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THE COURT: Let me call the case. This is Case Number 2924, In re: Zantac (Ranitidine) Product Liability Litigation. We are here this afternoon for a status conference on a couple of notices that were filed pursuant to pending discovery matters relating to the brand Defendants.

Let me begin by having counsel make their appearances. I'll start with counsel for the Plaintiffs.

MS. LUHANA: Roopal Luhana for the Plaintiffs.

MS. FINKEN: Tracy Finken on behalf of Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. WATTS: Mikal Watts for the Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Watts. On behalf of BI.

MR. SHORTNACY: Michael Shortnacy from King and Spalding, your Honor. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. And on behalf of GSK.

MR. SACHSE: Will Sachse from Dechert on behalf of GSK. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to all of you.
I am going to take up the BI portion first, so, Mr. Sachse, you are free to leave your screen on or off, whatever is easier for you.

I reviewed the notices that were submitted and I am trying to understand what the disagreement is. It seemed to me, and maybe I am reading these wrong, that the disagreement
was that BI may have some records that are in electronic format that the Plaintiffs want and there is some disagreement about whether the Plaintiffs should get them. If I could distill down everything $I$ read into one sentence, that is kind of what I understood what was going on here.

Mr. Watts, maybe $I$ can turn to you first. Tell me from your perspective what is going on that I need to know. MR. WATTS: Yes, sir, thank you. Greetings from Brussels.

The basic dispute is whether BI needs to produce the electronic analytical testing data that they conducted on Ranitidine electronically, or to take from their electronic database and print it out, often in Spanish language, and produce in Spanish tens of thousands of pages of Spanish pdf's.

The bottom line is -- I have seen this Court address the burdens of production and the new proportionality rule many times. I would submit to the Court, respectfully, it is a reciprocal rule that has just been added to the Federal rules.

I have about 50 people in my office in Puerto Rico that have been reading Spanish language documents in pdf format, and it is the height of -- it is just the height of work over nothing.

The bottom line is, the way $I$ see it, is that BI has this available in electronic format for two reasons. Number one, before 2017, BI had a partner in Germany known as

Boehringer Ingelheim, so BI Promeco, who has all this data, was electronically communicating with this data to Boehringer Ingelheim in Ingelheim, Germany. After Sanofi bought the molecule from BI at the end of 2016, that same communication was gotten from Promeco, Mexico, which is in Mexico City, with respect to this testing to Sanofi in France.

I think the starting point is that this Defendant maintains this data in electronic format and communicates with its partners, first BI and then Sanofi in electronic format. What has been happening is, Mr. Shortnacy and BI, who are my great friends and I don't mean to suggest anything untoward about what is happening, is they are pdf'ing this in Spanish, providing it to me because I think I am the only Puerto Rico office here.

I have 30 or 40 people reading tens of thousands of pages in Spanish documents looking for the needle in the haystack with respect to this analytical testing data that we all know they maintain in electronic format.

If they produce it in the electronic format, under the proportionality and burden rules that this Court has often cited, the burden is reduced by hundreds of times.

Now, you know, Tracy Finken is happy to allow me to have 50 people reading documents ad nauseam for months and months and months, and I suppose in terms of my relative allocation of common benefit it might be good for the Watts

Guerra law firm, but it is a complete and total waste of time what we are being asked to do.

THE COURT: If I could stop you for a second. I understand the burden argument, but before I get to the burden argument, I want to understand. When you say the analytical testing data records, $I$ know in the past when $I$ have talked to Ms. Luhana, we have talked about what she and Mr. Shortnacy have called batch records.

So, we are talking about the same thing, and the only question is, $B I$ is producing it to you in hard copy and you believe that they have it in electronic, and if they have it in electronic, you want it in the electronic format.

MR. WATTS: Yes, sir, and $I$ have three bases for that. Number one is the deposition I took of Torsten Mau on Friday, who was the plant manager for BI Promeco from 2010 to 2014, and then in effect the global quality executive for BI after that.

Tomorrow I take the deposition of Beate Scheidweiller, who was the quality liaison between Germany and Promeco. And Thursday I take the deposition of Susanne Thomsen, who was in effect -- after the acquisition of the molecule from BI to Sanofi, she was the liaison with Sanofi.

I would tell the Court, if you want to rule today it is one thing, but if you want me to show up with deposition transcripts to show you, it is already in my outline, I have the documents, tomorrow we will be with Scheidweiller, Thursday
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will be with Thomsen. By the end of the week I can point you to page and lines about the only way that BI Promeco communicated, first with BI before 2017, and then with Sanofi after 2017, is through an electronic transfer of these records.

We just want them in the same format that they were maintained by BI Promeco instead of producing them with a printout to pdf's, which makes my office in Puerto Rico spend thousands -- or tens of thousands of hours reading documents which they could electronically upload to us.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand the ask. I will come back to you.

Ms. Luhana, I didn't mean to jump over you, I was just told by the special master that Mr. Watts was going to go first, but $I$ am happy to hear anything that you want to add to supplement Mr. Watts and then I will turn to Mr. Shortnacy.

MS. LUHANA: I just wanted to give you the backdrop of what has transpired to date.

THE COURT: Before we get to that, maybe I can short circuit this.

Mr. Shortnacy, do you disagree with the underlying premise here, which is that there are documents in electronic format that could be produced in electronic format, but are not being produced in electronic format?

MR. SHORTNACY: Yes and no, your Honor. I will say this is the first time $I$ am hearing of this from Mr. Watts,
this specific issue was not raised previously. Let me respond and try to explain what $I$ think he is saying.

The batch records themselves are more than chromatograms. That is what $I$ think Mr. Watts is asking about. The batch records, if he just levels that back to what they are, they represent all forms of analytical testing on a given batch, and we talked before, your Honor, about the different process points from compression to coding to packaging of the tablets, so it is a complete package.

Those records are stored as the official record for the batch and paper, and so those -- BI undertook at great cost to effectively digitize those records and produce them compliant with the PTO for ESI. We hired a vendor to not only scan the records, but also associate the folders together and type in the titles to explain what the files are so that you would be seeing the documents as though you were looking at them in their original form. You would have all of the association for the binders and the clips and the envelopes and the bags.

So, all of that is being done. I don't understand what Mr. Watts is saying, that we, $B I$, are scanning things to pdf on purpose.

What I think he is asking about, your Honor, is chromatogram data, which is effectively, in part, the peaks that are taken from sophisticated machinery and also tabular
data which has the numerical values from the testing that was performed, those are included in the batch records and are in paper format.

I think what Mr. Watts is getting at is something completely separate from what is in the batch records. It is, in effect, asking for the source data for testing which resides in a different platform.

So they are, in fact, getting what they have always asked for, which is the chromatograms and the data, and as to -- and again, in responding to Mr. Watts here about the relative burdens for reviewing this, $I$ don't know what his reviewers are looking at and what can be done that would make that easier if it was not in an OCR document, a pdf. They would still have to review it, so I don't follow the point.

THE COURT: I hear you, but I am not going to get to the burden question until $I$-- the burden question, to me -the argument $I$ am hearing is, there seems to be something that exists that the Plaintiffs think they are not getting electronically and it would be less burdensome to review if they got it electronically.

I think as a general principle, everyone would agree, in the modern world, anything you can get electronically is easier to search than things you don't get electronically.

I am just trying to understand that baseline question. Is there something that exists electronically that the

Plaintiffs are not getting electronically that they could get electronically?

If what you are telling me is, at least within this sub-universe of documents we have of been referring to for several months as batch records, they don't exist electronically anywhere, and the Plaintiffs are getting all the batch records, which are in paper, and they are getting them in paper. But there may be a separate sub-universe of documents which we, BI, call something else which either they haven't asked for, or they are getting it, or -- so that is what I would like to focus on right here.

MS. LUHANA: Judge, I am sorry to interject, but I just want to correct the record.

THE COURT: Sure.
MS. LUHANA: The genesis of PTO 63 was a belief that the Promeco batch records were in paper form, okay, and we later learned in April, at the end of April, based on scrambled upon documents that there are these two databases called Limbs and Empower that store the chromatograms and store some of the analytical data that is actually put into the batch records and printed. So, they are taking stuff like data that is in reasonably usable form in a database and printing it and producing it to us that way.

The first time we learned about that was at the end of April. It wasn't disclosed in the ESI disclosures previously
by BI, and if it had been disclosed, what would have happened is, we would have met and conferred per the ESI protocol which requires the parties to meet and confer about electronic databases, discuss the scope of that database, the format of production, the content of it. That has not taken place. We still have not gotten the answers as to what is in those electronic systems versus what is in the paper, because there is significant overlap.

The first we learned of that was at the end of April, and so we have carried on and tried to get those answers during these meet and confers, but have been unsuccessful. That is why we served a $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ ESI notice upon BI so we can understand, hey, exactly what do these databases store, how is it stored, how is the interplay between Limbs and Empower, what is going on there.

Instead, they have close even to -- Judge, we told them to stop producing batch records on April 13th. At that point, only 2 percent of those batch records were produced. What we had told BI specifically is, you have produced them in Spanish, allow us to translate these batch records, review the batch records, and then have a discussion and circle back. What they did was, they continued to unilaterally produce batch records.

Then we gave them a narrower proposal and said, hey, produce representative batches, like one batch record for each
year that you had an NDA. They didn't get back to us for two weeks.

They decided, you know what, we are not going to take your proposal and what we're going to do is produce everything, all the batch records because it is in the pipeline, and we said that -- we don't understand why you are doing that because we want a narrow subset produced and to discuss electronic production of this information.

They said, no, we are going to produce all the batch records, not give you the answers you want in terms of these electronic databases.

All our concern is right now is -- it's two-fold. The first is we want them to act in good faith and have these discussions with us in terms of production of electronic records, that is the first thing, and not use the fact that they have unilaterally produced 270,000 more additional pages after we told them to stop against us and say, hey, we have met our burden here.

The second thing is, we want this data in a reasonably useable form as it was maintained and hopefully we are going to get the answers we need per this $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ that we intend to take. That is where we stand today.

MR. SHORTNACY: Your Honor, can I respond to that?
THE COURT: Candidly, both of you, I don't really care how we got where we are today. I want to deal with where we
are today, not how we got to where we are today, but feel free to respond, Mr. Shortnacy. Then I am going to ask you all the questions that Ms. Luhana wants to ask, which I was about to ask you before Ms. Luhana interrupted me.

Go ahead, Mr. Shortnacy.
MR. SHORTNACY: I apologize, your Honor. I will be brief only to say that your Honor had it correct in your recitation of the events. We are not printing these to elude production format, that is how the records are stored in the ordinary course. I wanted to make sure that was very clear to the Court, that it was not a decision to produce something in paper that didn't already exist as a record in paper.

THE COURT: If you could help me, Mr. Shortnacy. What exists in electronic format that we are talking about here?

MR. SHORTNACY: So, as I have explained to Ms. Luhana a number of times, and $I$ think as your Honor has framed it correctly, the batch records themselves are a business record maintained in paper, they contain information about all of the different stages of process for manufacturing of over-the-counter Zantac.

Pieces of information that form pieces of -- certain parts of the batch records, one example is chromatograms, are clearly stored electronically, and that has been, I think, well-known and explained to Plaintiffs.

And so the question is, what else is electronic? It
depends on the type of testing and it depends on the question. I think your Honor framed it correctly. It isn't that parts of the batch records are stored electronically, they are not. Certain data points may be, depending on what the data is, and that has, $I$ think, been the disconnect in the discussions with Plaintiffs because Plaintiffs don't appear to have actually reviewed the batch records.

I will rephrase that in a less incendiary way. Plaintiffs have not come to us, BI, with express reference to the batch records to say we are interested in understanding these pieces, so it is difficult to have that conversation in a vacuum. Ms. Luhana says to participate in good faith in answering questions, we believe, of course, we have.

What we really need is to understand -- and Mr. Watts has framed a very specific question about Empower, which is the system that houses the chromatograms, and what is able to be produced electronically from that would be duplicative of what has already been provided in paper. That is a specific question that can be responded to.

The question of we want all of the batch records in electronic form, first of all, I can't answer that; and second, it does not exist in that way.

THE COURT: So, if I understand you, then, I'm looking at my Venn diagram in my head, there is a circle of all the things that are in the batch records which are in paper, there
is a separate circle of all things that are kept electronically. There is a point of intersection between those two circles which may include things like the chromatogram data and similar analytical data. Am I correct so far?

MR. SHORTNACY: That is correct.

THE COURT: Let me start with just that intersection point. Does BI have an objection to producing, although it may be duplicative, the electronic versions of what has already been produced as part of the batch records?

MR. SHORTNACY: Right now we do because it would be burdensome to restore that information. It is a near line not readily available.

What we need to understand from Plaintiffs is what they need. Are there specific batches? Are there specific ways? Because the way it can be interrogated that database is by a project name, it doesn't always say Zantac. So, there are burdens to doing that in a world where we have already given the information that is in the record.

If it is --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SHORTNACY: If they have a discussion point that is specific, we can address it, and I think that would be where we are.

THE COURT: Now, what about the part of my circle here that is outside of the circle that includes the physical paper
batch records? So, there are electronic records that have nothing to do with the batch records. That could be lots and lots of stuff at BI, I understand that. I am cabining that with things that have been requested by the Plaintiffs in their requests for production which are not batch records, but which are in electronic format.

Do such things exist? Let me start with that.
MR. SHORTNACY: Well, I am not sure exactly how to answer that because $I$ am not sure what that would include in terms of things that they have asked for in electronic format.

