68/25 74/7 75/15 \\
\hline seeing [12] 4/9 4/10 8/10 & sided [1] 62/23 & speaking [6] 26/8 35/10 \\
\hline 16/25 40/21 45/10 46/24 & sides [19] 16/14 38/13 50/6 & 37/23 40/21 56/3 68/20 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}71 / 11 & 72 / 21 & 76 / 18 & 78 / 20\end{array}\) & 50/16 50/17 50/18 51/9 51/11 & speaks [1] 15/5 \\
\hline & 51/16 51/25 53/5 53/21 54/14 & special [19] 6/8 6/15 9/4 \\
\hline & 54/14 55/15 58/16 68/1 68/5 & 10/3 10/17 13/4 14/22 17/3 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{lll}
2 \mathrm{ek} & {[1]} & 18 / 18
\end{array}
\] & 81/17 & 17/13 18/9 18/20 20/19 54/9 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
seemed \\
[1] \\
31/1
\end{tabular} & signal [1] 49/1 & 57/7 67/24 68/5 70/4 70/17 \\
\hline seems
seem & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Signature [1] } 82 / 8 \\
& \text { signed [1] } 81 / 3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 79 / 24 \\
\text { speculating [1] } 65 / 9
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline S & struggling [ & [3] 9/14 9/14 14/11 \\
\hline speculation [1] 34/19 & subject [2] 34/13 51 & \[
18
\] \\
\hline spend [1] 49/17 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { su } \\
& \text { su }
\end{aligned}
\] & 74/20 74/21 74/25 75/11 76/7 76/8 \\
\hline spending [4] 7/4 7/6 21/11 & 54/22 55/18 55/20 67/21 & technical [6] 8/23 8/2 \\
\hline pent [2] 10/3 & submit [8] 8/1 24/5 54/9 & 10/15 17/18 18/2 18/4 \\
\hline spirit [1] 53/24 & 54/14 62/4 66/9 66/17 66/1 & teed [4] 48/15 48/17 64 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { spoke [3] } & 23 / 5 & 58 / 21 & 74 / 7\end{array}\) & submitted & \\
\hline spreadsheet [4] 12/7 12/12 & submitting [1] & teeing \\
\hline 12/15 12/16 & substantial & ter \\
\hline spur [1] 62 & success [2] 11/2 15/5 & 12/21 28/3 48/25 60/5 73 \\
\hline staggered [1] & successful [2] 19/15 39/25 such [9] 10/16 25/14 28/17 & \[
\begin{array}{|c}
74 / 4 \\
\text { telling [ }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline staggering [1] 4/9 & \[
31 / 25 \text { 36/12 } 37 / 14 \quad 38 / 21 \quad 58 / 4
\] & telling \\
\hline staking [1] 53/ & \[
75 / 12
\] &  \\
\hline andard [1] & suffering [1] 75/ & tend [2] 76/14 76/15 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
standardized \\
standards [1]
\end{tabular} & sufficient [1] 47 & tends [1] 76/16 \\
\hline standpoint [1] & suggest [3] 51/8 53/12 53/25 & Tennessee [1] 23/1 \\
\hline start [4] 5/21 11/23 11/24 & suggested [4] 12/23 22 & tens [1] \\
\hline 12/5 & & terms [5] 34/3 37/24 41/23 \\
\hline started [3] 28/25 58/17 & suggesting [4] 57/2 65/24 & 50/14 64/1 \\
\hline 74/23 & & tes \\
\hline starting [1] 46/18 & \[
53 / 23 \quad 54 / 8
