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THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody. It is now 3:00 o'clock.

Let me -- this is In Re Ranitidine MDL.

Can I ask -- I guess it's Ms. Finken for the Plaintiffs and Mr. Oot, and I don't know if Mr. Sachse and Ms. Luhana also want to be heard -- are here, they don't have to be .

Good afternoon, Ms. Finken.

MS. FINKEN: Good afternoon, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Oot, good afternoon.
MR. OOT: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: We are on the record, our court reporter is here, so I'll just remind everyone to please identify themselves each time that you speak so we can get a proper record made in this case.

We are not going to have any substantive discussions this afternoon, so don't feel you have to be prepared to have a substantive argument or discussion about anything, folks. We got your communications, which immediately meant $I$ didn't read your submissions because $I$ saw that there was nothing to talk about today, so I didn't spend the time, having already done 15 criminal matters this morning and two discovery hearings this afternoon. So, I was happy not to do the work.

I did want everyone to get together because I think this is a good opportunity as we are starting to see what
sounds like are going to be some more PTO 32 issues brought before the Court, which is perfectly fine, to talk about that process.

This one didn't work quite the way that Judge Rosenberg and I want them to work, through no fault of anyone in particular. I am not pointing fingers at anyone. I am always happy when parties are able to try to resolve their issues and are able to reach resolution or make progress, but also, it is never helpful for us to be scheduling hearings at the last minute and then canceling hearings at the last minute. So I just wanted to talk about that a little bit.

We have always been transparent kind of in both directions in this case, and $I$ think it is helpful for you to understand from the Court's perspective what we have to go through when you ask us to set a hearing.

We have to, first of all, schedule time with Zoom; we have to pull our staff away from other matters and we have to schedule time for a Zoom; we have to enter and draft an order; we have to get the Court Reporter lined up; we have to contact the liaisons and pull them away from what they are doing so they can act as gatekeepers. We already have on this call 44 people, so they all have to be admitted into the zoom.

There are a lot of moving parts when we have to schedule one of these hearings, and trust me, I am always happy not to have to do the work at the back end, but I hope you can
appreciate that sort of scrambling at the last minute to set a hearing and then canceling it at the last minute is just a lot of work and distraction. So, that is what $I$ want to talk about for a second if $I$ could.

My sense is that perhaps you all are taking a much more stringent view of the PTO 32 process than what I intended. So, I don't ant you to feel like there's more work than you need to do. O, if I could, I want to walk through that. If you have any questions or concerns or things I can clarify for you, I want to be able to respond to that as well.

The idea is the first notice that we should get is simply a pretty high level, we need a discovery hearing, we need this much time, and these are the days we would like to have it. You don't even really have to drill down about what the issue is.

So, it may be that you, because you are living this 24/7, 365 days a year, see things coming down the pike, and there may be four or five issues that are under discussion and your anticipation is we are probably going to get some of them resolved, but we may not get all of them resolved. That is fine. You can schedule time with me without telling me which of the five issues you are going to present.

I am getting the sense that perhaps you haven't always felt that way; that you felt that by the time you reach out to try to get time scheduled with the court you need to have
crystalized which specific issue it is. That is not the intent of the process, that is what the final memos are for.

So, I want to be clear, if you are juggling four, five, six, two, multiple issues that may need a hearing, feel free to go ahead and request a hearing. Give us plenty of lead time, we'll schedule a hearing and have all of the logistics taken care of. Then, as I said, the day or two ahead of time is when you can figure out which ones have to come before the Court, which ones don't have to come before the Court, or perhaps nothing has to come before the court.

At that point, you have time to let us know, to hear back from us, or, as with today, if you just need additional time. You say, Judge, we are making progress, but we need additional time. That is okay, too, but it is on a much more organized healthy timeframe for all of us.

I know it is not easy for you all to be running around trying to get me a submission that you have to run by the other side and the special master, and you have a deadline and we are running up against it, and you are simultaneously trying to negotiate a resolution that would avoid having to come here in the first place.

So, let me just start with that. Does that help both sides clarify that's what the expectations are with how the PTO 32 process is supposed to work? Ms. Finken?

MS. FINKEN: Yes, your Honor. My question would be
process wise, if we request a hearing because we see some issues on the horizon and we then resolve those issues and want to pull that down for your Honor, what is your preferred way of notifying the Court?

THE COURT: Thank you for asking. That is a good question.

What will happen is, once you notify me, $I$ will do an order, or Judge Rosenberg will do an order in her cases, we do an order setting a hearing. So, now there is a court order on the docket setting a hearing.

So, I think the proper thing to do is just to file something in the docket requesting that the hearing be canceled, and then we will do a very brief paperless order canceling the hearing. That way, people who are monitoring the case, other litigants in the case, but also the public who may be tracking things on the docket, they will have proper notice that the hearing has been canceled.

If I tell you and then $I$ tell the liaisons, kind of the insiders will find out organically, but the outsiders will not. So, that is, I think, the best way to do it, Ms. Finken.

Do you have any other thoughts, any preferred way to do that other than that?

MS. FINKEN: No. I appreciate the feedback on that and I guess I just have a followup question, and to the extent that submissions have been submitted to the court in the
meantime while we are working through these issues, would those submissions -- would you prefer that those submissions also get filed in the docket when we take it down so there is a clear record of everything that has transpired?

THE COURT: Let me think about that one. I don't have a direct answer, it's a good question I don't have a direct answer to. I will think out loud for a second and then maybe you all can give me your thoughts.

Certainly, if $I$ have ruled on something and $I$ have looked at something, I always make sure that is in the docket. If $I$ have never ruled on something, I don't know that it is necessary to put in the docket things I looked at that I never relied upon because there would be no need for another Court to review my nonruling. That is my visceral reaction.

I am open to discussion with the parties if you think there -- particularly in discovery where there is no public right of access in discovery, if there hasn't ever been a ruling, I don't know why we would be putting things in the record because it invites the impression -- nobody would ever do this on purpose, but it invites the impression that someone is simply loading up some submission with prejudicial information, filing it in the docket, and the Court never reads it, the Court never rules on it, and it is an opportunity for a litigant to take a free shot at somebody else, and I don't think any of us want that.

Having talked it out loud, my gut would be not to file it in the docket if the Court never ruled on it. But again, $I$ am open to discussion if the parties feel that way.