THE COURT: No, no, they propounded requests for production for lots and lots and lots of stuff. Some of those requests for production call for what is in the batch records, and you are producing those, and you are producing them in the format in which they exist, which is in hard copy.

What I am asking you is -- and you have told me that BI maintains certain electronic records that may -- I am asking, are there electronic records that $B I$ maintains that are responsive to the requests for production which have not been produced or to which you have an objection to producing, or is the issue, you don't know what they are asking for so you can't tell me if there are things that are responsive to the requests for production that are in electronic format?

MR. SHORTNACY: The latter part is correct, your
Honor. Certainly have produced from a number of different
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sources electronic data. So, for example, the BI literature database, the adverse events database, I could list lot of them, but anchoring back to manufacturing, I think that the batch records, plus some of the testing data the Plaintiffs are now asking about, sort of the raw underlying data, is really where the crux of the issue is.

THE COURT: Okay. You used the phrase the "raw underlying data." So, that is different from what is in the batch record itself, that is some other data point?

MR. SHORTNACY: Right, I guess in two respects. One is for the chromatograms themselves, so that is printed with the peaks and the tabular data and has all of the information in the printed form.

What I understand Mr. Watts to be getting at is, he wants to have that in electronic form, which is to say sort of a different format, but also the underlying data that comes with it, and that would also be true for other parts of the batch record.

For example, a certificate of analysis, that would list specification for impurity tolerance, and I will make up a number, .1 percent or .5 percent, next to it, it would say complies, and so that is part of the batch record.

What I understand Plaintiffs to be asking for is getting at the source data and source testing for all of that information that would sort of form the basis of it complying
with the specification.

THE COURT: Let me see if $I$ understand that.

So, as whatever it is is flowing through this process, there are different points in which you measure different things, different tolerances. I will use that word if I can. So, to get the tolerance you measure that it has six, whatever units of something or other, and that is within the acceptable tolerances, and so it says acceptable, it passes the test, but it doesn't say whether you passed the test with an 80 percent or a 90 percent, it just passed the test.

Am I correct?

The batch record will say you passed the test, but it won't say whether you got a 65 or an 85 on the test.

MR. SHORTNACY: I think that is fair.

THE COURT: When you say the underlying raw data, is that what you are talking about, the measurement that would have said whether it was a 65 percent or 85 percent?

MR. SHORTNACY: Correct.

THE COURT: One last question, and then $I$ will let you talk, I promise.

So, that number, the 65 or 85 percent in my hypothetical, wouldn't be in the batch record, but it would exist somewhere else at BI, but it is just more granular, it's more detailed, it's at a different level of detail.

Am I correct?

MR. SHORTNACY: Correct, and in many respects, difficult to get, and depending on the type of data, often times put in manually into a system by a lab analyst.

THE COURT: I am not here yet to argue about whether I should make you produce these things, or how hard it would be, or how much better it would be for the Plaintiff. I have not reached that normative question.

I am trying to understand what exists, because I can't reach the second question until $I$ address the first question.

I think I now understand the first question. What you are telling me is there is some data that you have in electronic format, for example, chromatogram printouts and that information, which would be duplicative of the physical copies that have been given, but it exists.

Then there is other data that has not been produced, it's more detailed, it's more granular, and that also has not been produced, but it exists in electronic format.

I am not making a value judgment whether it has been asked for, should have been produced, can be produced, or anything else. As a factual matter, am I at least correct, Mr . Shortnacy?

MR. SHORTNACY: I think that is correct, your Honor. It is over generalizing in a way and I understand why you need to do that and I fully appreciate it. Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Here is what I am going for.

I am going to send you all back to the table to talk to one another now that maybe we all understand a little better what is going on here.

I do think at some level -- I hear from the Plaintiffs that having some of the chromatogram data in electronic format would be a good starting point, maybe not all of it, but maybe there is a representative sampling or a few that you could show them.

Maybe then Mr. Watts and Ms. Luhana can look at it and say, oh, no, this really isn't any easier for us to deal with because it is not words, it is just lines on a graph and it doesn't really help us, or they might say this really helps us a lot and we would like to explore further. I think that conversation needs to occur, and I don't need to rule on it until you all have that conversation.

With that, let me go back to Mr. Watts or Ms. Luhana for the Plaintiffs. Have $I$ at least helped clarify a little bit of what you're staring at here?

MR. WATTS: I think the Court's instinct is right. It reminds me of all of the criticism from SCOTUS that we don't rule because of lack of standing. Sometimes things need time to germinate.

What I can tell you is, is that if the court were to order me to show up with deposition proof of Torsten Mau taken last Friday, Beate Scheidweiller taken tomorrow, Susanne
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Thomsen on Thursday, by Friday I could have you a fulsome record.

Here is what $I$ know is true from the deposition outlines that $I$ have already prepared: A, BI Promeco communicates with BI Germany and then Sanofi electronically with all of this data, so it already exists.

B, from the standpoint of concern about giving it to me electronically, they can do it attorneys' eyes only, or whatever, but the bottom line is that Mr. Shortnacy already said $I$ can do it electronically. We have an objection to repeating what we have already done paper-wise.

I can show you the emails from Ms. Finken and Ms. Luhana that say, quit producing it paper-wise. Don't claim burden because you produced it paper-wise, we want it electronically. I am not accusing Mr. Shortnacy of games, but the idea of oh, my God, it is a burden, we have already produced it paper-wise when the Plaintiffs told me not to --

THE COURT: I think there is a difference between saying whether we have ever produced anything in the past or not, it is unduly burdensome to have to go drill drown and find all this stuff. That is the argument $I$ hear today.

I don't hear him making the argument that it is cumulative and because we have already produced it all in paper it is not proportional to make us do it again. First of all, he is not making that argument, and second of all, $I$ am not
sure how I would react to that argument given that the Plaintiffs have clearly said stop producing.

On the other side said, look, you asked them for the documents. They are producing the documents you asked for. I am not going to criticize the Defendant for complying with his discovery obligations.

MR. WATTS: Except the discovery rules say you produce documents in the format in which you maintain them, and $I$ know, and I will prove to you, and I will submit a brief with deposition text about how somebody in Germany tomorrow, or somebody in France on Thursday gets this stuff from BI Promeco. They maintain it electronically.

So, the idea that you're going to take something that is maintained electronically, communicated across the Atlantic, and print it and claim burden is nonsense.

THE COURT: I don't hear -- hold on, and I will let him speak for himself in a second. I don't hear him saying it would be unduly burdensome to produce some of it, or samples of it, or examples of it if we knew more specifically what they're asking for.

What I heard him saying is, it would be burdensome to produce all of it because the way we keep it, to go find all of it would be difficult.

Mr. Shortnacy, I don't want to put words in your mouth. Am I understanding you correctly?
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MR. SHORTNACY: That is correct. That is a conversation we have always been willing to have, and I think that what has been lacking is specificity. Again, I am hearing from Mr. Watts for the first time that there is information shared between France, and I don't know exactly what he is speaking of, and so it is difficult to promise or to evaluate that having just heard it.

I do also want to make the point, your Honor, I am not waiving the right to reach a point in this discussion to say, you know, this is fruitless, not specific enough, and we have given you all of it in paper. I don't think your Honor has ever indicated that not saying something is a waiver, but I did want to plant that stake.

I am not saying that -- those words will never been said, but $I$ am saying $I$ am willing -- BI is willing to engage with Plaintiffs to have some targeted -- look for information along the lines of what Mr. Watts is suggesting, but we need to have that conversation.

MR. WATTS: Can I make a suggestion that we wait until
Friday? I will spend part of my deposition of Beate
Scheidweiller tomorrow to prove how this information was communicated to Germany. I will spend part of my deposition on Thursday to prove how this information was produced to Susanne Thomsen, and I will produce to the Court deposition in page and line. I am so confident that I am right that if I can't prove
it to you, deny the motion. But by Friday, I promise you, I know how this information is communicated across the pond. Maybe today is a little premature and Friday would be ripe.

THE COURT: You can do what you want. You can file a PTO 32 and you can put a motion before the Court any time you want to and I will rule on it if it comes before me.

What I am hearing is, you all are taking past each other today. That's what I'm hearing. Mr. Shortnacy is not saying he will never give you any of these records in electronic format, nor are the Plaintiffs necessarily saying give us everything you have tomorrow in electronic format.

I think there is an understanding here that $B I$ is not denying that the documents exist, no one is suggesting that the Plaintiffs are not acting in good faith and do not have a good evidentiary basis to believe that it does exist electronically, but I think you all need to sit down and talk about what exactly exists, why can't we get it, how hard would it be, the same conversations you have all the time.

If you can't reach some conclusion after a meet and conferral you can tee up whatever motions you want and I will rule on it.

Mr. Watts, it seems to me you are spending a lot of time trying to prove a fact that he is not denying, which is that they exist. He agrees that they exist and he agrees they
exist electronically. If you want to waste your depo time proving a fact that he is not challenging on, go forth, but $I$ think the time would be better spent talking with each other.

Now that you understand, and Mr. Shortnacy has candidly told the Court this exists, it is just a question of, we can't be asked in bulk to get all of it in electronic format, give it to them right now. We need to have a better sense of exactly what they want and maybe some sequencing. Mr. Watts.

MR. WATTS: I agree with you, Judge. I think it is really a debate about what percentage of the common benefit time is going to go to the Watts Guerra Puerto Rico office to read meaningless Spanish pdf's versus Roopal Luhana to do meaningful scientific work and Tracy Finken to do a meaningful analysis of testing data.

If you want to make me spend three months reading through pdf's of Spanish documents, I will do it and be handsomely paid for it, but it is a waste of time. So, we will get the data for you by Friday, and if $I$ am wrong, $I$ will be the first to admit it.

THE COURT: Again, Mr. Watts, I am not telling you what to do. Spend your time doing whatever you all want to do, looking at whatever you want to look at. All I am ruling on is what you are entitled to have, and what you are saying is that there is some stuff in electronic format that we think we
should get.
We have now confirmed with Mr. Shortnacy that stuff exists in electronic format that you don't have, so we have closed that loop. And there may be stuff that exists in electronic format that overlaps with stuff that you have in a different format.

Now that we have understood clearly on both sides that is where the world is, you all now need to have the conversation about why can't we have it, this is what we want, this is the order we want it in, this is how quickly we want it, this is how much of it we want, but at least we now know what is out there.

Now go forth and have that conversation. If at the end of that conversation BI says, no thank you, we will give you nothing, file your motion and $I$ can rule. If BI says we will give you half of it, but not all of it, file your motion and I'll rule. But right now, you all haven't even talked about it.

You can tee up the ball any way you want to tee it up.
MR. WATTS: I agree. We will meet and confer with Mr. Shortnacy, I will show up with deposition transcript by Friday and we will meet and confer and get with the special master. If we need the Court's assistance next week we will get back with you.

THE COURT: Great. My goal for today has now been
accomplished. I just wanted clarity for all of us as to what exists, what is in paper, what is electronic, what has BI got. At least from my standpoint, I think we are there, so I will encourage you all to go forth with that.

MS. LUHANA: Judge, can I raise one thing in terms of the chromatograms?

THE COURT: Sure. Of course.
MS. LUHANA: When you print the chromatograms, you can print it according to specifications you want versus the full picture. So, we are looking for that full picture because we believe NDMA, we can find it there if we actually do get a full picture and the underlying raw data, and that is why it is essential to the case.

In addition to that, there was a 483 investigation that was done by the FDA where BI had produced all the chromatograms from 2019 electronically and then it went back retrospectively and pulled all that data. So, I don't know where they are in that production, but since it has already been pulled for the FDA, presumably it is in that reasonably usable format and it can be produced to us in a similar fashion.

Then we could narrow it further, but we are looking for that data as well as the impurity testing from Limbs. So, those are the two types of data we are looking for, but as you have recommended, we are going to meet and confer and we will
circle back with the Court after we do.
THE COURT: Again, let me sort of summarize from the Court's perspective. Both sides have legitimate equities here and I hear you loud and clear.

On the one hand, the Plaintiffs are entitled to get proportional discovery in the most meaningful useable format that they can. I don't think anyone disagrees with that.

On the other hand, the Defendants are entitled to not be overburdened by having to produce a lot of expensive stuff and costs. That is where the Court gets involved in balancing those two concerns.

So, I think the more detailed conversations you can have about precisely what data you are looking for, the timeframes you are looking for -- Ms. Luhana, what you just said to me is very helpful when you say, look, this is exactly what we are looking for, these particular chromatograms because they show this, or this underlying raw data, because maybe there are a hundred data points that go into the chromatogram, but this is the one -- this is the box we want, the box that says NDMA, or says Ranitidine, or says something else.

I think the more detailed and specific the Plaintiffs can be in telling the Defendant what they want, the Court's expectation will be that you have narrowed your focus as much as you can, that should help the Defendants -- BI identify how hard will it be to produce this and do we have a legitimate
objection.
I will say it again, I am not ruling on this issue, but $I$ hear the Plaintiffs' concern and $I$ want to allay this. The argument -- obviously, if BI makes the argument, I will hear the argument with an open mind, but the fact that BI is continuing to produce materials in paper that were requested by the Plaintiffs, even though the Plaintiffs said stop producing, I can't, at least as I sit here today, criticize BI for that.

They are trying to get materials out of a country where we had trouble getting in in the first place. I would hate to get in a situation where we get down the road again and now the Plaintiffs are coming to me going, well, they didn't give us all the batch records and now they are back in Mexico and we can't get them.

So, on the one hand, BI can produce what it wants to produce in response to your request.