\] & estament [1] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{rllll}\text { state } & {[41]} & 3 / 8 & 21 / 19 & 22 / 5 \\ 22 / 9 & 22 / 15 & 23 / 15 & 23 / 22 & 24 / 3\end{array}\) & suggestions [2] 50/8 56/5 & Texas [1] 23/18 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{llllll}
22 / 9 & 22 / 15 & 23 / 15 & 23 / 22 & 24 \\
25 / 3 & 25 / 4 & 25 / 10 & 25 / 10 & 25 /
\end{array}
\] & suggests [1] 60/21 & than [22] 3/7 15 \\
\hline \[
25 / 12 \quad 25 / 17 \quad 25 / 19 \quad 26 / 22 \quad 27
\] & suitability [1] 37/18 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 4 & 19 / 22 & 25 / 5 & 45 / 6 & 45 / 10\end{array}\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 27 / 15 & 28 / 19 & 28 / 20 & 29 / 1 & 29 / 1\end{array}\) & suitable [1] 37/16 & 45/13 49/1 \(52 / 17\) 54/4 57/3 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 18 & 31 / 7 & 32 / 10 & 32 / 11 & 32 / 15\end{array}\) & Suite [4] 1/13 1/20 1/24 & 58/10 62/25 66/21 67/13 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 16 & 32 / 23 & 34 / 8 & 36 / 4 & 36 / 13\end{array}\) & summary [3] 65/20 65/25 & 67/22 75/6 78/24 80/17 81/20 \\
\hline 36/14 38/20 43/14 43/22 47/7 & 65/25 & \(\begin{array}{clllll}\text { thank [39] } & 4 / 24 & 9 / 7 & 9 / 20 \\ 13 / 15 & 21 / 5 & 21 / 14 & 21 / 15 & 21 / 16\end{array}\) \\
\hline 52/15 73/20 79/3 & support & 23/3 23/25 26/7 29/12 29 \\
\hline State's [2] 31/18 \(42 / 24\) & suppose [1] 47 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}29 / 15 & 30 / 6 & 31 / 10 & 32 / 20 & 35 / 9\end{array}\) \\
\hline State/Federal [3] 23/15 24/3 79/3 & supposed [1] 47/2 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}35 / 11 & 38 / 4 & 44 / 14 & 44 / 15 & 49 / 13\end{array}\) \\
\hline StATES [3] 1/1 1/10 1/11 & sure [26] 5/15 5/22 & 49/23 55/24 68/10 72/15 \\
\hline status [58] \(1 / 9\) 3/2 \(3 / 6\) 3/11 & 10/22 11/16 12/18 13/14 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}73 / 11 & 73 / 13 & 73 / 15 & 75 / 15\end{array}\) \\
\hline  & 21/12 23/5 26/25 35/22 41/3 & 75/16 75/16 77/3 77/4 77/2 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 15 & 25 / 18 & 30 / 15 & 30 / 16\end{array}\) & \(43 / 23\) 45/21 46/5 46/13 47/11 & 78/4 78/1 \\
\hline 30/20 \(44 / 17\) 45/16 \(46 / 9\) 46/18 & \[
76 / 6 \text { 76/7 80/20 81/2 }
\] & \[
77 / 6
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}46 / 23 & 47 / 2 & 47 / 6 & 47 / 13 & 48 / 8\end{array}\) & surely [1] 6/22 & that [595] \\
\hline 48/22 49/6 52/14 58/19 58/22 & & that on [1] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}59 / 4 & 59 / 9 & 59 / 10 & 59 / 20 & 59 / 21 \\ 59 / 22 & 60 / 9 & 60 / 19 & 61 / 1 & 61 / 11\end{array}\) & surprise [1] 63/25 & that the [1] 36/7 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}59 / 22 & 60 / 9 & 60 / 19 & 61 / 1 & 61 / 11 \\ 61 / 14 & 62 / 5 & 63 / 4 & 65 / 11 & 65 / 15\end{array}\) & surprised [1] 62/20 & that's [4] 28/17 29/20 48/13 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllll}61 / 14 & 62 / 5 & 63 / 4 & 65 / 11 & 65 / 15 \\ 65 / 19 & 66 / 1 & 66 / 8 & 66 / 9 & 69 / 6\end{array}\) & suspect [2] 18/21 27/16 & \[