MS. FINKEN: Than you, your Honor, that is helpful. I think that the confusion, I guess, on our side comes when we have already submitted them through the court's email, and if there is going to be an order issued rendering the hearing moot, or something along those lines, whether or not it makes sense to have the actual submissions submitted with that to just make the record clear.

I want to make sure we have clarity on what we should be doing on our side.

THE COURT: Ms. Finken, that might be a good topic to put on one of our discovery status conferences because that is a non-substantive process-based issue that I would welcome and I know Judge Rosenberg would welcome a broader view on, and we can have that discussion. I think that is the right forum for that.

Mr. Oot, you have been very patient, very quiet, I don't mean to box you out. Do you have any questions or comments or thoughts?

MR. OOT: No, your Honor. I agree that that would be a good subject to discuss at the next status conference. One of the things I think could be helpful to the parties in this PTO 32 process would be the issues that always should come up
with simultaneous submissions, so if we could seek some clarity from the Court on that.

Often times what happens is, the parties are talking in different directions in the submissions and there isn't much clarity, and we are fine doing the separate two and a half page submissions if that is the way the parties want to do that, but I think it is just a process that would be helpful if there was a seriatim of how we are sulomitting these things to even one another, so we can ensure that both sides are talking directly at the issue.

THE COURT: Sure. That may be something $I$ will defer to a discovery status to discuss.

I will tell you where that comes from, where the joint memo comes from, and maybe that will inform you.

It really developed out of other cases that $I$ do, and the purpose of forcing a joint memo is to make the parties actually talk to each other, because unlike you all who are BFFs and talk every day all day with each other and to the special master, in other cases the lawyers will file discovery disputes and not bother to talk to each other. So, by requiring them to do a joint memo $I$ am at least requiring them to formally meet and confer before they get to me. So that is one purpose.

And the other purpose is that it gives me an agenda and it gives me a consolidated document that I can use where I
can say the Plaintiff thinks this, the Defendant thinks that, and so there is transparency, that both sides know what the other side is saying.

Whereas if submit literally simultaneous submissions, the problem becomes you want to respond to theirs, they want to respond to yours, but this is the first time you are seeing it, so now I have four pieces of paper instead of two pieces of paper, and then you want to reply to their response, and now I have six pieces of paper instead of one piece of paper. That's where it comes from.

In terms of order of operations and who should have to submit the first proposal that ends up being the joint memo, we can discuss that. Maybe it is the party who is the one requesting the discovery hearing should go first, but sometimes it is not clear who is requesting the discovery hearing. Is it a motion to compel or a motion for protective order? They are sort of two sides of the same very thin piece of paper.

Again, I am thinking out loud to give you some general thoughts, but I think this would be a healthy thing to take up at one of our discovery status conferences.

The other thing, I'm not wedded formally to two and a half pages per side. I think it is always helpful to discipline people, that if you give them less time, they will actually use it.

When I worked at the Treasury Department when Lloyd
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Benson was the Secretary of the Treasury, if you sent something in to Lloyd Benson for his decision it could not be longer than two pages. It did not matter if it was the biggest law enforcement agenda item in the history of the ATF, he got two pages. So we got really good at condensing things down.

On the one hand, I try to force you to do that. On the other hand, I recognize there are some topics or maybe some hearings where there are four or five or six issues, they just simply can't be fairly addressed in two or three pages.

You can talk to the special master, I have given her some limited authority on that regard. I just wanted the parties to be aware of that. I am not fully rigid on that, I am only mostly rigid on that.

MS. FINKEN: Thank you, your Honor. It is a challenge.

THE COURT: I understand. I understand.
Again, the idea is to sort of tee up the issue, sort of this is the issue, this is our view, this is their view, and you have been through enough of it in a few of those hearings with me, you understand. I will give you plenty of time to argue your position, but while we are talking now -- and again, we can put this on for a discovery status topic. I just got off another hearing and this is fresh in my mind because this is what happened in that case.

They were so busy in their submission arguing the
legal issues that nobody submitted the evidence $I$ needed to look at to actually resolve who had the burden and whether they met their burden. So that doesn't count against your two and a half pages.

If this is an issue -- for example, I think we talked in the past about ESI where $I$ have said data is very helpful, it is very helpful to know hit counts and things like that, or if you are making an undue burden argument, you know, it would be helpful to have an affidavit from somebody who can say this is why we can't do what we're supposed to do by the date we're supposed to do it. That is actual evidence $I$ can rely on.

So, I just remind the parties oftentimes it is not a two-and-a-half page or three-page submission that is going to be dispositive or really important to me, it is the materials you attach, the request for production, the objection, the affidavit, the hit count, the interrogatory, the actual evidence, because at some point somebody has a burden and that's really what $I$ am measuring.

So, I will just remind you and encourage you to -those don't count against your pages. You can layer those on on the back side.

Okay, other general topics we can flesh out on the PTO 32 process?

Mr. Oot. You are going to get in trouble with Pauline, so say your name.

MR. OOT: Thank you, your Honor. Patrick Oot for GSK. Just an overarching comment of I would say that we are much different than your other parties that you are dealing with. Ms. Finken and I were on the phone for over three hours with Ms. Dodge yesterday, and for several other hours earlier this week, so we are spending plenty of time together in meet and confers and we can assure you that at least in those we are not talking sideways against each other.

THE COURT: I am sure you are not. The special master talks to me, obviously she does not share with me your conversations. She will just share with me they we are making progress, we are going to need this hearing, we are not going to need this hearing, so I do get some guidance from that. The consistent guidance is they are talking and they are talking productively. So, to the extent anybody is concerned the Court thinks there is not productive dialogue going on, that is certainly not the Court's impression. So, thank you for that.

To that end, let me turn to one other issue, which is, when on Tuesday would you like to come in and how much time do you need? I want to get something on the calendar so I can get and order out. If you need to cancel it, you can cancel it, but I want to get you on the calendar for Tuesday.

I know you are taking the deposition Wednesday, Ms. Finken, so if there is something that needs to be ruled on before that, I want to rule on it for you.

MS. FINKEN: Thank you. Tracy Finken on behalf of Plaintiffs.

While you are talking about Tuesday, I wanted to, in light of your Honor's comments, request -- we have an issue coming up in terms of the PTO 32 process with the generic Defendants, and we wanted to request time for that on Tuesday as well.