On the other hand, $I$ hear the Plaintiffs loud and clear, that if $B I$ comes down the road in three months and goes, Judge, we produced a million documents in paper, why do we have to produce these other things electronically, you have made a very clear record that you have been telling them to stop, and if they proceed forward, they proceed forward at their own risk, and the Court will take that into account.

I am not ruling on either side, but $I$ want both sides to understand I hear you both and I understand why you are
doing what you are go doing.

Mr. Watts.

MR. WATTS: Just one other comment on that. Again, I am not complaining that they produce it in paper, but if it is going to take 90 days for my lawyers in Puerto Rico to read this stuff because it is in paper -- we are going to Mexico City on August 16th. They have the ability to flip me the electronic documents tomorrow.

The bottom line is, if their argument is 30 days from now, we have already given them to you in paper and not electronically, we are out of time. We are supposed to go to Mexico City on August 16th, so this is a time issue as well as a burden issue.

THE COURT: I understand. I saw Mr. Shortnacy shaking his head when you said they can flip a switch and get me it electronically tomorrow. That is the conversation you all need to have, because what he is telling me is they can't, or at least they can't all of it, that some of it is easy to get to and some of it is hard to get to, and you all just need to have that conversation.

Again, they are not waiving anything, but $I$ don't hear BI necessarily saying we won't give you what is in electronic format once we have a better idea what you are asking for, and if it is easy, we will give it to you.

They are not objecting to that today. They may object
to that later, but again, that is a conversation you need to have. If you need the special master to guide you, I am sure she will be happy to help guide you.

MR. WATTS: We will have that conversation tomorrow about whether converting to pdf and push send to unprint is easier than emailing an electronic deal and we will show up Friday with that evidence if we need to, otherwise, we will confer.

THE COURT: All right. I will leave that to you. Mr. Shortnacy, I will give you the last word. MR. SHORTNACY: Your Honor, just one last seed to plant. To Ms. Luhana's statement about the testing and why they believe it is relevant, that testing will not show NDMA because there was no specification to test for that.

So, one of the things that $B I$ can see value in is avoiding unnecessary squabbles like this through simple questions that can be put that may resolve issues that the Plaintiffs have about the types of testing that were done, or any number of things that can maybe lend themselves to written discovery, logs, whatever, that may avoid some of this.

So, that is one other thing that we are, obviously, open to if it will avoid unnecessary disputes.

THE COURT: Thank you. Like I said, I can just speak for myself. In talking to you all today, the more detailed and less abstract, the better. So, when I hear analytical testing
data, $I$ don't know what that means. When you say $I$ want to know the -- when you ran a test on September 22, 1993, what was the NDMA measurement, that is a lot more detailed and I can respond to that better.

Again, I will leave it to you all. You are very experienced and very good at this, and the special master will work with you. I really do think the more detailed the questions, the more detailed the answers, and then the court is in a better position to rule. If BI says, no, we are not going to do it, then Ms. Luhana and Mr. Watts can come back and say it is not that hard, we told them exactly what we want, and we will have that discussion.

Thank you. I will excuse the parties on --
MS. LUHANA: Judge, one last thing. We have
outstanding questions to Mr. Shortnacy about these electronic databases, so we will look for responses, hopefully he can produce them, and then we can have a fruitful discussion.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know if that is formal or informal. Anything you can do to expedite it would be better.

Thank you all very much. I will excuse the parties on the BI issue.

MS. LUHANA: Thank you, Judge.
MR. SHORTNACY: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's turn to the GSK issue. Welcome back, Ms. Finken and Mr. Sachse.

I will tell you I -- I forget whether it was Ms. Luhana or Ms. Finken who, at the last status conference with Judge Rosenberg, said something about there are still hundreds of clinical trial studies that we don't have, and that concerned me because we have been having this conversation since March about what exists, what doesn't exist, et cetera. I wanted to get a better sense of where we are.

I think I said at some point along the road here, there comes a point when GSK is allowed to simply say we have done all we are willing to do, we have made a reasonable effort under Rule 26(g), and even if other stuff exists, we are not producing it. Then the Plaintiffs can move to compel, and I will rule.

It seems to me we ought to be pretty close to that point, if we are not at that point by now, but let me turn to Mr. Sachse and see where we are.

MR. SACHSE: Sure, your Honor. Let me start by just making sure that we are all on the same page in terms of what the Plaintiffs have, what we are still looking for, and the progress we have made.

So, where we are is that GSK has already produced more than 500 preclinical and clinical studies. We have also produced -- GSK has also produced the adverse events from the database that relate to cancer. This includes adverse events coming out of any of the clinical trials that we have been
taking about.
We have produced the complete regulatory file for Zantac. We have produced hundreds of lab notebooks, which is what it sounds like, it is the chemists and the other scientists, their kind of working papers. Of course, where we are now focused is what is becoming, I suppose, a notorious MedTrack sheet. This is the snapshot in time from 2003, 760 entries, and as of today, I believe the count is that there are 457 of those 762 entries that we have not been able to find.

So, I think the sort of top line headline here is we are continuing to look. I don't think we are yet at the point where we throw up our hands and say, we are done, we can't find these.

At the same time, we are providing regular updates to Ms. Finken and her team. In fact, earlier today my colleague, Noah Becker, while still mourning the Sixer's loss last night, he provided the latest update to the spreadsheet.

So, we are making progress, and I will say -- I imagine Ms. Finken will say it has been slow, and I agree. It has been a bit surprising that we haven't made more progress in some respects, but in other respects, maybe not so much.

What we are doing is, we are kind of double tracking, or maybe even triple tracking. One thing we are doing is, we are taking this list and we are comparing the entries on MedTrack to the PIER reports, which you have heard about
before, and wherever we think we have something that looks like a match or a close match, we are looking more closely at the materials from the archive and evaluating those for production.

The other thing that we have been doing, and I think are now maybe focusing on a little bit more again is, we went and compared the MedTrack list in the first instance to the documents we have already produced to see how many of these studies are already in the Plaintiffs' hands, and as we have gone and looked again at our production, one of the challenges that we have is that some of these old studies, they are paper documents that were digitized, and OCR, optical character recognition, is not always going to pick them up.

So, I think we have started to find a few additional studies that way that we have now crossed off the list, but we are still in the hundreds. So, where does that leave us?

We sort of look at the list of the 450 plus, 457, and say what more can we do in this regard to look for these?

The challenges that we are having, one I have mentioned before, is that when you look at this sheet, it is not necessarily a list of studies that were completed, concluded, study report made, so you would expect that you might be able to find a report that we could then turn over to the Plaintiffs. Some of these are identified as planned, some of these are identified as canceled, and terminated is another characterization.

When you look at the overall number of studies where we are sort of struggling to find anything that kind of matches, or might match, those are entries where we are seeing a lot of missing data or missing entry -- missing documentation.

The other thing that we have learned over the course of the last several weeks is that the naming conventions here, frankly, they are not consistent. So, when you look at MedTrack, it might identify a study by one name or an entry by one name, and then you go to PIER and you can't get a one-to-one match, so it does take a little bit more digging and kind of searching around to see if maybe something that was named, you know, I don't know, esophageal GERD in MedTrack is named something else in PIER.

So, we are continuing to do that and it is a time-consuming process and we are sort of incrementally drawing down that list.

The last thing I will say is that there are some entries that are just, frankly, baffling. There are things like data not available, or see Jane Mills for details, things like that, that just don't seem like we are ever going to be likely to find an actual document or documents that match up with that.

And then the last thing $I$ will say is that when we look at the list, there are entries that seem pretty far afield
from what we are trying to accomplish here. What we are focused on, of course, is the safety of this molecule, the studies that were done, whether there was any indication in those studies that this molecule had an increased risk of cancer.

A lot of the studies that are on this MedTrack sheet are more focused on efficacy, there are some what are called comparator studies where they are comparing one molecule to another, which is better, that kind of thing. There are even some studies about the comprehensibility of the label. So, these are not -- you know, when you look at the 457, it is not like there are 457 studies about the safety of Ranitidine, and that information is not in the Plaintiffs' hands.

As I mentioned, the Plaintiffs already have -- out of our safety database, they have the adverse events relating to clinical trials that would be relevant to this litigation, and I will just note that we had our $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition of our safety witness last week, not a single question about any adverse event coming out of that database related to any trial or anything else.

I think that is kind of where we are. Personally, I am not willing to give up. Some of my teammates might be egging me on to give up, but $I$ think we are not quite there yet. As I said, this is an ongoing effort and an ongoing dialogue with Ms. Finken.

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SACHSE: And I see Mr. Watts waving at me.
THE COURT: Ms. Finken gets priority over you on this one, Mr. Watts. I'm sorry, she is the GSK designee. If she wants to call on you, that's a different story, but Ms. Finken goes first.

MR. WATTS: I defer to the boss.

THE COURT: Are you also mourning the 76 ers loss last night, Ms. Finken?

MS. FINKEN: I am, and so is my entire household.

THE COURT: You need to have five players willing to shoot the ball.

MS. FINKEN: Thank you, your Honor. So, Mr. Sachse and I have had several conversations over the past week to clear up some misconceptions that we have had based on conversations with one of Mr. Sachse's colleagues about the production.

We did receive an updated spreadsheet today about the human clinical trials, and as your Honor probably remembers because we had an ad nauseam full-day hearing about it, there was the MedTrack spreadsheet that had 764 human clinical trials listed. They have produced 272 of them as of today's date and there are another 457 or so that are still missing according to the most recent spreadsheet.

From my conversations with Mr. Sachse, they are still
going to be searching and producing what they are able to find. There are two things that we have asked for that I am hoping that Mr. Sachse will be able to provide for us and he said that he would look into it.

One is, we had asked if there were any additional fields for the Medtrack spreadsheet that would identify the length of the study or the duration of exposure, or if that data is available anywhere else, so that we could really take a deep dive into some of the studies that are still outstanding just to see how long people were actually taking Zantac during those studies and things of that nature.

The second thing that we have been requesting, and Mr. Sachse and I didn't speak about this over the weekend, was a listing from the PIER index which is what they are cross referencing. With the human clinical studies, they are searching the PIER database to see if they are located within that database, and the ginormous spreadsheet that your Honor might recall we went over during that lengthy hearing has a number -- many, many, many entries that relate to clinical study protocol numbers.

The way these are identified is by study number, when you search the spreadsheet, they come up on the spreadsheet, and we had asked which ones have been pulled and reviewed so far so that we could maybe narrow down and help with determining which ones might be relevant in terms of human
clinical trials that are outstanding, and we haven't been provided with that information, albeit we just asked for that last week based upon some conversations that we had with Mr. Sheehan, who is co-counsel with Mr. Sachse.

So, I think that those two items might help us work through some of these issues, and I will let Mr. Watts explain to you why some of the clinical trial data relating to canceled studies might be relevant here, why that is information that we would seek as well.

THE COURT: Okay. I am not going to rule on it, but I will hear you, Mr. Watts.

MR. WATTS: Judge, if $I$ could, this is not really my fight, but as $I$ understand, it is a motion to compel by Mr. Sachse to compel the Harvey depo, which is --

MS. FINKEN: Mikal, that actually was taken down.
MR. WATTS: Okay. Let me kind of give you the spirit, and $I$ apologize, but what $I$ do know is the following. I didn't know anything about this until about 16 hours ago.

Number one, I know that at 3:00 a.m. Eastern time Tracy Finken got on a Zoom call to watch the deposition of John Wood which I took for about nine hours. What I also know is that GSK canceled clinical studies when the placebo was showing better efficacy than Zantac.

What I also know is that there was a very large discussion with respect to anti-secretion that was canceled by
the witness that I had today, John Wood, from publication.
What $I$ know is the witness had no explanation whatsoever as to why two-thirds of the clinical trials were no longer available. His partner, Jane Mills, had no explanation as to why the data was not available.

The bottom line is, is that it seems like 262 of the 467 clinical trials are missing, so $I$ think we have a real material problem here.

I had a jousting session with a very sophisticated witness today who told me the data that we saw said there was no nitrosation risk whatsoever. I asked him for the data, he couldn't point me to it, and two-thirds of it is gone. So, respectfully, I don't know how you try a pharmaceutical case with two-thirds of the clinical trials missing.

Now, if the Court says, it is good enough that GSK, who made 30 or $\$ 40$ billion off this drug, can say two-thirds of the clinical trials are gone, then I guess I can try the case with a negative inference. I do think that discretion is the better part of valor and Mr. Sachse's group should be compelled to continue to try to find this stuff.

I find a hard time believing that a former member of the European Union, the precursor to the United States, speaks the same English that we do, can't store clinical trials in a warehouse without losing two-thirds of them in the 2020's.

So, that would be the one thing that I would comment
on based on what I learned today. I was shocked that John Wood, a high level employee of Glaxo, had no explanation as to why all these clinical trials are gone.

There is just no explanation for it in the '80's, '90's, 2000's. There wasn't a hurricane that hit Scotland, there wasn't some earthquake that wiped out the database, there wasn't some Russian hacking that said the computer files were all wiped out. They are just gone, and I think we are entitled to know where they are.

THE COURT: Okay. You know, I hear you, but that is not the issue before me at this time.

As I have said to the parties directly and through the special master many, many times, if you want something from me, ask for it. Nobody is asking me for anything here.

Mr. Sachse is saying to me we are doing the best we can, we are still looking, we are not digging our heels in and saying we don't have to do any more. The Plaintiffs haven't come to me and said we want a remedy, they are not giving us what we need, we want a remedy.