49 / 4
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}65 / 19 & 66 / 1 & 66 / 8 & 66 / 9 & 69 / 6 \\ 69 / 7 & 69 / 10 & 70 / 22 & 71 / 2 & 72 / 10\end{array}\) & system [9] 3/15 12/13 25/11 & \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}69 / 7 & 69 / 10 & 70 / 22 & 71 / 2 & 72 / 10 \\ 73 / 5 & 77 / 24 & 78 / 25 & 79 / 5 & 79 / 23\end{array}\) & \[
\begin{array}{rlll}
\text { system } \\
56 / 14 & 57 / 8 & 57 / 20 & 67 / 18 \\
70 / 10
\end{array}
\] & the ten [1] 7/ \\
\hline  & \[
77 / 1
\] &  \\
\hline stay [2] 27/9 81/24 & &  \\
\hline step [1] 81/18 & T & 50/17 \(51 / 20\) 53/6 \(54 / 14\) 57/14 \\
\hline stick [5] 65/2 67/19 6 69/24 80/10 & tackle [1] 41/ & 57/22 57/22 81/11 \\
\hline still [8] 6 & take [17] 3/16 3/18 6/17 & them [34] 4/10 8/18 \(10 / 24\) \\
\hline 14/2 40/10 41/7 43/6 62/17 & 16/21 17/16 17/20 19/23 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 8 & 14 / 3 & 14 / 6 & 14 / 7 & 19 / 22\end{array}\) \\
\hline & 22/11 30/9 30/14 33/3 33/6 & 26/5 30/13 33/10 33/12 33/17 \\
\hline pulation [1] & 33/12 44/16 47/8 65/11 80/25 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}33 / 25 & 41 / 5 & 47 / 13 & 48 / 1 & 51 / 22\end{array}\) \\
\hline  & taken [1] 32/6 & 54/23 57/3 60/20 66/12 66/13 \\
\hline  & takes [5] 53/7 55/2 56/22 & 67/8 70/7 70/20 70/21 72/7 \\
\hline  & 56/23 78/1 & 76/14 76/15 76/16 79/1 79/19 \\
\hline strategy and [1] 74/1 streamline [1] 13/5 & taking [4] 29/6 30/7 47/12 & 81/20 \\
\hline reamlined [1] & 51/21 & themselves [3] \(30 / 18\) 44/2 \\
\hline reet [4] \(2 / 2\) 2/5 \(2 / 8\) 2/14 & talented [1] 75 & 57/11 \\
\hline ressed [1] 79/9 & talents [1] 75/ & then [46] 8/21 17/19 18/18 \\
\hline ressful [1] 47/21 & talk [10] 26/20 30/23 38/16 & 20/7 \(24 / 1 \begin{array}{lllll} & 28 / 15 & 30 / 12 & 31 / 3\end{array}\) \\
\hline strongly [2] 19/16 & 8/19 58/14 58/22 58/23 & \(32 / 2\) 37/12 \(38 / 2\) 39/7 39/17 \\
\hline structure [1] 75/23 & 61/18 61/19 61/21 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll} & 40 / 1 & 40 / 8 & 40 / 13 & 43 / 11 & 43 / 15\end{array}\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
structures \\
[1] \(27 / 18\)
\end{tabular} & talked [2] 6/15 22/4 & 44/21 \(47 / 2\) 47/9 \(54 / 17\) 55/16 \\
\hline & talking [2] 32/15 41/8 & 58/15 59/4 59/5 60/8 60/18 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline T & 16/17 17/24 19/20 20/11 & nendous \\
\hline then... [18] 62/16 63/18 & 20/11 20/18 21/1 21/6 22/24 & trial [1] 74/19 \\
\hline 64/2 64/16 64/20 65/22 66/1 & 27/11 31/6 42/25 46/5 58
\[
67 / 8 \quad 70 / 4 \quad 70 / 17 \quad 76 / 21
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { tribute [1] } 15, \\
& \text { tried [1] } 30 / 7