We will send a formal request, obviously, to the Court, but would you prefer, your Honor, to have those back to back, those two PTO 32 conferences?

THE COURT: Let me tell you what I've got Tuesday. I have a settlement conference starting at 11:00 o'clock, which I am not optimistic is going to last very long. I had sort of in my mind set aside the afternoon.

My thought was I would hear, yes, your issue and the generic issue back to back, probably one -- depending on how much time you need, starting at 2:00 o'clock. So one from 2:00 to 3:00, one from 3:00 to 4:00, or one from 2:00 to 3:30, one from 3:30 to 5:00. That is why I am asking you how much time you need.

We can sequence it because I don't necessarily need all of the generic lawyers to be billing their clients to sit there and listen while we are talking about a brand issue, and likewise, $I$ don't need the brand lawyers sitting there while we're talking about a generics issue.
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What is you preference, Ms. Finken, if you have one? MS. FINKEN: My preference would be that we go first with the GSK, and I don't foresee us needing more than an hour for that particular topic, and then followed by the generic, so that I don't lose stamina by the time we get to the GSK discussion. That would be my preference.

Hopefully, it will be more of a short conversation. Depending upon whatever the proposal is that GSK provides to me over the weekend, maybe we won't need the hearing with them at all.

THE COURT: Mr. Oot, are you okay with 2:00 o'clock on Tuesday for an hour?

MR. OOT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Great. We'll do an order setting a
hearing for 2:00 o'clock on Tuesday for the -- how would I phrase it -- the issues relating to GSK's -- the deposition on Wednesday? I don't want to be pejorative to anybody by seeming to cast blame on anyone. Do $I$ have an alternate term that I can put in the order?

Mr. Oot, let me ask you: How would you like me to phrase it?

MR. OOT: Related to GSK's regulatory (30)(b)(6) I think would be fine.

THE COURT: That's fine. We'll do an order setting a hearing on the discovery issues related to GSK's regulatory
$30(b)(6) . \quad$ I like that. Okay.
Then, Ms. Finken, $I$ understand the -- I don't know if the generic people are here, so I don't want to talk too much about them other than $I$ will tell you I will set aside the time from 3:00 o'clock -- how much time do you think you will need for the generics issue?

MS. FINKEN: That's a little bit more of a moving target, so I suspect we are going to need some more time. We are working very diligently through these issues, and hopefully we will be able to narrow them quite a bit by the time we get in front of the Court on Tuesday, but I would set aside a good two and a half hours.

THE COURT: Okay. I will set aside 3:00 to 5:30 for the generics.

MS. FINKEN: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Now we have done that. See, this process works beautifully.

Then, in terms of submissions, assuming -- let's be pessimistic that you are not going to resolve your issues with GSK over the weekend and I do actually have to have a substantive hearing on Tuesday. Do you want to make new submissions? Can you live off of the old submissions and just tell me what parts not to read?

I really need to get that stuff at least 24 to 36 hours in advance so that $I$ can give you a real hearing. If I
get it the last minute, $I$ can't read it and be prepared. I would like to get those submissions by noon on Monday if 1 can. What is your feeling, Ms. Finken?

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, I think that we can rest on the submissions that we sent today, and if we need to supplement them at all, we can set a timeline Monday morning that we can supplement the submissions or amend them. As far as I'm concerned, we can rely on the ones that have been submitted.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me turn to Mr. Oot.
MR. OOT: Patrick Oot for GSK, your Honor.
If we could do a -- if any, which I agree with
Ms. Finken, if we need one, that we would do a supplemental report perhaps after the meet and confer over the weekend on Monday morning, if that would work for the Court.

THE COURT: That is fine. My only request would be, in both directions, if there is something you need to supplement, just let us know, and if there is stuff that $I$ don't have to worry about because you have resolved, please let me know.

That can be very informal. That can be, like I said, a joint email to the Zantac email account that gets forwarded on to me. I would rather you spend your energies and your time resolving your issues, not preparing pretty letters for me. I don't need that. I can read an email just as well as I can
read a pretty letter.
Okay. All right. That is great, I think we are set for Tuesday on that.

All right. This is always my exit question on these things: Ms. Finken, as long as we are all together, anything else that you think we can make productive use of while we are all together today?

MS. FINKEN: I don't think so right now, your Honor. I just want to say that we are very, very appreciative of the Court's time. We do understand the logistics that go into scheduling these types of conferences and the Zoom aspect of it placing a whole new level of resources that you need to dedicate to that. We are appreciative and I just want to thank your Honor for the time today and for the time that you are setting aside on Tuesday for us.

THE COURT: That is my pleasure. By the way, I have not set a deadline for submissions if there is an issue with the generics. I see Mr. Henry is on the call.

Mr. Henry, $I$ don't mean to catch you off guard if you're not ready and you want to confer with Ms. Finken on this, but my preference would be to try to get whatever submission $I$ am going to get on any generics issue by noon on Monday as well.

Ms. Finken, why don't you and Mr. Henry confer on that. That is going to be my presumptive order unless I hear
back through the special master that there is some good reason not to be doing that. Okay?

MS. FINKEN: I do not foresee that being a problem, your Honor.

MR. HENRY: Thank you, your Honor. We appreciate that. Thank you.

THE COURT: Of course. For the record, this is Mr. Henry. Go ahead.

MR. HENRY: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Oot, anything further while we are all together this afternoon?

MR. OOT: No, thank you, your Honor. I appreciate the Court's time and echo Ms. Finken's praises to the Court. Thank you.

THE COURT: Look, my pleasure. You are working so hard, I know that. We really are here to make your lives easier, not more difficult, so we will just continue to be transparent.

Thank you very much, have a good weekend, everybody, and we will be in recess. Have a good day.