If Plaintiffs want a remedy, tee up a PTO 32, tell me the remedy you want, and I will have a hearing and I will rule on it. If GSK feels like we have done enough and we ain't going to do no more, tell the Plaintiffs that. They will file a PTO 32 and $I$ will rule on it. But that is all $I$ can do, folks.

On the flip side, if you are working through it, then work through it, but we need to get this moving, folks. The point at which one side or the other has to stop being -candidly, has to stop being nice and just dig their heels in and say, I am going to go to the judge, that is what he gets paid for, and I am going to get a ruling, is fast approaching.

You got your very generous extension on PTO 30. I know you all went home and thought how nice Judge Rosenberg was about that, but you ain't going to get another one.

So, I don't want to be here in 90 days still hearing we can't do $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{Z}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C because we haven't gotten what we need, and nobody teed up an order for me to rule and order somebody to do something. So, that is my message today.

I am appreciative of the fact that everyone is working well together and trying to be ethical and professional and cooperative. But at some point, the case has to move forward and somebody needs to tee this up for me one way or the other, and if there is a remedy that the Plaintiffs are entitled to, they will get it. If GSK has done enough, I will rule that they have done enough and you will appeal me to Judge Rosenberg, and then she will decide.

MR. WATTS: In forecast, a very large army of people are going to spend a fortune going to London beginning July 18. I would like GSK's clinical trials in advance of that trip, in time to read the documents to take the depositions of the
science people we are scheduled to take beginning July 19. That is the ask.

THE COURT: Then file a motion, or file a PTO 32 request and they will respond to it and $I$ will rule on it. That is all I can do.

MR. WATTS: We will do it. Thank you, Judge.
MR. SACHSE: Just to respond on that, your Honor, if I may, first of all, I need to note that $I$ don't think the jury is here. I feel like I just got a bit of a preview of Mr. Watts' closing argument.

Second of all, I have to correct the record because Mr. Watts is talking about two-thirds of the studies are missing; that is just not true. The studies that served as the basis for the approvals, they have all of those, they have all of the safety data relating to those studies.

What we are talking about here, yes, the number is big because we are talking about a 40-year history of this product. The number of entries on this MedTrack sheet that we still haven't been able to locate is a large number, but the majority -- when you add in the studies we have already produced here, the majority of them are in the Plaintiffs' hands. They already have the stuff that really matters here. THE COURT: Again, if somebody tees it up and $I$ have a hearing, everybody will get to present their evidence, not their arguments, their evidence as to what they have, what they
don't have, and what is missing, and I will have to decide whether the Plaintiffs have been given what they are entitled to or not.

At this point, no one has asked me to do that, but I am telling you, that is where this ultimately has to end. I don't think Mr. Sachse is going to wake up next week and say, oh, we found all 457, here they are. I don't think the Plaintiffs are going to wake up next week and go, you know what, we decided we have enough, we don't need anymore. I don't see the world ending that way in either direction.

So, this is coming to me eventually. I would like to acknowledge that and just encourage you to narrow it as quickly as you can and tee it up as fast as you can in a way that is meaningful to both sides.

MR. WATTS: 467, Judge, 61.2 percent gone.
THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Sachse told me it was 457 out of 762 , that is 465.

Obviously there are two that have disappeared into the ether that now we have to fight about, where are the other two, obviously the two most important studies in the entire case and, you know, they are somewhere. Okay.

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, I think it would be helpful to have a check-in in the next -- maybe two weeks from now and see where we are at in terms of the production.

While I hear what you are saying in terms of teeing up
a PTO 32, some interim deadlines and guidance I think would be helpful in getting this moving along. Mr. Sachse and I have been working through this, and we have been working well together in terms of trying to get this done.

At some point, you are correct, we are going to need to figure out what happened to these studies and why they are not available.

The product had been on the market up until 2019 globally for GSK, and typically companies don't destroy their clinical trial data while -- during the life cycle of the product, so it raises a lot of questions for us, your Honor. THE COURT: Clearly it does, and some of the response I hear from Mr. Sachse is, some of what you see there isn't what you think it is, it's not that we destroyed it, we actually never ran that test, but it looks like we did, or that notebook I dropped in the river, $I$ don't know.

I am not encouraging anyone to give me more work than I already have, so I don't want to suggest that. I do want to acknowledge, look, I see how hard the parties are working on this particular issue. I understand Mr. Sachse had some health issues that slowed things down a little bit.

I am not criticizing either side for -- I am never going to criticize the parties for working together to try to resolve an issue, but $I$ do think at some point we just need to bring this to closure.

I am happy to set another interim deadline. I think two weeks from today is July 6th. I am not going to ruin your July 4th weekend.

What is your pleasure, Ms. Finken? I will let you pick a day. We have usually been doing two weeks, but I'll give you whatever date you want. Mr. Watts will be working night and day over there in Belgium on the 4 th of July. Everyone else might want to quit early.

MR. WATTS: This is our first a 11:00 p.m. hearing on discovery matters, Judge.

THE COURT: And our last, I hope.

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, I think -- how does July 1st work, before the holiday weekend? It's a Thursday.

THE COURT: Works for me. July lst will be the hundred and thirty something anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

MR. SACHSE: July lst would be fine with me, your Honor.

THE COURT: Should we have a live hearing or do you want to just file a notice with me, Ms. Finken?

Let's set it for a live hearing. If you all have some Kumbaya and are very happy by then and really don't think there is anything $I$ need to be involved with, you can just file a written notice before that date and $I$ will take it down.

MS. FINKEN: Fair enough. Thank you.

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

THE COURT: Can I ask the BI people to come back for a second. There was one other issue that I thought I was clear on, but as I am thinking about it, maybe not.

Let me ask Ms. Luhana and Mr. Shortnacy if they could come back real quick. Thank you both.

Since I am going to have the GSK people back on July lst, does it make sense to have a check-in with you all as well on what progress has been made and if you still need the Court's involvement?

In the interim, if either side wants to bring a PTO 32 before we get to July 1st, you can certainly do that, or if you want an earlier hearing, you can ask for one through the special master. Ms. Finken makes a good suggestion that just keeping dates on the calendar helps.

So, does July 1st work for you, Mr. Shortnacy?
MR. SHORTNACY: Sure, your Honor, I appreciate that.
THE COURT: Ms. Luhana?
MS. LUHANA: Same here, Judge.
THE COURT: Great. Mr. Watts, you're here. July 1st it is for both.

The other thing, and I realize this is not on the agenda here, but the special master has asked me a couple of procedural questions about the topic of depositions and cancellation of depositions and things like that.

I don't want to open a hornet's nest here by getting
into a long discussion other than to say the following: A party sets a deposition, a party can cancel their deposition.

Now, the timing of that and whether the timing of a particular cancellation causes prejudice to the other side in a way that the other side is entitled to a remedy is a separate question. But $I$ don't think $I$ have ever heard of a Court ordering someone to take a deposition when they said they didn't want to take it.

Again, whether there is a remedy in the future for the fact that someone canceled the deposition, particularly in a case like this with very tight deadlines, is an issue $I$ will take up on an individualized basis if it happens. I understand there has been some debate back and forth among the parties about whether a party can cancel a deposition somewhere along in the process after setting it, and my view is they can.

If that gives you all guidance as you go forward, sobeit, again, without prejudice to anybody seeking a remedy that may result from that.

The other thing I wanted to clarify with the BI people, it occurred to me in listening to you that there is a little bit of tell us what you want, we will tell us what we have. It is unclear kind of who goes first.

In the interest of breaking that stalemate, $I$ am going to direct the Plaintiffs to, in the first instance, identify for the Defendant with some greater detail exactly what it is
you want, what is the data that you believe they have and that you want, in as detailed a fashion as you can.

Then it will be the burden on BI to then say either we don't have it, we do have it and we will give it to you, or we do have it, but we don't think we should give you all of it, some of it, none of it, whatever.

I think just to break the stalemate $I$ will direct the Plaintiffs to go first.

Now, obviously, BI has a -- I don't know if it's an ethical obligation, but a professional obligation that if they don't hit the exact button that you know exactly what they are asking for, and you have it, but they haven't said the magic words, I would expect BI to say, it seems to me what you are really asking for is this, and we do have that. We are still not going to give it to you, but we concede that we have it. That is how $I$ would expect the dialogue to go.

Mr. Shortnacy.
MR. SHORTNACY: A fair point, your Honor, well taken, and I agree.

THE COURT: Mr. Watts, Ms. Luhana, any issues?
MR. WATTS: Judge, $I$ think we will be able to give them a request of what we want after the depositions tomorrow are completed.

THE COURT: Great. Let me be clear, that is without prejudice to, obviously, as you go along, if you have specific
information -- I am not limiting the Plaintiffs to one request and then you are stuck with all you get is what you asked for in the first cycle. This is an iterative process, I understand that, but somebody has to go first. That doesn't mean they don't get to go again.

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, can I say one thing?
THE COURT: Hold on. I need to call on you so
Mrs. Stipes keeps -- Ms. Finken. Go ahead.
MS. FINKEN: I'm sorry, Ms. Stipes. Tracy Finken on behalf of Plaintiffs.

One of the problems we have had with BI, and this particular issue, and $I$ have been watching it unfold now for three months, is that we have been requesting information about how the data is maintained, how long it is retained, and simple questions like that that would allow us to tailor our requests in terms of this electronic data.

That is something that we have been unable to get clear answers on from Mr. Shortnacy. We have asked multiple, multiple times and I am hoping, with the guidance that your Honor gave the parties today, that we will actually be able to get substantive accurate answers and responses to the questions we have been posing for quite some time, and then we can maybe move the ball forward.

THE COURT: Again, if the Plaintiffs go first and they say this is the category of data that we want, obviously, the
first response will be either we have it or we don't, and if we have it, it is either in electronic format or it is not. That would be the logical response that $I$ assume you will get. Nobody is prejudiced by giving that answer.

The next level of questioning is where it gets tougher, right? Will you give it to us? How much will you give us? I understand that, and that is where the parties -that is why you all get paid the big money, to have that debate and that discussion and work through those issues if you can. If you can't, that is why $I$ get paid a lot less money to then tell you what to do.

Mr. Watts.
MR. WATTS: Judge, just on your first comment about canceling depositions, $I$ can tell you that our special master, Jaime Dodge, has been on me like a cheap suit, and we had a Plaintiffs' deposition committee call today, we'll have another one Friday.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. WATTS: My goal, at the strong request from the special master, is to give you and the Court an updated deposition schedule by the end of the month. That is not a wish list of when depositions are going to happen, it is going to be a list of depositions that we have met and conferred and scheduled, so that when we see yourself and Judge Rosenberg by the end of the month, the deposition schedule between now and

September, you will know that it is well up to date, not canceled, and hard dates.

THE COURT: No problem. My comments were not meant to criticize either side. I understood from the special master there had been maybe one or more occasions where the Plaintiff wanted to take down a deposition closer in time to when the deposition was to occur and there was some discussion among the parties about whether that was proper or not.

The special master suggested it might help the parties if $I$ gave a little bit of guidance on that, but that is not in any way meant to suggest that either side is acting improperly or that -- there is all kinds of reasons why depositions may have to be rescheduled at the last minute. It is probably going to recur when the Defendants are taking the Plaintiffs' side depositions.

That's why I am being very neutral here. I truly am not casting aspersions on anybody.

MS. LUHANA: Judge, I wanted to raise one point, if I may.

THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Luhana, of course.
MS. LUHANA: Previously, when I had raised the outstanding questions, some of the outstanding questions we had to Mr. Shortnacy were specifically the two databases and the data that is stored in the databases. That is what $I$ was looking to have answers to, and then we could narrow the funnel
and say we don't want any of this, but this is what would be helpful.

I believe it is easy on their end to inform us as to what data is housed in the databases because they only input a certain amount of data into Empower and into Limbs, and that is what we're looking for and that will guide and frame the discussion for us.

THE COURT: I hear you, but I am going to stick with my order, which is that you have to go first. You are the Plaintiff, you brought the lawsuit, you have a better idea of what you want. It is not a question of tell us everything you have, and then we will go shopping in your records. It's, we are the Plaintiff, this is our theory of the case, this is the evidence we want. Tell us if you have that evidence or not.

That is how I want this to proceed.
MS. LUHANA: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: No, thank you. I shudder to ask this, anything else needs to come before the Court today? Mr. Sachse?

MR. SACHSE: Nothing for GSK, your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: Ms. Finken?
MS. FINKEN: I don't believe so, your Honor.
THE COURT: I am doing this because this is the order you are in on the screen. Mr. Shortnacy?

MR. SHORTNACY: No, your Honor, not for BI.

Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter

THE COURT: Ms. Finken, I am going to determine that you out rank Mr. Watts and Ms. Luhana, so your response is binding on all Plaintiffs.

I will excuse the parties. Thank you everybody, have a good week.

MS. FINKEN: Thank you, your Honor.
(Thereupon, the hearing was concluded.)