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}66 / 2 & 67 / 4 & 68 / 15 & 69 / 20 & 69 / 25\end{array}\) & time [55] 3/4 4/8 4/12 \(7 / 6\) & troubleshoot [1] 9/4 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 70 / 3 \\
& 79 / 11
\end{aligned}
\] & \(\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 5 & 14 / 22 & 15 / 5 & 17 / 20 & 20 / 8\end{array}\) & true [4] 9/9 32/22 33/1 \\
\hline theories [1] 36/7 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}21 / 11 & 22 / 6 & 23 / 13 & 26 / 4 & 27 / 16\end{array}\) & 81/21 \\
\hline there [91] & 28/23 \(30 / 16\) 33/11 \(37 / 13\) 39/8 & truly [2] \\
\hline there's [1] 40/20 & 12 39/13 39/16 40 & trust [1] 63/13 \\
\hline therefore [1] 15/24 & 41/8 41/9 43/4 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 18 & 45 / 24 & 48 / 11 & 53 / 21 & 55 / 3\end{array}\) \\
\hline Thereupon [1] 82/1 & \[
\begin{array}{llll}
8 & 47 / 8 & 47 / 12 & 47 / 12 \\
57 / 14 \\
5 & 52 / 2 & 54 / 23 & 56 / 22 \\
56 / 23
\end{array}
\] & \(\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 18 & 45 / 24 & 48 / 11 & 53 / 21 & 55 / 3\end{array}\)
\[
56 / 13 \quad 63 / 18 \quad 67 / 7
\] \\
\hline these [35] 5/5 8/25 9/23 & \(58 / 3 \quad 60 / 12 \quad 60 / 20 \quad 62 / 15 \quad 67 / 15\) & trying [10] 9/3 20/17 21/12 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llll}13 / 9 & 14 / 23 & 17 / 15 & 17 / 25 \\ 20 / 18 & 22 / 6 & 27 / 18 & 30 / 18 \\ 33 / 18\end{array}\) & 67/19 \(68 / 22 \quad 70 / 14 \quad 71 / 6 \quad 74 / 7\) & 29/8 \(29 / 1141 / 25 \quad 46 / 9 \quad 47 / 19\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 18 & 22 / 6 & 27 / 18 & 30 / 18 & 33 / 18 \\ 40 / 18 & 40 / 25 & 42 / 24 & 43 / 7 & 49 / 20\end{array}\) & 74/10 \(76 / 20 \quad 78 / 19 \quad 78 / 23\) 79/6 & 49/18 67/18 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllllll}40 / 18 & 40 / 25 & 42 / 24 & 43 / 7 & 49 / 20 \\ 50 / 25 & 51 / 3 & 51 / 8 & 53 / 13 & 53 / 17\end{array}\) & 80/24 & Tuesday [2] 4/12 78/20 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{lllll}
50 / 25 & 51 / 3 & 51 / 8 & 53 / 13 & 53 / 17 \\
54 / 4 & 54 / 22 & 56 / 5 & 56 / 19 & 56 / 24
\end{array}
\] & timely [4] 10/20 21/13 52/7 & turn [8] 4/13 4/21 5/3 16/21 \\
\hline \(57 / 12\) 57/20 60/3 60/13 67/6 & \(55 / 20\)
times [3] & \[
\begin{array}{rrr}
44 / 12 & 49 / 12 & 52 / 9 \\
\text { turned }[1] & 52 / 20
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \(67 / 21 \quad 70 / 19\)
they [56] 6/25 7/11 7/16 8/8 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { timing [11] } & 37 / 5 & 43 / 23 & 58 / 22\end{array}\) & tweak [2] 39/14 65/18 \\
\hline they [56] 6/25 7/11 7/16 8/8 & 58/23 58/24 59/2 59/11 59/13 & twice [1] 35/12 \\
\hline 17/14 19/12 20/9 & 59/16 59/17 71/21 & two [47] 3/12 4/6 4/9 6/20 \\
\hline 28/17 \(41 / 1441 / 16\) 41/16 & tirelessly [2] 5/9 6/9 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}6 / 21 & 20 / 15 & 31 / 16 & 40 / 3 & 41 / 10\end{array}\) \\