MS. FINKEN: Thank you. You, too, your Honor.
(Thereupon, the hearing was concluded.)
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|  | 7 | around [1] 6/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. HENRY: [2] 20/4 20/8 | 772.467.2337 [1] 2/2 | 4/21 5/10 6/7 |
| MR. OOT: [7] 3/10 9/21 | 8 | 18/25 19/5 19/5 19/23 |
| 20/11 | 8400 [1] 1/21 | aside [5] 15/14 17/4 17/11 |
| MS. FINKEN: [13] 3/8 6/24 |  | 17/13 19/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}7 / 22 & 9 / 3 & 12 / 13 & 14 / 25 & 16 / 1\end{array}$ | A | ask [3] 3/4 4/15 16/20 |
|  | able [4] 4/7 4/8 5/10 17/10 | asking [2] 7/5 15/19 |
| 20/20 | about [13] 3/18 3/21 4/2 | aspect [1] 19/11 |
| THE COURT: [21] $2 / 2$ 3/9 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}4 / 11 & 5 / 3 & 5 / 14 & 8 / 5 & 13 / 6 & 15 / 3\end{array}$ | \|assure [1] 14/7 |
| 3/11 7/4 8/4 9/12 10/10 | 15/23 15/25 17/4 18/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { assure [1] } 14 / 7 \\ & \text { ATF [1] } 12 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 12/15 14/8 15/10 16/10 16/13 | above [1] 21/2 | attach [1] 13/15 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 23 & 17 / 12 & 17 / 15 & 18 / 9 & 18 / 15\end{array}$ | access [1] 8/17 | authority [1] 12/11 |
| 19/15 20/6 20/9 20/14 | account [1] 18/22 | avoid [1] 6/20 |
| / | actual [3] 9/9 13/11 13/16 | aware [1] 12/12 |
| /s [1] 21/5 | actually [4] 10/17 11/24 | away [2] 4/17 4/20 |
| 1 |  | B |
| 1000 [1] 1/20 | addressed [1] 12/9 | back [8] 4/25 6/12 13/21 |
| 1130 [1] 1/14 | admitted [1] 4/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 9 & 15 / 10 & 15 / 16 & 15 / 16 & 20 / 1\end{array}$ |
| 11:00 o'clock [1] 15/12 | advance [1] 17/25 | Bacon [1] 1/19 |
| 130 [2] 1/13 1/24 | affidavit [2] 13/9 13/16 |  |
| 15 [1] 3/21 | after [1] 18/14 | be [49] |
| 1600 [1] 1/13 | afternoon [9] 3/1 $3 / 8$ 3/9 | beautifully [1] 17/17 |
| 1800 [1] 1/20 | $3 / 10$ 3/11 $3 / 17$ 3/23 15/14 | $\text { because [12] } 3 / 20 \quad 3 / 24 \text { 5/16 }$ |
| 18th [2] 1/13 1/24 | 20/11 | 7/1 8/13 8/19 9/14 10/17 |
| 19103 [2] 1/13 1/24 | again [4] 9/2 11/18 $12 / 17$ | $12 / 23 \quad 13 / 1715 / 21 \quad 18 / 19$ |
| 19104 [1] 1/17 | 12/21 | becomes [1] 11/5 |
| 2 | $\underset{14 / 8}{\operatorname{against}}[4] \quad 6 / 19$ | been [7] $4 / 12$ 7/17 $7 / 25$ 8/17 |
|  | agenda [2] 10/24 12/4 <br> agree [2] 9/22 18/12 | $\begin{array}{\|ccccc} 9 / 19 & 12 / 19 & 18 / 8 & & \\ \text { before [7] } & 1 / 9 & 4 / 2 & 6 / 8 & 6 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| 20006 [1] 1/21 | ahead [3] 6/5 6/7 20/8 | 6/10 10/22 14/25 |
| 202-783-8400 [1] 1/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { all [19] } & 4 / 16 & 4 / 22 & 5 / 5 & 5 / 20\end{array}$ | behalf [1] 15/1 |
| 2021 [2] 1/5 21/4 | $6 / 6$ $6 / 15$ $6 / 16$ $8 / 8$ | being [2] 11/12 $20 / 3$ |
| 215-569-5644 [1] 1/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 18 & 15 / 22 & 16 / 10 & 18 / 6 & 19 / 2\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Benson [2] 12/1 } & 12 / 2\end{array}$ |
| 215-735-1130 [1] 1/14 | 19/4 19/5 19/7 20/10 20/11 | best [1] 7/20 |
| 215-994-4000 [1] 1/18 | along [1] 9/8 | BFFs [1] 10/18 |
| 24 [1] 17/24 | already [3] 3/21 4/21 9/6 | biggest [1] 12/3 |
| 24/7 [1] 5/17 | also [4] 3/6 4/9 7/15 8/2 | billing [1] 15/22 |
| 26 [1] 1/5 | alternate [1] 16/18 | bit [3] 4/11 17/7 |
| 27 [1] 21/4 | always [8] 4/7 4/12 $4 / 24$ | blame [1] 16/18 |
| 2929 [1] 1/17 | 5/23 8/10 9/25 11/22 19/4 | both [5] 4/12 6/22 10/9 11/2 |
| 2:00 [2] 15/17 15/18 | am [15] $4 / 6$ 4/6 $4 / 24$ 5/23 | both [5] 4/12 6/22 10/9 11/2 18/17 |
| ```2:00 o'clock [3] 15/17 16/11``` | $\begin{array}{llllll}8 / 15 & 9 / 3 & 10 / 21 & 11 / 18 & 12 / 12 \\ 12 / 13 & 13 / 18 & 14 / 9 & 15 / 13 & 15 / 19\end{array}$ | bother [1] 10/20 |
| 3 | 19/22 | brand [2] 15/23 15/2 |
| 30 [2] 16/22 17/1 | Anapol [1] 1/ | brief [1] 7/13 |
| 32 [7] 4/1 5/6 6/24 9/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { another [3] } & 8 / 13 & 10 / 9 & 12 / 23\end{array}$ | broader [1] 9/16 |
| 13/23 15/5 15/10 | answer [2] 8/6 8/7 | brought [1] 4/1 |
| 36 [1] 17/24 | ant [1] 5/7 | BRUCE [1] 1/9 |
| 365 [1] 5/17 | anticipation [1] 5/19 | burden [4] 13/2 13/3 13/8 |
| 3:00 [3] 15/18 15/18 17/13 | any [8] 3/16 5/9 7/21 $7 / 21$ |  |
| 3:00 o'clock [2] 3/2 17/5 | 8/25 9/20 18/12 19/22 | busy [1] 12/25 |
| 3:30 [2] 15/18 15/19 | anybody [2] 14/15 16/17 | C |
| 4 |  | calendar [2] 14/20 14/22 |
|  | ```appreciate [4] 5/1 7/23 20/5 20/12 appreciative [2] 19/9 19/13``` | ```call [2] 4/21 19/18 can [36] can't [3] 12/9 13/10 18/1 cancel [2] 14/21 14/21``` |
| 5 | Arch [1] are [62] | canceled [2] 7/13 7/17 |
| 5644 [1] 1/25 | argue [1] 12/21 | canceling [3] 4/10 5/2 7/14 |
| 5:00 [1] 15/19 | arguing [1] 12/25 | care [1] $6 / 7$    <br> case [6] $1 / 3$ $3 / 15$ $4 / 13$ $7 / 15$ |
| 5:30 [1] 17/13 | argument [2] 3/18 13/8 | $7 / 15 \quad 12 / 24$ |