*     *         * 
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|  | 2000's [1] 42/5 | 888-480-1113 [1] 1/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. SACHSE: [6] 3/16 33/16 | $\begin{array}{lll}2003[1] & 34 / 7 \\ 2010[1] & 6 / 15\end{array}$ | 9 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}38 / 1 & 44 / 6 & 47 / 16 \\ \text { MR }\end{array}$ | 2014 [1] 6/15 | 90 [3] 18/10 30/5 43/10 |
| MR. SHORTNACY: [21] 3/13 <br> $\begin{array}{llllll}7 / 23 & 12 / 22 & 13 / 5 & 13 / 14 & 15 / 4\end{array}$ | 2016 [1] 5/4 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 9 & 15 / 20 & 16 / 7 & 16 / 23 & 17 / 9\end{array}$ | 2017 [3] 4/25 7/3 7/4 | A |
| $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 13 & 18 / 17 & 18 / 25 & 19 / 21\end{array}$ | 2019 [2] 27/16 46/8 | a value [1] 19/18 |
| 22/25 31/10 32/22 48/15 | 2020's [1] 41/24 | a.m [1] 40/1 |
| 50/17 54/24 | 2021 [2] 1/5 55/12 | ability [1] 30/7 |
| MR. WATTS: [20] 3/10 4/7 | $\begin{array}{lcc} 21 & {[1]} & 1 / 5 \\ 210-447-0500 \end{array}$ | able [8] 14/16 34/9 35/22 <br> 39/1 39/3 44/19 50/21 51/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}6 / 12 & 20 / 18 & 22 / 6 & 23 / 18 & 25 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 215-735-1130 & {[1]} & 1 / 13 \end{array}$ | about [56] |
| 26/19 $30 / 2$ 31/3 38/6 40/11 | $\begin{array}{lll} 215-735-1130 & {[1]} & 1 / 13 \\ 215-994-4000 & {[1]} & 1 / 23 \end{array}$ | about 50 [1] 4/19 |
| 40/15 $43 / 21$ | 22 [1] 32/2 [1] | about what [1] 24/17 |
| 50/20 52/12 52/18 <br> MS FINKEN: [11] $3 / 8 \quad 38 / 9$ | 24 [1] 55/12 | above [1] 55/10 |
| $38 / 12 \quad 40 / 14 \quad 45 / 21 \quad 47 / 11$ | 26 [1] 33/11 | abstract [1] 31/25 |
| 47/24 51/5 51/8 54/21 55/5 | 262 [1] 41/6 | acceptable [2] 18/7 18/8 |
| MS. LUHANA: [12] 3/7 7/15 | 270,000 [1] 12/16 | accomplish [1] 37/1 |
| 10/11 10/14 $27 / 4$ 27/7 32/13 | 272 [1] 38/22 | accomplished [1] 27/1 |
| 32/21 48/17 53/17 53/20 | 2924 [1] 3/2 | according [2] 27/9 38/23 |
|  | 2929 [1] 1/22 | account [1] 29/23 |
| THE COURT: [63] | 3 | accurate [1] 51/21 |
| \$ | 30 [7] 5/15 11/12 12/21 30/9 | acknowledge [2] 45/12 46/19 |
| \$40 [1] 41/16 | $37 / 17$ 41/16 43/7 $30309[1] ~ 2 / 2$ | acquisition [1] 6/20 across [2] 22/14 24/2 |
| \$40 billion [1] 41/16 | $32 \text { [6] } 24 / 6 \text { 42/20 } 42 / 24 \quad 44 / 3$ | $\text { act [1] } 12 / 13$ |
| ' | 46/1 48/10 | acting [2] 24/15 53/11 |
| '80's [1] 42/4 | 3:00 [1] 40/19 | actual [1] 36/22 |
| '90's [1] 42/5 | 4 | $\begin{array}{rrrr}\text { actually } \\ 27 / 11 & 39 / 10 & 40 / 15 & 46 / 15\end{array}$ |
|  | 40 [1] 5/15 | 51/20 |
| . 1 [1] 17/21 | 40-year [1] 44/17 | ad [2] 5/23 38/20 |
| . 5 [1] $17 / 21$ | 4000 [1] 1/23 | add [2] 7/14 44/20 |
| / | 450 [1] 35/16 | addition [1] 27/14 |
| /s [1] 55/13 | 457 [7] 34/9 35/16 37/11 | additional [3] 12/16 35/13 |
| 0 | 4600 [1] 2/3 | address [3] 4/15 15/22 19/9 |
| 0500 [1] 1/19 | 465 [1] 45/17 | admit [1] 25/20 |
| 1 | 483 [1] 27/14 | adverse [5] 17/2 $33 / 23 \quad 33 / 24$ |
| 100 [1] 1/18 | 4th [2] 47/3 47/7 | 37/15 37/19 |
| 10016 [1] 1/15 | 5 | afield [1] 56 |
| 1113 [1] 1/16 | 50 [2] 4/19 5/23 | $\begin{array}{lllllllll}\text { 12/17 } & 24 / 20 & 28 / 1 & 49 / 15 & 50 / 22\end{array}$ |
|  | 500 [1] 33/22 | afternoon [7] 3/3 3/10 $3 / 12$ |
| 11:00 [1] 47/9 | 6 | 3/15 3/16 3/18 3/19 |
| 12th [1] 1/15 | 600 [1] 1/15 | $25 / 21 \quad 28 / 2 \quad 29 / 2 \quad 29 / 11 \quad 30 / 3$ |
| 130 [1] 1/12 | $61.2 \text { [1] } 45 / 15$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} 30 / 21 & 31 / 1 & 32 / 5 & 35 / 5 & 35 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| 13th [1] 11/17 16 [1] $40 / 18$ | 63 [1] 10/15 | 44/23 49/9 49/17 51/5 51/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} 16[1] & 40 / 18 \\ 1600[2] \quad 1 / 12 & 2 / 2 \end{array}$ | 65 [2] 18/13 18/17 | against [1] 12/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}16 \text { th [2] } & 30 / 7 & 30 / 12\end{array}$ | 65 or [1] 18/21 | agenda [1] 48/22 |
| 18 [1] 43/23 | 6th [1] 47/2 | ago [1] 40/18 |
| 18th [1] 1/12 | 7 | agree [5] 9/21 25/10 26/: |
| 19 [1] 44/1 | 760 [1] 34/7 | agrees [2] 24/25 24/25 |
| 19103 [1] 1/12 | 762 [2] $34 / 9$ 45/17 | ahead [2] 13/5 51/8 |
| 19104 [1] 1/23 | $764 \text { [1] } 38 / 21$ | $\text { ain't [2] } 42 / 2243 / 9$ |
| 1993 [1] $32 / 2$ | $\text { 76ers [1] } 38 / 8$ | albeit [1] 40/2 |
|  | $772.467 .2337 \text { [1] } 2 / 6$ | all [73] |
| 48/7 48/11 48/15 48/19 | 78257 [1] 1/19 | allay [1] 29/3 |
| 2 | 8 | allocation [1] 5/25 |
| 2 percent [1] 11/18 $20-$ md-02924-ROSENBERG [1] $1 / 3$ | 80 $[1]$ $18 / 9$   <br> 85 [1] $18 / 13$   <br> 85 percent $[2]$ $18 / 17$ $18 / 21$ | ```allow [3] 5/22 11/20 51/15 allowed [1] 33/9 along [5] 23/17 33/8 46/2 49/14 50/25``` |



| B | claim [2] 21/13 22 | nt [1] 23/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brussels [1] 4/9 | clarify [2] 20/17 49/19 | confirmed [1] 26 |
| bulk [1] 25/6 | clarity [1] 27/1 <br> clear [8] 13/10 28/4 29/18 |  |
| burden [12] 5/20 5/21 6/4 | 29/21 38/15 48/2 50/24 51/18 | contain [1] 13/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 21 / 16 & 22 / 15 & 30 / 13 & 50 / 3\end{array}$ | clearly [4] 13/23 22/2 $26 / 7$ | content [1] 11/5 |
| burdens [3] 4/16 9/11 15/17 | 46 | continue [1] 41/20 |
| burdensome [5] 9/19 15/11 | clinical [19] 33/4 33/2 33/25 37/16 38/19 38/21 | continued [1] 11/22 <br> continuing [3] 29/6 34 |
| 21/20 22/18 22/21 | $39 / 15 \text { 39/19 } 40 / 140 / 7 \text { 40/22 }$ | $36 / 15$ |
| business [1] 13/17 | 41/3 41/7 41/14 41/17 41/23 | conventions [1] 36/7 |
| button [1] 50/11 by study [1] $39 / 21$ | 42/3 43/24 46/10 | conversation [13] 14/11 |
| by study [1] 39/21 | clips [1] 8/18 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 20/14 } & 20 / 15 & 23 / 2 & 23 / 18 & 26 / 9\end{array}$ |
| C | close [3] 11/16 33/14 35/2 | 26/13 26/14 30/16 30/20 31/1 |
| cabining [1] 16/3 | closed [1] closely [1] $35 / 2$ | 31/4 33/5 <br> conversations [6] 24/19 |
| calendar [1] 48/14 | closely [1] closer [1] 53/6 | $\begin{array}{cccc}\text { conversations [6] } & 24 / 19 & \\ 28 / 12 & 38 / 14 & 38 / 16 & 38 / 25 \\ 40 / 3\end{array}$ |
| ```call [7] 3/1 10/9 16/13 38/5 40/20 51/7 52/16``` | closing [1] 44/10 | converting [1] 31/5 |
| called [3] 6/8 10/18 37/7 | closure [1] 46/25 | cooperative [1] 43/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { can [64] } \\ \text { can't [17] } & 14 / 21 & 16 / 21 & 19 / 8\end{array}$ | co [1] 40/4 <br> co-counsel [1] 40/ | copies [1] 19/13 <br> copy [2] 6/10 16/15 |
| can't [17] 14/21 16/21 19/8 | coding [1] 8/8 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { correct [15] } & 10 / 13 & 13 / 7 & 15 / 4\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 25 & 24 / 18 & 24 / 20 & 25 / 6 & 26 / 9 \\ 29 / 8 & 29 / 14 & 30 / 17 & 30 / 18 & 34 / 12\end{array}$ | colleague [1] 34/15 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}15 / 5 & 16 / 24 & 18 / 11 & 18 / 18 & 18 / 25\end{array}$ |
| $9 / 8 \text { 29/14 30/17 30/18 34/12 }$ $6 / 10 \quad 41 / 23 \quad 43 / 11 \quad 52 / 10$ | colleagues [1] 38/16 | 19/1 19/20 19/22 23/1 44/11 |
| cancel [2] 49/2 49/ | come [8] 7/10 14/9 32/10 | 46/5 55/9 |
| canceled [6] 35/24 40/7 | 39/22 42/18 48/1 48/5 54/18 | correctly [3] 13/17 14/2 |
| 40/22 40/25 49/10 53/2 | comes [4] 17/16 24/7 29/18 | 22/25 |
| canceling [1] 52/14 | $33 /$ | cost [1] 8/ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { cancellation [2] } & 48 / 24 & 49 / 4\end{array}$ | coming [4] 29/12 $33 / 25$ 37/19 | costs [1] 28/10 |
| cancer [2] 33/24 37/5 | comment [3] 30/3 41/25 52/13 | $\begin{array}{\|cllll} \text { could }[17] & 4 / 3 & 6 / 3 & 7 / 9 & 7 / 4 \\ 10 / 1 & 13 / 13 & 16 / 2 & 17 / 2 & 20 / 7 \end{array}$ |
| candidly [3] 12/24 25/5 43/4 | comments [1] 53/3 | $\begin{array}{llllll}1 / 1 & 27 / 22 & 35 / 22 & 39 / 8 & 39 / 24\end{array}$ |
| care [1] 12/24 | committee [1] 52/16 | 40/12 48/4 53/25 |
| $\text { case }[10] \quad 1 / 3 \quad 3 / 1$ | common [2] 5/25 25/1 | couldn't [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 41 / 13 & 41 / 17 & 43 / 16 & 45 / 20\end{array}$ | communicated [4] 7/3 22/1 | counsel [3] 3/6 3/7 40/4 |
| 49/11 54/13 | 23/22 24/2 | count [1] 34/8 |
| casting [1] 53/17 | communicates [2] 5/8 21/ | counter [1] 13/20 |
| category [1] | communicating [1] 5/2 | country [1] |
| causes [1] 49/4 | communication [1] 5/ | couple [2] 3/3 48/22 |
| [1] 1/22 | companies [1] 46/9 | course [7] 13/10 14/13 27/7 |
| certain [4] 13/21 14/4 | comparator [1] 37/8 | $34 / 5$ 36/6 37/2 53/20 |
| 54/5 [4] 13/21 14/4 | compared [1] 35/6 | COURT [20] 1/1 $2 / 5$ 4/15 $4 / 17$ |
| certainly [2] | comparing [2] 34/24 37/8 | 5/20 6/22 13/11 20/23 23/24 |
| certificate [1] 17/19 | compel [3] 33/12 40/13 40/14 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}24 / 6 & 25 / 5 & 28 / 1 & 28 / 10 & 29 / 23\end{array}$ |
| certify [1] 55/9 | compelled [1] 41/19 | 32/8 41/15 49/6 52/20 54/18 |
| cetera [1] 33/6 | complaining [1] 30/ | 55/14 |
| Chaffin [1] 1/14 | complete [3] 6/1 $8 / 9$ 34/2 | Court's [5] 20/19 26/23 28/3 |
| challenges [2] 3 | completed [2] 35/20 50/23 | 28/22 48/9 |
| allenging [1] | completely [1] 9/5 | criticism [1] 20/20 |
| llenging | compliant [1] 8/13 | criticize [4] 22/5 29/8 |
| cterization | complies [1] 17/22 | 46/23 53/4 |
| racterization | complying [2] 17/25 22/5 | criticizing [1] 46/22 |
|  | comprehensibility [1] 37/10 | cross [1] 39 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { check [2] } \\ \text { check-in [2] } & 45 / 23 & 48 / 7\end{array}$ | compression [1] 8/8 | crossed [1] 35/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { check-in [2] } & 45 / 23 \\ \text { chemists [1] } & 34 / 4\end{array}$ | computer [1] 42/7 | crux [1] 17/6 |
| Chemists [1] 34/4 <br> chromatogram [5] 8/24 15/3 | concede [1] 50/15 | cumulative [1] 21/23 |
| chromatogram [5] 8/24 19/12 20/5 28/18 | concern [3] 12/12 21/7 29/3 | cycle [2] 46/10 51/3 |
| chromatograms [10] 8/4 9/9 | $1]$ | D |
| 10/19 13/22 14/16 17/11 27/6 | concluded [2] 35/21 55/7 | data [57] |
| 27/8 27/16 28/16 Cira [1] 1/22 | conclusion [1] 24/20 | database [12] 4/13 10/22 |
| Cira [1] 1/22 <br> circle [6] 11/21 14/24 1 | conducted [1] 4/11 | 11/4 15/15 17/2 17/2 33/24 |
|  | confer [5] 11/3 26/20 26/22 | 37/15 37/19 39/16 39/17 42/6 |
| $\begin{array}{cc}15 / 24 & 15 / 25 \\ \text { circles [1] } & 15 / 3\end{array}$ | 27/25 31/8 | databases [8] 10/18 11/4 |
| Circles [1] 15/3 | conference [3] 1/8 3/3 33/2 | 11/13 12/11 32/16 53/23 |
| circuit [1] 7/19 | conferral [1] 24/21 | 53/24 54/4 |
| cited [1] 5/21 | conferred [2] 11/2 52/23 | date [6] 7/17 38/22 47/6 |
| City [3] 5/5 30/7 30/12 | confers [1] 11/11 | $47 / 24 \quad 53 / 1 \quad 55 / 12$ |