\hline 41/17 \(42 / 4\) 48/2 \(49 / 21\) 49/21 & title [1] 77/24 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}42 / 7 & 42 / 16 & 43 / 12 & 45 / 5 & 45 / 15\end{array}\) \\
\hline 50/5 50/6 50/25 51/1 51/21 & titled [1] 59/25 & 46/24 48/3 \(48 / 3 \quad 48 / 5\) 50/1 \\
\hline 52/12 52/16 53/1 53/10 56/18 & to speak [1] 68/22 & 50/17 \(54 / 13\) 54/21 \(57 / 8\) 59/2 \\
\hline 58/14 60/12 60/16 62/21 & today [11] 3/22 11/13 56/2 & 59/19 59/20 61/5 61/25 62/4 \\
\hline 66/12 67/2 69/13 69/17 69/18 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}58 / 2 & 73 / 4 & 73 / 18 & 74 / 7 & 75 / 15\end{array}\) & 62/8 63/2 63/7 63/8 63/8 \\
\hline 69/19 71/18 \(72 / 1\) 72/2 \(72 / 9\) & 7/22 78/4 78/19 & 63/9 63/14 63/23 65/20 65/22 \\
\hline 75/24 \(76 / 12 \quad 79 / 2 \quad 81 / 1 \quad 81 / 10\) & today's [1] 4/2 & 66/1 66/16 66/17 66/18 70/19 \\
\hline 81/10 81/12 81/12 81/14 & together [7] 18/20 27/11 & 71/11 73/8 78/24 \\
\hline they think [1] 67/2 & /23 47/19 49 & two-month \\
\hline they're [1] 69/18 & told [1] 51/4 tomorrow [2] & two-page [3] 50/17 62/ \\
\hline thing [8] 9/6 12/21 15/25 & tomorrow [2] & \\
\hline 30/24 30/25 37/4 77/25 80/16 & \(\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { ton [7] } & \text { [7] } & 42 / 4 & 45 / 1 & 47 / 12 & 49\end{array}\) & types [1] 53/17 \\
\hline things [22] 5/25 6/16 6/24 & \[
73 / 16 \quad 76 / 18 \quad 78 / 23
\] & typically [3] 30/8 35/20 \\
\hline 7/13 7/25 8/22 9/4 16/7 & took [8] 8/8 12/8 & \[
35 / 25
\] \\
\hline 18/24 23/15 26/21 27/2 27/10 & 48/23 49/17 58/20 & \\
\hline 29/3 32/22 46/5 52/22 59/15 & 1 & U \\
\hline 61/20 64/10 68/14 79/18 & tools [1] 53/14 & ultimate [1] 69/21 \\
\hline think [92] & top [1] 6/24 & ultimately [7] 19/25 37/21 \\
\hline thinking [4] 41/23 43/3 68/16 71/21 & topic [8] 22/4 44/17 44/17 & 43/10 46/12 55/4 63/13 71/3 \\
\hline ks [5] 66/24 70/13 & 44/20 59/2 62/8 69/25 72/5 & unable [1] 18/ \\
\hline \[
71 / 12 \quad 71 / 12
\] & topical [2] 62/7 65/21 & unanimous [1] 24/12 \\
\hline this [150] & topics [10] 9/25 50/15 50/21 & unarticulated [1] \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll}\text { those [34] } & / 4 & 6 / 12 & 7 / 18\end{array}\) & 50/25 51/9 51/10 51/24 52/15 & uncomfortable [2] 65/7 65/8 \\
\hline 7/20 9/2 9/13 12/18 18/3 & 54/11 54/16 & under [8] 29/4 39/8 39/11 \\
\hline 18/7 18/8 18/21 19/16 19/24 & torts [3] 74/11 \(74 / 13\) 74/16 & 57/5 59/2 60/4 62/8 79/12 \\
\hline 20/25 33/12 33/22 34/2 34/15 & track [6] 12/14 26/18 27/18 & underneath [1] 70/1 \\
\hline 35/6 36/25 47/7 51/24 53/6 & /15 53/22 79/1 & understand [32] 4/19 11/1 \\
\hline 54/16 55/4 55/15 55/18 55/20 & \begin{tabular}{l}
tracking [1] 9/13 \\
traditional [3] 33/10 33/21
\end{tabular} & \[
12 / 3 \text { 13/7 14/23 15/21 16/15 }
\]
\[
17 / 23 \quad 21 / 20 \quad 22 / 3 \quad 25 / 11 \quad 26 / 22