| G | Honor [18] 3/9 6/25 7/3 9/4 | 15/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| generics [5] 15/25 17/6 <br> 17/14 19/18 19/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}9 / 22 & 12 / 14 & 14 / 1 & 15 / 9 & 16 / 13 \\ 17 / 15 & 18 / 4 & 18 / 11 & 19 / 8 & 19 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { layer [1] } & 13 / 20 \\ \text { lead [1] } & 6 / 5 \end{array}$ |
| 17/14 19/18 19/22 | 20/4 20/5 20/12 20/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { least [3] } & 10 / 21 & 14 / 7 & 17 / 24\end{array}$ |
| get [22] <br> gets [1] 18/22 | Honor's [1] 15/4 | legal [1] 13/1 |
| getting [1] 5/23 | HONORABLE [1] 1/9 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { less [1] } & 11 / 23 \\ \text { let [10] } & 3 / 3 \end{array}$ |
| give [6] 6/5 8/8 11/18 11/23 | hope [1] 4/25 <br> hopefully [2] 16/7 17/9 | let [10] 3/3 6/11 6/22 8/5 14/18 15/11 16/20 18/10 |
| $\begin{array}{cc}12 / 20 \quad 17 / 25 \\ \text { given [1] } & 12 / 10\end{array}$ | horizon [1] 7/2 | $\begin{array}{ll}18 / 18 & 18 / 19\end{array}$ |
| given [1] 12/10 | hour [2] 16/3 16/12 | let's [1] 17/18 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { gives [2] } & 10 / 24 & 10 / 25 & \\ \text { go [6] } & 4 / 14 & 6 / 5 & 11 / 14 & 16 / 2\end{array}$ | hours [4] 14/4 14/5 17/12 | letter [1] 19/1 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccc} \text { go [6] } & 4 / 14 & 6 / 5 & 11 / 14 & 16 / 2 \\ 19 / 10 & 20 / 8 & & & \end{array}$ | 17/25 | letters [1] 18/24 |
| going [15] 3/16 $4 / 1$ 5/19 | how [8] 6/23 10/8 14/19 | level [2] 5/12 19/12 |
| 5/22 9/7 13/13 13/24 14/12 | 15/16 15/19 16/15 16/20 17/5 | LIABILITY [1] 1/5 |
| 14/12 14/16 15/13 17/8 17/19 | I | liaisons [2] 4/20 7/18 |
| 19/22 19/25 | I'll [1] 3/13 | light [1] 15/4 <br> like [9] 4/1 5/7 |
| good [15] $3 / 1$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { I'm [2] } & 11 / 21 & 18 / 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 14 / 19 & 16 / 20 & 17 / 1 & 18 / 2 & 18 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}3 / 11 & 3 / 25 & 7 / 5 & 8 / 6 & 9 / 13 \\ 1 / 2 / 5 & 1 / 23\end{array}$ | I've [1] 15/11 | likewise [1] 15/24 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccl}12 / 5 & 17 / 11 & 20 / 1 & 20 / 19 & 20 / 20\end{array}$ | idea [2] 5/11 12/17 | limited [1] 12/11 |
| got [5] 3/19 12/4 12/5 12/22 15/11 | identify [1] 3/13 | lined [1] 4/19 |
|  | immediately [1] 3/19 | lines [1] 9/8 |
| great [2] 16/14 19/2 | important [1] 13/14 | listen [1] 15/23 |
| GSK [6] 14/1 16/3 16/5 16/8 17/20 18/11 | impression [3] 8/19 8/20 | literally [1] 11/4 |
| GSK's [3] $16 / 16$ 16/22 $16 / 25$ | 14/17 | litigant [1] 8/24 |
| guard [1] 19/19 | inform [1] 10/14 | litigants [1] 7/15 |
| guess [3] 3/4 7/24 9/5 | informal [1] 18/21 | LITIGATION [1] 1/5 |
| guidance [2] $14 / 1314 / 14$ | information [1] 8/2 <br> insiders [1] 7/19 | little [2] 4/11 17/7 <br> live [1] 17/22 |
| gut [1] 9/1 | instead [2] 11/7 11/ | lives [1] 20/1 |
| H | intended [1] 5/6 | living [1] 5/16 |
| had [2] 13/2 15/13 | intent [1] 6/1 interrogatory [1] 13/16 | Lloyd [2] 11/25 12/2 <br> LLP [3] 1/16 1/19 1/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { half [5] } 10 / 5 \text { 11/22 } 13 / 4 \\ & 13 / 13 \text { 17/12 } \end{aligned}$ | invites [2] 8/19 8/20 | loading [1] 8/21 |
| hand [2] 12/6 | is [93] | Logan [2] 1/12 1/23 |
| happen [1] 7/7 | isn't [1] 10/4 | logistics [2] 6/6 19/10 |
| happened [1] 12/24 | issue [16] 5/15 6/1 9/15 | long [2] 15/13 19/5 |
| happened [1] 10/3 happens [1] | $\begin{array}{lllll} 10 / 10 & 12 / 17 & 12 / 18 & 13 / 5 & 14 / 18 \\ 15 / 4 & 15 / 15 & 15 / 16 & 15 / 23 & 15 / 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { longer [1] } 12 / 2 \\ & \text { look [2] } 13 / 2 \quad 20 / 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| happy [3] 3/23 4/7 4/24 |  | looked [2] 8/10 8/12 |
| Hardy [1] 1/19 | issued [1] 9/7 | lose [1] 16/5 |
| has [4] 6/10 7/17 8/4 13/ | issues [16] 4/1 4/8 5/18 | lot [2] 4/23 5/2 |
| hasn't [1] 8/17 | 5/22 6/4 7/2 7/2 8/1 9/25 | loud [3] 8/7 9/1 11/18 |
| have [62] | $\begin{array}{ll}12 / 8 & 13 / 1 \\ 16 / 16 & 16 / 25 ~ 17 / 9\end{array}$ | Luhana [1] 3/6 |
| haven't [1] 5/23 | it [54] ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | M |
| having [3] 3/21 6/20 9/1 | it's [2] 3/4 8/6 | made [1] 3/15 |
| he [1] 12/4 healthy [2] | item [1] 12/4 | MAGISTRATE [1] 1/10 |
| hear [3] 6/11 15/15 19/25 | J | make [8] 4/8 8/10 9/10 |
| heard [1] 3/6 | joint [5] 10/13 10/16 10/21 | makes [1] 9/8 |
| hearing [24] <br> hearings [6] 3/22 4/9 4/10 | 11/12 18/22 | making [3] 6/13 $13 / 8$ 14/11 |
| 4/24 12/8 12/19 | JUDGE [5] 1/10 $4 / 4$ 6/13 $7 / 8$ | master [5] 6/18 10/19 12/10 |
| help [1] 6/22 | 9/16 | 14/9 20/1 |
| helpful [9] 4/9 4/13 9/4 | juggling [1] 6/3 just [22] | materials [1] 13/14 <br> matter [2] 12/3 21/2 |
| 9/24 10/7 11/22 13/6 13/7 | just [22] | matters [2] 3/22 4/17 |
| 13/9 | K | may [6] 5/16 5/18 5/20 6/4 |
| HENRY [5] 1/22 19/18 $19 / 19$ <br> 19/24 20/8 | kind [2] 4/12 7/18 | 7/15 10/11 |
| her [2] 7/8 12/10 | know [14] 3/5 6/11 6/16 8/11 | maybe [5] 8/7 10/14 11/13 |
| here [5] $3 / 6$ 3/13 6/20 17/3 | 8/18 9/16 11/2 13/7 13/8 <br> 14/23 17/2 18/18 18/20 20/16 | $\begin{array}{cc} 12 / 7 & 16 / 9 \\ \operatorname{md~[1]~} & 1 / 3 \end{array}$ |
| high [1] 5/12 | L | MDL [1] 3/3 |
| his [1] 12/2 |  | $\text { mean [2] } 9 / 20 \text { 19/1 }$ |
| history [1] 12/4 | $15 / 13 \quad 18 / 1$ | meant [1] 3/19 |
| hit [2] 13/7 13/16 | law [1] 12/3 | meantime [1] 8/1 |
| HON [1] 2/1 | lawyers [3] 10/19 15/22 | measuring [1] 13/18 |