| D | disclosures [1] 1 | drug [1] 41/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| dates [2] 48/14 53/2 | disconnect [1] 14/5 <br> discovery [6] 3/4 22/6 22 | duplicative [3] 14/17 15/8 19/13 |
| day [3] $38 / 20$ 47/5 $47 / 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { discovery } \\ & 28 / 631 / 20 \quad 47 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | duration [1] 39/7 |
| days [3] 30/5 30/9 43/10 deadline [1] 47/1 | discretion [1] 41/18 | during [4] 11/10 39/10 39/18 |
| deadlines [2] 46/1 49/11 | discuss [2] 11/4 12 | 46 |
| deal [3] 12/25 20/10 31/6 | discussion [10] | E |
| debate [3] 25/11 $49 / 13$ 52/8 | $52 / 9 \quad 53 / 7 \quad 54 / 7$ | each [3] 11/25 24/8 25 |
| $\begin{array}{llrl}\text { Dechert [2] } & 1 / 21 & 3 / 17 \\ \text { decide [2] } & 43 / 21 & 45 / 1\end{array}$ | discussions [2] 12/14 14/5 | $\text { earlier [2] } 34 / 15 \text { 48/ }$ |
| $\begin{array}{lrr}\text { decide [2] } & 43 / 21 & 45 / 1 \\ \text { decided [2] } & 12 / 3 & 45 / 9\end{array}$ | dispute [1] 4/10 | early [1] 47 |
| decided [2] 12/3 45/9 decision [1] 13/11 | disputes [1] 31/22 | earthquake [1] |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { decision [1] } \\ \text { deep [1] } & 39 / 9 \end{array}$ | distill [1] 4/3 | easier [5] 3/22 9/13 9/23 |
| Defendant [4] 5/7 22/5 28/22 | DISTRICT [2] 1/1 | 20/10 31/6 |
| 49/25 | dive [1] 39/9 | Eastern [1] |
| DEFENDANTS [5] 1/21 3/5 28/8 | DIVISION [1] 1/2 | easy [3] |
| 28/24 53/14 | do [49] 6/2 7/20 11/13 12/4 | effect [3] 6/16 6/20 |
| defer [1] 38/7 | 15/10 16/2 $16 / 7$ 19/24 $20 / 4$ | effectively [2] |
| deny [1] 24/1 | $21 / 8$ $21 / 10$ $21 / 24$ $23 / 8$ <br> $15 / 5$    | efficacy [2] 37/7 40 |
| denying [2] 24/14 24/24 | 24/15 25/13 25/14 25/17 | effort [2] 33/11 |
| depending [2] 14/4 19/2 | 9/19 32/7 32/10 32/19 33 | ing [1] 37/23 |
| depends [2] 14/1 14/1 | $35 / 17 \quad 36 / 15 \quad 40 / 17$ 41/18 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { either [10] } & 10 / 9 & 29 / 24 & 45 / 10\end{array}$ |
| depo [2] 25/1 40/14 | 1/23 $42 / 17$ 42/23 $42 / 24$ | 46/22 48/10 50/3 52/1 52/2 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { deposition } & \text { [23] } & 6 / 14 & 6 / 17 \\ 6 / 19 & 6 / 23 & 20 / 24 & 21 / 3 \\ 22 / 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}43 / 11 & 43 / 13 & 44 / 5 & 44 / 6 & 45 / 4\end{array}$ | 53/4 53/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}6 / 19 & 6 / 23 & 20 / 24 & 21 / 3 & 22 / 10 \\ 23 / 20 & 23 / 22 & 23 / 24 ~ 26 / 21\end{array}$ | 46/18 $46 / 24 \quad 47 / 19$ 48/11 $50 / 4$ | electronic [48] 4/1 4/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}23 / 20 & 23 / 22 & 23 / 24 \\ 37 / 17 & 40 / 20 & 49 / 2\end{array}$ | 50/5 50/14 52/11 | 4/12 $4 / 24$ 5/8 5/9 5/18 $5 / 19$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 17 & 40 / 20 & 49 / 2 & 49 / 2 & 49 / 7 \\ 49 / 10 & 49 / 14 & 52 / 16 & 52 / 21\end{array}$ | document [2] 9/13 36/22 | 6/11 6/12 6/12 7/4 7/21 7/22 |
| 49/10 49/14 52/16 52/21 $52 / 25 \quad 53 / 6 \quad 53 / 7$ | documentation [1] 36/ | 7/23 11/3 11/7 12/8 12/11 |
| depositions | documents [21] 4/20 5/16 | 12/14 13/14 13/25 14/21 15/8 |
| 48/24 50/22 52/14 52/22 | 5/23 6/25 7/8 7/21 8/16 10/4 | 16/1 16/6 16/10 16/17 16/18 |
| 52/23 53/13 53/15 | 10/8 10/18 22/4 22/4 22/8 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}16 / 23 & 17 / 1 & 17 / 15 & 19 / 12 & 19 / 17\end{array}$ |
| designee [1] 38/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 14 & 25 / 17 & 29 / 19 & 30 / 8 & 35 / 7\end{array}$ | 20/5 24/11 24/12 25/6 25/25 |
| destroy [1] 46 | 5/11 36/22 43/25 | 26/3 26/5 27/2 30/8 30/22 |
| destroyed [1] 46/14 | Dodge [1] 52/15 | 31/6 32/15 51/16 52/2 |
| detail [2] 18/24 49/ | $\text { [9] } 14 / 22 \text { 15 }$ $15 \text { 36/11 46/12 }$ | electronic production [1] 12/8 |
| detailed [9] 18/24 19/16 | $48 / 15$ | electronically [27] 4/12 5/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 28 / 12 & 28 / 21 & 31 / 24 & 32 / 3 & 32 / 7 \\ 32 / 8 \quad 50 / 2 \end{array}$ | doesn't [5] 15/16 18/9 20/12 | 7/9 9/19 9/20 9/22 9/23 9/25 |
| details [1] | 33/6 51/4 | $\begin{array}{llll}10 / 1 & 10 / 2 & 10 / 6 & 13 / 2314 / 3\end{array}$ |
| determine [1] 55/1 | doing [11] 12/6 15/17 25/22 | 14/17 15/2 21/5 21/8 21/10 |
| determining [1] 39/25 | 30/1 30/1 34/22 34/23 35/4 | 21/15 22/12 $22 / 14$ 24/16 25/1 |
| diagram [1] 14/24 | [1/5 54/23 |  |
| dialogue [2] 37/25 50/16 | Domain [1] $1 / 18$ <br> don't [52]  <br> $5 / 11$ $8 / 20$ | 19/20 28/20 36/14 37/20 39/8 |
| did [4] 11/22 23/12 $38 / 18$ | $\begin{array}{rlllll}\text { don } \\ 9 / 14 & 9 / 23 & 10 / 5 & 12 / 6 & 12 / 24\end{array}$ | 47/8 54/18 |
| 46/15 | 14/6 16/21 20/14 20/20 21/13 | elude [1] 13/8 |
| $\begin{array}{rllll} \text { didn't } & {[7]} & 7 / 12 & 12 / 1 & 13 \\ 29 / 12 & 39 / 13 & 40 / 17 & 49 / 8 \end{array}$ | 21/22 22/16 22/17 22/24 23/5 | emailing [1] 3 |
| difference [1] 21/18 | $\begin{array}{llllll}23 / 11 & 26 / 3 & 27 / 17 & 28 / 7 & 30 / 21\end{array}$ | emails [1] 21/12 |
| different [12] 8/7 9/7 13/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 1 & 32 / 18 & 33 / 4 & 34 / 11 & 36 / 13\end{array}$ | employee [1] 42/2 |
|  | $36 / 21$ 41/13 42/17 43/10 44/8 | Empower [4] 10/19 11/14 |
| 18/5 18/24 26/6 38/5 | 45/1 $45 / 6$ 45/7 45/9 45/10 | 14/15 54/5 |
| difficult [4] 14/11 19/2 | 46/9 46/16 46/18 47/22 48/25 | encourage [2] 27/4 45/12 |
| 22/23 23/6 | 49/6 50/4 50/5 50/9 50/11 | encouraging [1] |
| dig [1] 43/4 | 51/5 52/1 54/1 54/22 | end [10] 5/4 7/1 10/17 10/24 |
| digging [2] 36/11 42/16 | don't hear [1] 22/16 | 11/9 26/14 45/5 52/21 52/25 |
| digitize [1] 8/12 | done [12] 8/20 9/12 21/11 | 54/3 |
| digitized [1] 35/11 | 27/15 $31 / 18$ 33/10 $34 / 12$ 37/3 | ending [1] 45/10 |
| direct [2] 49/24 50/7 | 42/22 43/19 43/20 46/4 | engage [1] 23/15 |
| direction [1] 45/10 | double [1] 34/22 | English [1] 41/23 |
| directly [1] 42/12 | down [10] 4/4 24/17 29/1 | enough [7] 23/10 41 |
| disagree [1] 7/20 | $\begin{array}{llllllllllll} \\ 29 / 18 & 36 / 17 & 39 / 24 & 40 / 15\end{array}$ | 43/19 43/20 45/9 47/25 |
| disagreement [3] 3/24 3/25 | 46/21 47/24 53/6 | entire [2] 38/10 45/20 |
| 4/2 | drawing [1] 36/16 | titled [7] 25/24 28/5 28/8 |
| disagrees [1] 28/7 | drill [1] 21/20 | 42/8 $43 / 18$ 45/2 49/5 |
| disappeared [1] 45/18 | Drive [1] 1/18 | entries [8] 34/8 34/9 34/2 |
| disclosed [2] 10/25 11/1 | dropped [1] 46/16 drown [1] 21/20 | entry [2] 36/4 36/9 |