\] \\
\hline \(77 / 19\)
though [7] \(8 / 2 \quad 28 / 3 \quad 33 / 17\) & trains [2] 52/24 52/25 & 32/2 32/3 43/18 43/24 44/1 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{ccccccl}\text { though [7] } & 8 / 2 & 28 / 3 & 33 / 17 \\ 68 / 21 & 72 / 25 & 76 / 12 & 81 / 15\end{array}\) & tranche [2] 6/6 18/1 & 49/19 51/20 53/20 55/4 55/14 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{cccccl}68 / 21 & 72 / 25 & 76 / 12 & 81 / 15 \\ \text { thought [9] } & 4 / 3 & 5 / 25 & 20\end{array}\) & tranches [1] 17 & 66/4 71/20 74/21 81/15 81/16 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{clll}
\text { thought [9] } & 4 / 3 & 5 / 25 \\
30 / 14 & 46 / 25 & 62 / 5 & 63 / 5
\end{array}
\] & transcript [2] 69/9 82/3 & understanding [9] 4/4 31/5 \\
\hline & transfer [10] 10/15 32/5 & 31/13 32/17 45/25 48/22 \\
\hline & 32/5 37/9 37/17 37/18 37/21 & 48/25 58/18 70/2 \\
\hline thousands [1] 15/5 & 38/1 38/1 39/25 & understands [1] 34/1 \\
\hline \[
\text { three [5] } 46 / 1 \quad 47 / 4
\] & transferee [1] 53/14 & understood [4] 26/2 41/3 \\
\hline \(66 / 1766 / 19\) & transferor [1] 31/1 & 71/22 73/9 \\
\hline three-page [2] 66/17 66/19 & transferred [6] 31/6 31/18 & undertaking [1] 12/24 \\
\hline through [30] \(1 / 9\) 9/2 10/19 & 32/11 33/4 37/11 40/1 & unexpected [1] 47/10 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllllll}11 / 17 & 12 / 2 & 12 / 18 & 12 / 19 & 13 / 3\end{array}\) & transferring [1] 10/17 & \[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { unfairly [1] } & \text { 62/20 } \\
\text { unfathomable [11 }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline 13/22 15/13 16/16 16/17 & treat [2] 76/14 81/21 & unfiled [1] 16/12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline U & 26/18 27/24 27/24 30/9 36/10 & 1 \\
\hline uniquely [1] 18/2 & 38/4 42/1 42/2 43 & waste [1] 78/23 \\
\hline UNITED [3] \(1 / 11 / 10\) 1/11 & 49/21 52/16 54/25 56/22 & watching [ Watts [1] \\
\hline unless [5] 21/3 24/10 69/13 & 56/23 56/24 57/19 61/19 & way [31] \(3 / 6\) 6/13 \(8 / 19\) 13/24 \\
\hline unlike [2] 33/21 65/19 & 75/18 76/6 77/16 77/21 78/2 & \(\begin{array}{llllllllll}14 / 16 & 16 / 16 & 21 / 1 & 22 / 8 & 22 / 20\end{array}\) \\
\hline unofficially [1] 23/19 & veto [2] 69/14 71/10 & \(30 / 11 \quad 32 / 10 \quad 32 / 18 \quad 37 / 24\) \\
\hline unopposed [1] 29/18 &  & \(40 / 15\) 42/8 43/3 43/23 44 \(\begin{array}{llllll}45 / 9 & 46 / 8 & 48 / 1 & 49 / 2 & 49 / 4\end{array}\) \\
\hline unprecedented [1] 14/24 & vice [2]
videos [1] 4/21 & \[
\begin{array}{llllll}
52 / 8 & 53 / 25 & 58 / 25 & 63 / 21 & 65 / 4
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline unquote [1] 8/12
unreasonable [1] \(41 / 1\) & view [6] \(16 / 14\) 33/5 \(34 / 22\) & 65/18 77/10 81/14 \\
\hline unreasonable [1] 41/ untenable [1] 63/22 & 49/10 67/3 71/19 & ways [4] 14/24 45/6 46/2 \\