| M | 12/21 17/16 19/8 | patient [1] 9/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| meet [3] 10/22 14/6 18/14 | NW [1] 1/20 | PATRICK [3] $1 / 19$ 14/1 $18 / 1$ |
| memo [4] 10/14 10/16 10/21 | 0 | pejorative [1] 16/17 |
|  | O'clock [6] 3/2 15/12 15/17 | people [4] 4/22 7/14 11/23 |
| met [1] 13/3 | 16/11 16/15 17/5 | 17/3 |
| might [1] 9/13 | objection [1] 13/15 | per [1] 11/22 |
| mind [2] 12/23 15/14 | obviously | perfectly [1] 4/ |
| $\underset{18 / 1}{\operatorname{minute}}[5] \quad 4 / 10 \quad 4 / 10 \quad 5 / 1 \quad 5 / 2$ | Official [2] 2/1 21/5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { perhaps [4] } \\ 18 / 14 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Monday } & {[4]} & 18 / 2 & 18 / 6 & 18 / 15\end{array}$ | Often [1] 10/3 | perspective [1] 4/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} \text { Monday } \\ 19 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | oftentimes [1] 13/1 | pessimistic [1] 17/19 |
| monitoring [1] 7/14 | okay [8] 6/14 13/22 16/11 | Philadelphia [3] 1/13 1/1 |
| moot [1] 9/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 1 & 17 / 13 & 18 / 10 & 19 / 2 & 20 / 2\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { more [9] } & 4 / 1 & 5 / 6 & 5 / 7 & 6 / 14\end{array}$ | old [1] 17/22 | phone [1] 14/4 |
| $16 / 316 / 717 / 7 ~ 17 / 8 ~ 20 / 17 ~$ | once [1] | phrase [2] |
| morning [3] 3/22 $18 / 6$ 18/15 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { ne } \\ 8 / 5 & 9 / 14 & 9 / 23 & 10 / 8 \\ 10 / 23\end{array}$ |  |
| mostly [1] 12/13 | $\begin{array}{llll}11 / 9 & 11 / 13 & 11 / 20 & 12 / 6 \\ 14 / 18\end{array}$ | Pierce [1] 2/2 |
| motion [2] 11/16 11/16 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll} \\ 15 / 16 & 15 / 17 & 15 / 18 & 15 / 18\end{array}$ | Pierce/West [1] 2/2 |
| moving [2] 4/23 17/7 | 15/18 $16 / 1 \quad 18 / 13$ ll |  |
| Mr [13] $3 / 5$ 3/5 $3 / 10$ 9/19 | ones [3] 6/8 6/9 18/8 | place [1] 6/21 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 24 & 16 / 11 & 16 / 20 & 18 / 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { ones } & {[3]} & 6 / 8 & 6 / 9 & 18 / 8 \\ \text { only }[2] & 12 / 13 & 18 / 16 \end{array}$ | placing [1] 19/12 |
| 19/18 19/19 19/24 20/7 20/10 | ООT [11] 1/19 3/5-3/1 |  |
| Ms [11] 3/5 6/24 7/20 9/13 | OOT [11] 1/19 3/5 3/10 9/1 | Plaintiff [1] 11/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 14 / 4 & 14 / 5 & 14 / 23 & 16 / 1 & 17 / 2 \\ 19 / 5 & 19 / 20 & & \end{array}$ | 13/24 14/1 16/11 16/20 18, 18/11 20/10 | PLAINTIFFS [3] 1/11 3/5 15/2 <br> please [2] 3/13 18/19 |
| Ms. [6] $3 / 4$ 3/8 18/3 $18 / 13$ | open [2] 8/15 9/3 | pleasure [2] 19/16 20/15 |
| 19/24 20/13 | operations [1] 11/11 | plenty [3] 6/5 $12 / 20$ 14/6 |
| Ms. Finken [5] 3/4 $3 / 8$ 18/3 | opportunity [2] 3/25 8/23 | point [2] 6/11 13/17 |
| 18/13 19/24 | optimistic [1] 15/13 | pointing [1] 4/6 |
| Ms. Finken's [1] 20/13 | order [14] 4/18 7/8 7/8 7/9 | position [1] 12/21 |