| E | faith [3] 12/13 14/12 24/15 | forward [5] 29/22 29/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| envelopes [1] 8/18 | far [3] 15/4 36/25 39/24 <br> fashion [2] 27/21 50/2 | 43/16 49/16 51/23 <br> found [1] 45/7 |
| equities [1] 28/3 | ```fashion [2] 27/21 50/2 fast [2] 43/6 45/13``` | found [1] $45 / 7$ <br> frame [1] $54 / 6$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccc}\text { ESI [4] } \\ \text { 11/12 }\end{array} \quad 8 / 13 \quad 10 / 25 \quad 11 / 2$ | FDA [2] 27/15 27/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { framed [3] } & 13 / 16 & 14 / 2 & 14 / 1\end{array}$ |
| esophageal [1] 36/13 | Federal [2] 4/18 55/1 | France [3] 5/6 22/11 23 |
| ESQ [5] 1/10 1/14 1/17 1/21 | feel [2] 13/1 44/9 | frankly [2] 36/8 36/1 |
| 2/1 | feels [1] 42/22 | free [2] 3/21 13 |
| essential [1] 27/13 | few [2] 20/7 35/13 | Friday [10] 6/14 20/25 21 |
| et [1] 33/6 | fields [1] 39/6 | 23/20 24/1 $24 / 3$ 25/19 26 |
| ether [1] 45/19 | ```fight [2] 40/13 45/19 figure [1] 46/6``` | $\begin{aligned} & 31 / 752 / 17 \\ & \text { friends [1] } 5 / 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| ethical [2] 43/15 50/10 | file [9] $24 / 5$ 26/15 26/16 | fruitful [1] 32/17 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { European [1] } & 41 / 22 \\ \text { evaluate [1] } & 23 / 6\end{array}$ | 34/2 42/23 44/3 44/3 47/20 | fruitless [1] 23/1 |
| luate [1] luating [1] | 47/23 | Ft [1] $2 / 6$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { evaluating [1] } \\ \text { even [6] } 11 / 16 & 26 / 17 & 2\end{array}$ | filed [1] 3/4 | full [4] 27/9 27/10 27/11 |
| 33/11 34/23 37/9 | files [2] 8/15 42/7 | 38/20 |
| event [1] 37/19 | find [12] 21/20 22/22 27 | full-day [1] 38/20 |
| events [5] 13/8 17/2 $33 / 23$ | 34/9 $34 / 12$ 35/13 $35 / 22$ 36/2 | fully [1] 19/24 |
| 33/24 37/15 | 36/22 39/1 41/20 41/21 | fulsome [1] 21/ |
| eventually [1] 45/11 | fine [1] 47/17 | funnel [1] 53/25 |
| ever [4] 21/19 23/12 $36 / 21$ | FINKEN [21] 1/10 3/9 | further [2] 20/13 27/22 |
| 49/6 [4] 21/19 23/12 36/21 | 21/12 25/14 32/25 33/2 34/15 | future [1] |
| everybody [2] 44/24 55/4 |  | G |
| everyone [3] 9/21 43/14 47/8 | 51/9 54/21 55/1 | GA [1] 2/2 |
| everything [4] 4/4 12/4 | firm [1] 6/1 | games [1] 21/15 |
| 24/12 54/11 | first [30] 3/20 4/6 5/9 7/3 | gave [3] 11/24 51/20 53 |
| evidence [5] 31/7 $44 / 24$ | 7/14 7/25 10/24 11/9 12/13 | general [1] 9/21 |
| $44 / 25 ~ 54 / 14 ~ 54 / 14$ evidentiary [1] $24 / 16$ | 12/15 14/21 19/9 19/10 $21 / 24$ | generalizing [1] 19/23 |
| evidentiary [1] 24/16 exact [1] 50/11 | 23/4 25/20 29/10 $35 / 6 \quad 38 / 6$ | generous [1] 43/7 |
| exact [1] 50/11 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}44 / 8 & 47 / 9 & 49 / 22 & 49 / 24 & 50 / 8\end{array}$ | genesis [1] 10/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { exactly [9] } & 11 / 13 & 16 / 8 & 23 / 5\end{array}$ | 51/3 51/4 51/24 52/1 52/13 | GERD [1] 36/13 |
| 24/18 25/8 28/15 32/11 49/25 | 54/9 | Germany [6] 4/25 5/3 6/18 |
| 50/11 [4] 13/22 17/1 | five [1] | 21/5 22/10 23/220/l |
| example [4] 13/22 17/1 17/19 | FL [2] 1/5 | germinate [1] 20 |
| $19 / 12$ examples [1] $22 / 19$ | flip [3] 30/7 30/15 43/1 | get [43] 4/3 6/4 7/18 9/15 |
| examples [1] 22/19 Except [1] $22 / 7$ | Floor [1] 1/15 | 9/22 9/23 10/1 11/10 12/ |
| Except [1] $22 / 7$  <br> excuse [3] $32 / 13$ $32 / 20$ | FLORIDA [1] 1/1 | 12/21 18/6 19/2 24/18 25/6 |
| excuse [3] $32 / 13$ 32/20 executive [1] 6/16 | flowing [1] 18/3 | 25/19 26/1 26/22 26/23 27/11 |
| $\text { exist [12] } 10 / 5 \text { 13/12 } 14 / 22$ | focus [2] 10/11 28/23 | 28/5 29/9 29/11 29/11 29/14 |
| $16 / 7$ $16 / 15$ $18 / 23$ $24 / 14$ <br> $18 / 16$    | focused [3] 34/6 37/2 $37 / 7$ | 30/15 30/18 30/19 33/7 36/10 |
| 24/25 24/25 25/1 33/6 | focusing [1] 35/5 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}43 / 2 & 43 / 6 & 43 / 9 & 43 / 19 & 44 / 24\end{array}$ |
| exists [14] 9/18 9/25 | fold [1] 12/12 | 46/4 48/11 51/2 51/5 51/17 |
| 19/8 19/14 $19 / 17$ 21/6 24 | folders [1] 8/14 | 51/21 52/3 52/8 52/10 |
| 25/5 26/3 26/4 27/2 33/6 | folks [2] 42/25 43/2 | get is [1] 51/2 |
| 33/11 | follow [1] 9/14 | gets [5] 22/11 |
| expect [3] | following [2] 40/17 49/1 | 43/5 52/5 |
| expectation [1] 28/23 | forecast [1] 43/22 | getting [12] 9/4 9/8 9/1 |
| expedite [1] 32/19 | foregoing [1] 55/9 | 10/1 10/6 10/7 10/10 17/1 |
| expensive [1] 28/9 | forget [1] 33/1 | 17/24 29/10 46/2 48/25 |
| experienced [1] 3 | form [9] 8/17 10/16 10/22 | Gettysburg [1] 47/16 |
| explain [3] 8/2 8/15 $40 /$ | /20 13/21 14/21 17/13 | ginormous [1] 39/17 |
| explained [2] 13/15 13/24 | 17/15 17/25 | give [23] 7/16 12/1 |
| explanation [4] 41/2 41/4 | formal [1] 32/18 | 24/12 25/7 26/14 26/16 29/13 |
| $42 / 2 \quad 42 / 4$ | format [36] 4/1 4/21 4/24 | $30 / 22$ 30/24 31/10 37/22 |
| explore [1] 20/13 | 5/8 5/9 5/18 5/19 6/12 7/5 | 37/23 40/16 46/17 47/6 50/4 |
| exposure [1] 39/7 | 7/22 7/22 7/23 9/3 11/4 13/9 | 50/5 50/15 50/21 52/6 52/7 |
| express [1] 14/9 | 13/14 16/6 16/10 16/15 16/23 | 52/20 |
| extension [1] 43 | 17/16 19/12 19/17 20/5 22/8 | given [7] 8/6 15/17 19/14 |
| eyes [1] 21/8 | 24/11 24/12 25/7 25/25 26/3 | 22/1 23/11 30/10 45/2 |
|  | 26/5 26/6 27/20 28/6 30/23 | gives [1] 49/16 |
| F | 2 | giving [3] 21/7 42/18 52/4 |
| fact [8] 9/8 12/15 24/24 | former [1] 41/ | Glaxo [1] 42/2 |
| 25/2 $29 / 5$ 34/15 $43 / 14$ 49/10 | forms [1] 8/6 | global [1] 6/16 |
| factual [1] 19/20 | forth [4] 25/2 26/13 27/4 | globally [1] 46/ |
| fair [3] 18/14 47/25 50/18 | fortune [1] 43/23 | $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { go [25] } & 7 / 13 & 13 / 5 & 20 / 16 \\ 21 / 20 & 22 / 22 & 25 / 2 & 25 / 12 \end{array}$ |


| G | 24/18 $28 / 25$ 30/19 32/11 | $8 / 23 \quad 12 / 23 \quad 13 / 6 \quad 13 / 713$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| go... [17] 27/4 28/18 30/1 | 41/21 46/19 53/2 | $14 / 2 \quad 16 / 25 \quad 19 / 22 \quad 23 / 8 \quad 23 / 11$ |
| 30/11 $36 / 10 \quad 43 / 5 \quad 45 / 8 \quad 49 / 16$ | Harvey [1] 40/14 | $\begin{array}{llll} 31 / 11 & 32 / 23 & 33 / 17 & 38 / 13 \\ 38 / 19 & 39 / 17 & 44 / 7 & 45 / 22 \end{array} 46 / 11$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}50 / 8 & 50 / 16 & 50 / 25 & 51 / 4 & 51 / 5\end{array}$ | 5/20 7/17 9/1 11/5 13/16 | $47 / 12 \quad 47 / 18 \quad 48 / 16 \quad 50 / 18 \quad 51 / 6$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{llll}13 / 23 & 14 / 5 & 14 / 15 & 14 / 18 \\ 17 / 12 / 8\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}51 / 20 & 54 / 20 & 54 / 22 & 54 / 25 & 55 / 6\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { goal [2] } & 26 / 25 & 52 / 19 \\ \text { God [1] } & 21 / 16 & \end{array}$ |  | HONORABLE [1] 1/8 |
| goes [3] 29/18 38/6 49/22 | 23/3 23/11 25/4 26/25 27/2 | hope [1] 47/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { going [45] } & 3 / 20 & 4 / 5 & 4 / 7 & 7 / 13\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}27 / 18 & 33 / 21 & 33 / 23 & 34 / 19\end{array}$ | hopefully [2] $12 / 20 \quad 32 / 16$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { 9/15 } & 11 / 15 & 12 / 3 & 12 / 4 & 12 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 20 & 39 / 18 & 43 / 3 & 43 / 4 & 43 / 16\end{array}$ | hoping [2] 39/3 51/19 |
| 12/20 13/2 19/25 20/1 20/3 | 43/19 $45 / 4 \quad 45 / 548 / 8 \quad 48 /$ | hornet's [1] 48/25 |
| 22/5 22/13 25/12 27/25 29/12 | 49/13 50/9 51/4 hate [1] 29/11 | hours [3] 7/8 40/18 40/21 housed [1] 54/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 5 & 30 / 6 & 32 / 9 & 35 / 12 & 36 / 21\end{array}$ | have [183] | household [1] 38/10 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}39 / 1 & 40 / 10 & 42 / 23 & 43 / 5 \\ 43 / 6 \\ 43 / 9 & 43 / 23 & 43 / 23 & 45 / 6 \\ 45 / 8\end{array}$ | haven't [8] 10/9 26/17 34/20 | houses [1] 14/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}43 / 9 & 43 / 23 & 43 / 23 & 45 / 6 & 45 / 8 \\ 46 / 5 & 46 / 23 & 47 / 2 & 48 / 6 & 49 / 23\end{array}$ | 40/1 42/17 43/11 44/19 50/12 | how [28] 11/13 11/14 $12 / 25$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}50 / 15 & 52 / 22 \quad 52 / 22 ~ 53 / 14 ~ 54 / 8\end{array}$ | having [6] 3/6 20/5 23/7 | 13/1 13/9 16/8 19/5 19/6 |
| 55/1 | 28/9 33/5 35/18 | 22/1 22/10 23/21 23/23 24 |
| gone [6] 35/9 41/12 41/17 | haystack [1] 5/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 18 & 26 / 10 & 26 / 11 & 28 / 24 & 35 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 42/3 42/8 45/15 | he [18] 8/2 8/5 8/23 17/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll}39 / 10 & 41 / 13 & 43 / 8 & 46 / 19 & 47 / 12\end{array}$ |
| good [16] 3/10 3/12 $3 / 15$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 25 & 23 / 5 & 24 / 10 & 24 / 24 & 24 / 25\end{array}$ | 50/16 51/14 51/14 52/6 54/15 |
| 3/16 $3 / 18$ 3/19 5/25 12/13 | 24/25 25/2 30/17 32/16 34 | human [4] 38/19 38/21 39/1 |
| 14/12 20/6 24/15 24/15 32/6 | 39/3 39/4 41/11 43/5 |  |
| 41/15 48/13 55/5 | headline [1] 34/10 |  |
| got [8] 9/20 12/25 13/1 | $\text { health [1] } 46 /$ | $35 / 15$ |
| 18/13 27/2 $40 / 2043 / 744 / 9$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { hear [19] } & 7 / 14 & \text { /15 } & 20 / 4\end{array}$ | hurricane [1] 42/5 |
| gotten [3] 5/5 11/6 43/11 granular [2] 18/23 19/16 | 21/21 21/22 22/16 22/17 28/4 | hypothetical [1] 18/22 |
| granular ${ }^{\text {graph [1] }}$ 20/11 | /313 29/5 29/17 29/25 30/21 | I |
| great [5] 5/11 8/11 26/25 |  | I'll [3] |
| 48/19 50/24 | heard [4] 22/21 23/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { I'm [4] } & 14 / 23 & 24 / 9 & 38 / 4 & 51 / 9\end{array}$ |
| greater [1] 49/25 | 49/6 [4] 22/21 23/7 | idea [4] 21/16 $22 / 13$ 30/23 |
| Greetings [1] 4/8 | hearing [15] 7/25 9/17 23/3 | 54/10 |
| group [1] 41/19 | 24/8 24/9 38/20 39/18 42/21 | identified [3] 35/23 35/24 |
| GSK [14] 3/16 3/18 32/24 | 43/10 $44 / 24 \quad 47 / 9 \quad 47 / 19 \quad 47 / 21$ | 39/21 |
| 33/9 33/21 $33 / 23$ 38/4 40/22 | 48/12 55/7 | identify [4] 28/24 $36 / 9 \quad 39 / 6$ |
| 41/15 42/22 43/19 46/9 48/6 | heels [2] $42 / 16$ 43/4 | 49/24 [4] |
| GSK's [1] | height [2] 4/21 4/21 | imagine [1] 34/ |
|  | help [7] 13/13 20/12 $28 / 24$ | important [1] 45/20 |
| guess [2] 17/10 | 31/3 39/24 40/5 53/9 | improperly [1] 53/12 |
| guidance [4] | helped [1] 20/17 | impurity [2] 17/20 27/23 |
| 51/19 53/10 | helpful [4] 28/15 45/22 $46 / 2$ | in paper [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { guide [3] } & 31 / 2 & 31 / 3 & 54 / 6\end{array}$ | 4/2 | incendiary [1] 14/8 |
| H | her [1] 34/15 | included [1] |
| hacking [1] 42/7 | here [35] 3/3 4/5 5/14 7/21 | includes [2] 15/25 33/24 |
| had [28] 4/25 11/1 11/19 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}9 / 10 & 10 / 11 & 12 / 18 & 13 / 14 & 15 / 24\end{array}$ | increased [1] 37/4 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { 12/1 } & 13 / 7 \quad 27 / 15 & 29 / 10 & 37 / 4\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 4 & 19 / 25 & 20 / 3 & 20 / 18 & 21 / 3\end{array}$ | incrementally [1] 36/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}37 / 17 & 38 / 14 & 38 / 15 & 38 / 20\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}24 / 13 & 28 / 3 & 29 / 8 & 33 / 8 & 34 / 10\end{array}$ | index [1] 39/14 |
| 38/21 39/5 39/23 40/3 41/1 | $36 / 7$ 37/1 $40 / 8$ 41/8 42/14 | indicated [1] 23/12 |
| 41/2 41/4 41/9 42/2 46/8 | 43/10 $44 / 9$ 44/16 $44 / 21$ 44/22 | indication [1] 37/3 |
| 46/20 51/11 52/15 53/5 53/21 | 45/7 48/18 48/19 48/22 48/25 | individualized [1] 49/12 |
| 53/22 | 53/16 | inference [1] 41/18 |
| half [1] 26/16 | hey [3] 11/13 11/24 12/17 | inform [1] 54/3 |
| hand [4] 28/5 28/8 | high [1] 42/2 | informal [1] 32/19 |
| 29/17 | him [5] 21/22 22/17 $22 / 17$ | information [18] 12/8 13/18 |
| hands [4] 34/12 35/8 37/13 | 22/21 41/11 | 13/21 15/11 15/18 17/12 |
| 44/22 | himself [1] 22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 25 & 19 / 13 & 23 / 4 & 23 / 16 & 23 / 21\end{array}$ |
| handsomely [1] 25/18 | hired [1] 8/13 | 23/23 24/2 $37 / 13$ 40/2 $40 / 8$ |
| happen [1] 52/22 | his [4] 9/11 22/5 30/15 41/4 history [1] 44/17 | 51/1 51/13 <br> Ingelheim [3] 5/1 5/3 5/3 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { happened [2] } & 11 / 1 & 46 / 6\end{array}$ | hit [2] 42/5 50/11 | input [1] 54/4 |
| happening [2] 5/10 happens [1] $49 / 12$ | hold [3] 22/16 45/16 51/7 | instance [2] 35/6 49/24 |
| happens [1] 49/12 happy [5] 5/22 | holiday [1] 47/13 | instead [2] 7/6 11/16 |
| happy [5] $5 / 22$ $7 / 14$ $31 / 3$ <br> $47 / 1$ $47 / 22$  | home [1] 43/8 | instinct [1] 20/19 |
| hard [10] 6/10 16/15 19/5 | HON [1] 2/5 <br> Honor [32] 3/15 7/24 8/7 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { intend [1] } & 12 / 21 \\ \text { interest [1] } & 49 / 23 \end{array}$ |