\hline until [6] 10/22 37/11 40/1 & viewing [1] & \\
\hline 54/12 59/18 60/21 & views [7] 19/13 44/9 53 & we [306] \\
\hline up [39] \(3 / 16\) 3/18 \(4 / 6\) 6/7 & 54/21 54/22 60/6 66/20 & we'd [2] 5/25 26 \\
\hline 8/10 9/4 10/7 12/12 14/4 & virtually [1] 30 & we're [2] \\
\hline 15/4 15/12 15/14 15/15 18/10 & \[
1356 / 756
\] & wealth [1] 25/9 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llll}20 / 20 & 24 / 19 & 27 / 12 & 30 / 7 \\ 31 / 2 & 30 / 9\end{array}\) & vitally [2] 13/20 28/11 & week [7] 6/21 12/24 18/11 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{llll}
\(31 / 2\) & \(32 / 6\) & \(33 / 3\) & \(43 / 10\) \\
\(46 / 16\) & \(47 / 8\) & \(48 / 75\) & \(48 / 17\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & volume [3] \(16 / 18\) 17/5 17/19 & \(\begin{array}{llll}\text { 19/4 } & 23 / 16 & 55 / 12 & 57 / 10\end{array}\) \\
\hline 46/16 47/8 48/15 48/17 51/15 51/21 54/12 55/7 55/8 63/12 & volunteer [2] \(75 / 3 \quad 76 / 4\) & weekly [1] 76/22 \\
\hline 64/12 64/14 72/24 79/10 81/3 & W & eks [14] 3/12 4/6 4/9 \\
\hline upcoming [2] 18/10 74/24 & wait [3] 30/10 36/23 75/13 & 59/19 59/20 62/1 63/8 63/24 \\
\hline update [17] \(4 / 18\) 5/4 \(22 / 6\) & waiting [5] 31/24 42/7 42/16 & \[
73 / 8
\] \\
\hline 22/8 29/12 \(48 / 2\) 59/4 59/8 & 43/12 43/18 & Weiselberg [1] \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{llll}
60 / 19 & 61 / 1 & 61 / 2 & 62 / 17 \\
62 / 23 & 64 / 19 & 69 / 15 & 71 / 2
\end{array}
\] & walk [2] 58/8 79/25 & welcome [2] 58/10 58 \\
\hline updated [3] 12/16 38/2 & walking [1] 79/25 & well [40] 4/23 4/24 5/2 9/10 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ipaatea } \\
& 63 / 23
\end{aligned}
\] & walks [1] 76/21 & 11/6 11/12 11/16 11/25 12/14 \\
\hline updates [19] 5/5 26/15 27/9 & want [55] 3/8 5/12 5/21 7/25 & 13/14 13/23 15/22 21/18 \\
\hline 45/16 \(48 / 1 \quad 48 / 2 \quad 48 / 4\) 48/7 & 9/7 10/22 13/17 14/14 14/20 & 22/17 26/4 28/7 29/2 30/3 \\
\hline 48/8 48/23 52/14 57/21 58/18 & \(\begin{array}{llllllllll}18 / 6 & 18 / 14 & 21 / 22 & 22 / 21 & 22 / 22\end{array}\) & \(30 / 14\) 34/23 39/2 42/2 42/4 \\
\hline 59/20 59/24 64/4 65/2 67/22 & 27/5 27/9 37/4 42/5 44/4 & 44/16 48/2 49/10 51/10 54/2 \\
\hline 76/9 & 45/12 45/14 47/19 47/20 & 55/9 60/12 65/12 67/19 69/23 \\
\hline upon [9] 6/11 15/10 22/23 & 47/20 47/21 48/24 49/1 51/2 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}72 / 25 & 74 / 25 & 76 / 8 & 78 / 2 & 80 / 12\end{array}\) \\
\hline 38/12 51/9 51/11 51/17 51/25 & 51/6 56/13 58/21 60/4 60/7 & 80/21 81/2 \\
\hline \(54 / 17\) & 62/8 64/9 64/12 64/23 65/6 & went [5] 32/10 45/25 60/24 \\
\hline urge [3] 36/7 55/7 55/9 & 65/7 65/7 65/8 65/11 66/24 & 77/10 77/1 \\
\hline us [19] \(7 / 17\) 11/9 11/16 & 68/12 69/15 70/2 71/22 73/10 & were [35] 3/19 3/25 4/7 \\