| much [11] 5/5 5/13 6/14 10/4 | 7/9 7/13 9/7 11/11 11/16 | praises [1] 20/13 |
| 14/3 14/19 15/17 15/19 17/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 21 & 16 / 14 & 16 / 19 & 16 / 24\end{array}$ | prefer [2] 8/2 15/9 |
| 17/5 20/19 | 19/25 | preference [4] 16/1 16/2 |
| multiple [1] 6/4 | organically [1] organized | 16/6 19/21 <br> preferred [2] |
| my [16] $5 / 5$ 6/25 $8 / 1448 / 14$ | other [20] 4/17 6/17 7/15 | prejudicial [1] 8/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}9 / 1 & 12 / 23 & 15 / 14 & 15 / 15 & 16 / 2\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}7 / 21 & 7 / 22 & 10 / 15 & 10 / 17 \\ 10 / 18\end{array}$ | prepared [2] 3/17 18/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16 / 6 ~ 18 / 16 ~ 19 / 4 ~ 19 / 16 ~\end{aligned} 19 / 21$ | $10 / 19 \text { 10/20 10/24 11/3 11/21 }$ | preparing <br> [1] $18 / 24$ |
| 1 | 12/7 $13 / 22$ 14/3 14/5 $14 / 8$ | present [1] 5/22 |
| N | 14/18 17/4 | presumptive [1] 19/2 |
| name [1] 13/ | our [7] 3/12 4/17 9/5 9/12 | pretty [3] 5/12 18/24 19/1 |
| narrow [1] 17/10 | 9/14 11/20 12/18 <br> out [10] 5/24 6/8 7/19 8/7 | probably [2] 5/19 15/16 probably one [1] 15/16 |
| necessarily [1] 15/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { 9/1 } & 9 / 20 & 10 / 15 & 11 / 18 & 13 / 22\end{array}$ | $\text { problem [2] } 11 / 5 \text { 20/3 }$ |
| necessary [1] 8/12 need [25] | 14/21 | proceedings [1] 21/2 |
| needed [1] | outsiders [1] 7/1 | process [11] 4/3 5/6 6/ |
| needing [1] 16/3 | over [4] 14/4 16/9 17/20 | 6/24 7/1 9/15 9/25 10/7 |
| eeds [1] 14/24 | overarching [1] 14/ | 13/23 15/5 17/16 <br> rocess-based [1] |
| negotiate [1] 6/20 |  | production <br> [1] <br> 13/15 |
| never [6] 4/9 8/11 8/12 8/22 | P | productive [2] 14/16 |
| 8/23 9/2 | PA [3] 1/13 1/17 1/24 | productively [1] 14/15 |
| next [1] 9/23 | page [3] 10/5 13/13 13/13 | PRODUCTS [1] 1/5 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { no [7] } & 1 / 3 & 4 / 5 & 7 / 23 & 8 / 13\end{array}$ | pages [6] 11/22 $12 / 312 / 5$ | progress [3] 4/8 6/13 14/12 |
| 8/16 9/22 20/12 | 12/9 13/4 13/20 | proper [3] 3/14 7/11 7/16 |
| nobody [2] 8/19 | PALM [3] 1/2 1/5 2/ | proper thing [1] 7/11 |
| non [1] 9/15 | paper [5] 11/7 11/8 11/9 | proposal [2] 11/12 16/8 |
| non-substantive [1] 9/15 | 1/9 11/17 | protective [1] 11/16 |
| nonruling [1] 8/14 | paperless [1] | provides [1] 16/8 |
| noon [2] 18/2 19/2 | particular [2] 4/6 16/4 | PTO [7] 4/1 5/6 6/23 9/25 |
| not [32] | particularly [1] 8/16 | 13/22 15/5 15/10 |
| nothing [2] 3/20 6/10 | rties [10] 4/7 8/15 9/3 | public [2] 7/15 8/16 |
| notice [2] 5/11 7/16 | $\begin{array}{ll} 9 / 24 & 10 / 3 \\ 13 / 12 & 14 / 3 \end{array}$ | pull [3] 4/17 4/20 7/3 purpose [4] 8/20 10/16 |
| notify [1] 7/7 | parts [2] 4/23 17/23 | purpose [4] 8/20 10/16 $10 / 23$ |
| notifying [1] 7/4 | party [1] 11/13 | put [4] 8/12 9/14 $12 / 22$ |
| now [7] 3/1 7/9 11/7 11/8 | past [1] 13/6 | puti9 |