\hline  & 76/4 78/17 \(78 / 24\) 79/8 79/8 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 15 & 14 / 20 & 24 / 17 & 30 / 16\end{array}\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 26 / 16 & 38 / 24 & 51 / 4 & 51 / 4 & 51 / 4\end{array}\) & 79/9 79/21 & \(\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 15 & 36 / 22 & 37 / 12 & 38 / 15\end{array}\) \\
\hline 54/3 54/6 54/6 55/2 68/6 & wanted [20] 14/20 21/4 23/13 & 38/18 39/21 40/6 41/3 41/14 \\
\hline \(72 / 19\) lis & 23/19 \(24 / 8\) 24/11 \(24 / 13\) 24/21 & \(\begin{array}{llllll}41 / 16 & 42 / 1 & 42 / 3 & 43 / 15 & 45 / 24\end{array}\) \\
\hline USC [1] 77/11 & 26/11 \(32 / 240 / 18\) 41/3 \(42 / 18\) & 45/25 46/2 46/5 46/9 46/24 \\
\hline use [5] & 43/25 47/11 48/21 61/19 & 48/2 56/8 56/9 57/21 59/11 \\
\hline 75/4 & 61/20 62/12 70/6 & 63/8 65/24 68/23 75/19 \\
\hline used [1] & wanting [2] 31/9 48/ & weren't [1] 52/20 \\
\hline useful [1] & wants [2] 61/17 69/19 & WEST [7] 1/2 1/5 2/5 2/18 \\
\hline using [1] 64/12 & warrant [1] 53/15 & 35/3 78/7 78/7 \\
\hline usually [1] 63/16 & warranted [1] & hat [99] \\
\hline usurping [1] 29/6 & was [78] 3/20 6/4 6/4 10/9 & whatever [3] 39/4 66/12 \\
\hline V & 20/6 20/9 20/9 20/10 21/4 & when [41] 9/4 11/24 14/10 \\
\hline & 22/3 24/7 24/12 24/12 24/21 &  \\
\hline  & \(30 / 7\) 31/15 31/20 32/25 33/1 & 29/5 29/17 31/14 35/1 35/20 \\
\hline ues [1] & \(33 / 1\) 33/2 35/3 36/25 37/16 & 38/19 40/7 40/8 41/24 44/6 \\
\hline variety [1] 17/24 & 39/4 41/11 41/23 41/24 42/3 & \(\begin{array}{llllll} & 45 / 15 & 45 / 18 & 45 / 21 & 46 / 12\end{array}\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llll}\text { various [2] } & 6 / 18 & 26 / 19 \\ \text { vehicle [1] } & 68 / 9 & \end{array}\) & 43/3 \(43 / 3 \quad 43 / 4 \quad 43 / 15 \quad 43 / 25\) & 47/15 47/25 50/1 51/3 51/14 \\
\hline vehicle [1] 68/9 & \(\begin{array}{lllllll}44 / 11 & 44 / 20 & 45 / 7 & 45 / 8 & 45 / 8\end{array}\) & 52/3 52/23 53/15 53/18 57/19 \\
\hline vendor [1] 8/17 & 45/15 \(46 / 8 \quad 46 / 10 \quad 46 / 1446 / 20\) & 63/1 63/13 63/25 64/18 66/24 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{ll}\text { vendors [2] } \\ \text { venues [1] } & \text { 10/8 }\end{array}\) & 46/21 46/21 47/11 51/13 & 76/13 76/23 81/8 81/21 \\
\hline  & 51/16 51/17 58/9 59/1 59/3 & where [26] 3/16 3/18 8/2 \\
\hline  & 59/11 60/1 60/11 60/25 61/1 & 15/24 16/1 18/11 18/13 19/12 \\
\hline  & 61/24 61/24 63/9 64/5 65/4 & 20/25 22/12 28/16 28/17 \\
\hline \[
10 / 1 \quad 11 / 9 \quad 12 / 14 \quad 14 / 10 \quad 15
\] & 65/17 66/7 66/8 67/8 69/15 & 42/20 43/10 43/12 47/22 \\
\hline  & 70/24 72/24 74/7 80/12 82/1 & 48/13 51/1 51/11 56/14 58/5 \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{llllllllllll} & 23 / 13 & 24 / 17 & 25 / 5 & 25 / 16 & 25 / 16\end{array}\) & Washington [2] 2/2 2/11 & 60/24 64/24 65/20 79/16 \\
\hline & wasn't [4] 33/17 41/23 46/25 & 79/17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