| T | try [4] 4/7 5/25 12/6 19/21 | where [7] 8/16 10/13 10/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| that [138] | trying [2] 6/17 6/19 <br> Tuesday [11] 14/19 14/22 | 10/25 11/10 12/8 13/6 <br> Whereas [1] 11/4 |
| ```that's [5] 6/23 11/9 13/18 16/24 17/7``` | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 3 & 15 / 6 & 15 / 11 & 16 / 12 & 16 / 15\end{array}$ | whether [2] 9/8 13/2 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { their [6] } & / 7 & 11 / 8 & 12 / 18\end{array}$ | 17/11 17/21 19/3 19/15 | which [9] 3/19 4/2 5/21 6/1 |
| 12/25 13/3 15/22 | turn [2] 14/18 18/10 | 6/8 6/9 14/18 15/12 1 |
| theirs [1] 11/5 | two [14] 3/22 6/4 6/7 10/5 | while [7] 8/1 12/21 15/3 |
| them [13] 4/5 4/20 5/19 5/20 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}11 / 7 & 11 / 17 & 11 / 21 & 12 / 3 & 12 / 4\end{array}$ | 15/23 15/24 19/6 20/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 6 & 10 / 21 & 10 / 21 & 11 / 23 & 16 / 9\end{array}$ | 12/9 13/3 13/13 15/10 17/12 two-and-a-half [1] 13/13 | who [8] 7/14 7/15 10/17 <br> 11/11 11/13 11/15 13/2 13/9 |
| hemselves [1] 3/14 | types [1] 19/11 | whole [1] 19/ |
| then [11] 4/10 5/2 6/7 7/2 | U | why [4] 8/18 $13 / 10$ 15/19 $19 / 24$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 13 ~ 7 / 18 ~ 8 / 7 ~ 11 / 8 ~ 16 / 4 ~ 17 / 2 ~ \\ & 17 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | under [1] 5/18 | will [26] |
| there [23] | understand [6] 4/14 12/16 | wise [1] 7/1 |
| there's [1] 5/7 | 12/16 12/20 17/2 19/10 undue [1] 13/8 | without [1] 5/21 won't [1] 16/9 |
| Thereupon [1] 20/22 | UNITED [2] 1/1 1/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { work [8] } & 3 / 23 & 4 / 4 & 4 / 5 & 4 / 25\end{array}$ |
| these [7] 4/24 5/13 8/1 10/8 17/9 19/4 19/11 | unless [1] 19/25 | 5/3 5/7 6/24 18/15 |
| they [15] 3/6 4/20 4/21 4/22 | unlike [1] 10/17 | worked [1] 11/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}7 / 16 & 10 / 22 & 11 / 5 & 11 / 16 \\ 11 / 23\end{array}$ | up [8] 4/19 6/19 8/21 9/25 | working [3] 8/1 17/9 20/15 |
| 12/8 12/25 13/2 14/11 14/14 | 11/12 11/19 12/17 15/5 | works [1] 17/17 |
| 14/14 | upon [2] 8/13 16/8 | worry [1] 18/19 |
| thin [1] 11/17 | us [10] 4/9 4/15 6/5 6/11 | would [32] |
| thing [3] 7/11 11/19 11/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}6 / 12 & 6 / 15 & 8 / 25 & 16 / 3 & 18 / 18\end{array}$ | Y |
| things [10] 5/9 5/17 7/16 | use [3] 10/25 11/24 19/6 | year [1] 5/17 |
| 8/12 8/18 9/24 10/8 12/5 |  | yes [3] 6/25 15/15 16/13 |
| 13/7 19/5 | V | yesterday [1] 14/5 |
| think [21] 3/24 4/13 7/11 | very [12] 7/13 9/19 9/19 | you [111] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}7 / 20 & 8 / 5 & 8 / 7 & 8 / 15 & 8 / 25 \\ 9 / 17 & 9 / 24 & 10 / 7 & 11 / 19 & 11 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}11 / 17 & 13 / 6 & 13 / 7 & 15 / 13 & 17 / 9\end{array}$ | you're [1] 19/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 9/17 } & \text { 9/24 } & 10 / 7 & 11 / 19 & 11 / 22\end{array}$ | 18/21 19/9 19/9 20/19 | your [37] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 5 & 16 / 23 & 17 / 5 & 18 / 4 & 19 / 2\end{array}$ | view [4] 5/6 9/16 12/18 | yours <br> [1] $11 / 6$ |
| 19/6 19/8 | $12 / 18$ |  |
| thinking [1] 11/18 | visceral [1] 8/14 | Z |
| thinks [3] 11/1 11/1 $14 /$ |  | ZANTAC [2] 1/4 18/22 |
| this [32] | W | Zoom [5] 1/9 4/16 4/18 4/2 |
| those [11] $7 / 2$ 8/1 $8 / 2$ 9/8 | walk [1] 5/8 | 19/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 12 / 19 & 13 / 20 & 13 / 20 & 14 / 7 & 15 / 9 \\ 15 / 10 & 18 / 2 \end{array}$ | want [23] |  |
| thought [1] 15/15 | wanted [4] 4/11 12/11 15/3 |  |
| thoughts [4] 7/21 8/8 9/21 11/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { was [7] } & 3 / 20 & 3 / 23 & 10 / 7 & 12 / 1\end{array}$ |  |
| three [3] 12/9 13/13 14/4 | 12/3 15/15 20/22 |  |
| three-page [1] 13/13 | was I [1] 15/15 |  |
| through [9] $1 / 9$ 4/5 4/15 $5 / 8$ | Washington [1] 1/21 |  |
| 8/1 9/6 12/19 17/9 20/1 | way [9] 4/4 5/24 7/3 7/14 |  |
| time [31] | we [88] |  |
| timeframe [1] 6/15 | we'll [3] $6 / 6$ 16/14 $16 / 24$ |  |
| timeline [1] 18/6 | $\text { we're [3] } 13 / 10 \quad 13 / 10 \quad 15 / 25$ |  |
| times [1] 10/3 | wedded [1] 11/21 |  |
| to 3:30 [1] 15/18 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{cllll} \text { today } & {[5]} & 3 / 21 & 6 / 12 & 18 / 5 \\ 19 / 7 & 19 / 14 \end{array}$ | week [1] 14/6 |  |
| together [5] $3 / 24 \quad 14 / 6 \quad 19 / 5$ | weekend [4] 16/9 17/20 18/14 |  |
| 19/7 20/11 | [1] 1/12 |  |
| too [3] 6/14 17/3 20/21 | Weiss [1] 1/12 <br> welcome [2] 9/15 9/16 |  |
| topic [3] 9/13 12/22 16/4 | $\text { well [4] 5/10 } 15 / 7 \quad 18 / 25$ |  |
| topics [2] 12/7 13/22 | $19 / 23$ |  |
| tracking [1] 7/16 | were [2] $12 / 25$ 14/4 |  |
| TRACY [2] 1/11 15/1 | WEST [3] $1 / 2$ 1/5 $2 / 2$ |  |
| transcript [1] 21/1 | what [20] $3 / 25$ 4/14 $4 / 20$ 5/3 |  |
| transparency [1] 11/2 | 5/6 $5 / 14$ $6 / 2$ $6 / 23$ $7 / 3$ <br> $1 / 7$     |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { transparent [2] } & 4 / 12 & \text { 20/18 } \\ \text { transpired [1] } & 8 / 4 & \end{array}$ | 9/11 10/3 11/2 12/24 13/10 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \text { transpired [1] } & 8 / 4 & \\ \text { Treasury [2] } & 11 / 25 & 12 / 1 \end{array}$ | 13/18 15/11 16/1 17/23 18/3 |  |
| trouble [1] 13/24 | whatever [2] 16/8 19/21 |  |
| trust [1] 4/24 | when [9] $4 / 7$ 4/15 $4 / 23$ 6/8 |  |