| I |
| :---: |
| interested [1] 14/10 |
| interim [3] 46/1 47/1 48/10 |
| interject [1] 10/12 |
| interplay [1] 11/14 |
| interrogated [1] 15/15 |
| interrupted [1] 13/4 |
| intersection [2] 15/2 15/6 |
| investigation [1] 27/14 |
| involved [2] 28/10 47/23 |
| involvement [1] 48/9 |
| is [329] |
| is maintained [1] 22/14 |
| is really [1] 25/11 |
| isn't [3] 14/2 20/10 46/13 |
| issue [14] 8/1 16/21 17/6 |
| 29/2 30/12 30/13 32/21 32/24 |
| 42/11 46/20 46/24 48/2 49/11 |
| 51/12 |
| issues [5] 31/17 40/6 46/21 |
| 50/20 52/9 |
| it [229] |
| it if [1] 22/19 |
| it's [9] 12/12 18/23 18/24 |
| 19/16 19/16 46/14 47/13 50/9 |
| 54/12 |

items [1] $40 / 5$
iterative [1] $51 / 3$
its [1] 5/9
itself [1] $17 / 9$
$J$
Jaime [1] 52/15
Jane [2] 36/20 41/4
John [3] 40/20 41/1 42/1
jousting [1] 41/9
judge [22] 1/9 10/12 11/16
$\begin{array}{llll}25 / 10 & 27 / 5 & 29 / 19 & 32 / 14 \\ 32 / 22\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 3 & 40 / 12 & 43 / 5 & 43 / 8 & 43 / 20\end{array}$
44/6 45/15 47/10 48/18 50/21
52/13 52/24 53/18 54/16
judgment [1] 19/18
July [12] 43/23 44/1 47/2
47/3 $47 / 7$ 47/12 $47 / 14$ 47/17
48/6 48/11 48/15 48/19
July 18 [1] 43/23
July 19 [1] 44/1
July 6th [1] 47/2
jump [1] 7/12
June [2] 1/5 55/12
jury [1] 44/8
just [39] 4/18 4/21 7/5 7/12
7/16 8/5 9/24 10/13 15/6
18/10 18/23 20/11 23/7 25/5
27/1 28/14 30/3 30/19 31/11
$31 / 23 \quad 33 / 17 \quad 36 / 19 \quad 36 / 21$
37/17 39/10 40/2 42/4 42/8
43/4 44/7 44/9 44/13 45/12
46/24 47/20 47/23 48/13 50/7
52/13

| K |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| keep [1] | $22 / 22$ |  |  |  |
| keeping [1] | $48 / 14$ |  |  |  |
| keeps [1] | $51 / 8$ |  |  |  |
| kept [1] | $15 / 1$ |  |  |  |
| kind [9] | $4 / 4$ | $34 / 5$ | $34 / 22$ | $36 / 2$ |

36/12 37/9 37/21 40/16 49/22 kinds [1] 53/12
King [2] 2/1 3/14
knew [1] 22/19
know [36] 4/7 5/18 5/22 6/6 9/11 12/3 16/21 21/3 22/8 23/5 23/10 24/2 $26 / 11 \quad 27 / 17$ $32 / 1 \quad 32 / 2 \quad 32 / 18 \quad 36 / 13 \quad 36 / 13$ 37/11 40/17 40/18 40/19 40/21 $40 / 24 \quad 41 / 2 \quad 41 / 13 \quad 42 / 9$ 42/10 43/8 45/8 45/21 46/16 50/9 50/11 53/1
known [2] 4/25 13/24
Kumbaya [1] 47/22
I
lab [2] 19/3 34/3
label [1] 37/10
lack [1] 20/21
lacking [1] 23/3
language [2] 4/13 4/20
large [3] 40/24 43/22 44/19
last [15] 18/19 20/25 31/10
$\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 11 & 32 / 14 & 33 / 2 & 34 / 16 & 36 / 7\end{array}$
36/18 36/24 37/18 38/8 40/3
47/11 53/13
later [2] 10/17 31/1
latest [1] 34/17
latter [1] 16/24
law [1] 6/1
lawsuit [1] 54/10
lawyers [1] 30/5
learned [5] 10/17 10/24 11/9
36/6 42/1
least [7] 10/3 19/20 20/17
26/11 27/3 29/8 30/18
leave [4] 3/21 31/9 32/5 35/15
legitimate [2] 28/3 28/25
legitimate equities [1] 28/3
lend [1] 31/19
length [1] 39/7
lengthy [1] 39/18
less [4] 9/19 14/8 31/25 52/10
let [17] 3/1 3/6 8/1 15/6
16/7 18/2 18/19 20/16 22/16 28/2 33/15 33/17 40/6 40/16 47/4 48/4 50/24
Let's [2] 32/24 47/21
level [4] 18/24 20/4 42/2 52/5
levels [1] 8/5
LIABILITY [2] 1/5 3/2
liaison [2] 6/18 6/21
liaison between [1] 6/18
life [1] 46/10
like [23] 10/11 10/21 11/25 15/3 20/13 31/16 31/23 34/4 35/1 36/20 36/21 36/21 37/12 41/6 42/22 43/24 44/9 45/11 46/15 48/24 49/11 51/15 52/15
likely [1] 36/22
Limbs [4] 10/18 11/14 27/23 54/5
limiting [1] 51/1
line [8] 4/15 4/23 15/11

21/9 23/25 30/9 34/10 41/6
lines [3] 7/2 20/11 23/17
list [11] 17/2 17/20 34/24
35/6 35/14 35/16 35/20 $36 / 17$
36/25 52/22 52/23
listed [1] 38/22
listening [1] 49/20
listing [1] 39/14
literature [1] 17/1
litigation [3] $1 / 5 \quad 3 / 2 \quad 37 / 16$
little [8] 20/2 20/17 24/3
35/5 36/11 46/21 49/21 53/10
live [2] 47/19 47/21
$\begin{array}{llllll}\operatorname{LLP}[4] & 1 / 14 & 1 / 17 & 1 / 21 & 2 / 1\end{array}$
locate [1] 44/19
located [1] 39/16
Logan [1] 1/11
logical [1] 52/3
logs [1] 31/20
London [1] 43/23
long [3] 39/10 49/1 51/14
longer [1] 41/4
look [16] 20/9 22/3 23/16 25/23 28/15 32/16 34/11 $\begin{array}{llllllll}35 / 16 & 35 / 17 & 35 / 19 & 36 / 1 & 36 / 8\end{array}$ 36/25 37/11 $39 / 4$ 46/19
looked [1] 35/9
looking [16] 5/16 8/16 9/12 14/23 25/23 27/10 27/22
27/24 28/13 28/14 28/16
33/19 35/2 42/16 53/25 54/6
looks [2] 35/1 46/15
loop [1] 26/4
losing [1] 41/24
loss [2] 34/16 38/8
lot [9] 17/2 20/13 24/23 28/9 32/3 36/4 37/6 46/11 52/10
lots [5] 16/2 $16 / 316 / 12$ 16/12 16/12
loud [2] 28/4 29/17
LUHANA [21] 1/14 $1 / 14$ 3/8 6/7 7/12 13/3 13/4 13/15 $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 12 & 20 / 9 & 20 / 16 & 21 / 13 & 25 / 13\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 14 & 32 / 10 & 33 / 2 & 48 / 4 & 48 / 17\end{array}$ 50/20 53/20 55/2
Luhana's [1] 31/12
M
machinery [1] 8/25
made [7] 29/20 33/10 33/20 34/20 35/21 41/16 48/8
magic [1] 50/12
MAGISTRATE [1] 1/9
maintain [3] 5/18 22/8 22/12
maintained [5] 7/6 12/20
13/18 22/14 51/14
maintains [3] 5/8 16/17 16/18
majority [2] 44/20 44/21
make [10] $3 / 6$ 9/12 13/10 17/20 19/5 21/24 23/8 23/19 25/16 48/7
makes [3] 7/7 29/4 48/13
making [5] 19/18 21/22 21/25 33/18 34/18
manager [1] 6/15
manually [1] 19/3

| M | month [2] 52/21 52/25 | $44 / 8 \quad 45 / 9 \quad 46 / 5 \quad 46 / 24 \quad 47 / 23$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| manufacturing [2] 13/19 17/3 | $\begin{array}{clll} \text { months }[7] & 5 / 23 & 5 / 24 & 5 / 24 \\ 10 / 5 & 25 / 16 & 29 / 18 & 51 / 13 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|cc} 48 / 851 / 7 \\ \text { needle [1] } & 5 / 16 \end{array}$ |
| many [8] $4 / 16$ 19/1 $35 / 7$ | more [24] $8 / 3 \quad 12 / 16 \quad 18 / 23$ |  |
| 39/19 39/19 39/19 42/13 | $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 24 & 19 / 16 & 19 / 16 & 22 / 19\end{array}$ | 54/18 |
|  | 28/12 $28 / 21$ 31/24 $32 / 3 \quad 32 / 7$ | negative [1] 41/18 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { March [1] } & 33 / 6 \\ \text { market [1] } & 46 / \end{array}$ | $32 / 8$ 33/21 34/20 35/2 35/5 | nest [1] 48/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { master [11] } & 7 / 13 & 26 / 22 & 31 / 2\end{array}$ | 35/17 $36 / 11$ 37/7 42/17 42/23 | neutral [1] |
| 32/6 42/13 48/13 48/22 52/14 | 46/17 | [4] 23/14 24/10 46/1 |
| 52/20 53/4 53/9 | most [3] 28/6 38/24 45 | 46/22 |
| match [5] 35/2 35/2 36/3 | $\begin{array}{cllll} \text { motion } & {[6]} & 24 / 1 & 24 / 6 & 26 / 15 \\ 26 / 16 & 40 / 13 & 44 / 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lcccc} \text { new [2] } & 1 / 15 & 4 / 16 \\ \text { next [6] } & 17 / 21 & 26 / 23 & 45 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| /11 36/ | motions [1] 24/21 | 45/8 45/23 52/5 |
| material [1] $41 / 8$ | mourning [2] 34/16 38/8 | nice [2] 43/4 43/8 |
| materials [3] 29/6 29/9 $35 / 3$ | mouth [1] 22/25 | night [3] 34/16 38/9 47/7 |
| matter [2] 19/20 55/10 | move [3] 33/12 43/16 51/23 | nine [1] 40 |
| matters [3] 3/5 44/22 47/10 | moving [2] 43/2 46/2 | nitrosation [1] |
| Mau [2] 6/14 20/24 | Mr [74] | no [21] 1/3 7/24 |
| may [14] $4 / 1$ | Mr |  |
| 15/7 16/17 $26 / 4$ 30/25 31/17 | Ms [12] 14/12 20/16 $21 / 12$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}41 / 11 & 42 / 2 & 42 / 4 & 42 / 23 & 45 / 4\end{array}$ |
| 31/20 $44 / 8$ 49/18 $53 / 13$ 53/19 | $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { M } \\ 28 / 14 & 31 / 12 & 32 / 10 & 33 / 2 & 47 / 4\end{array}$ | 53/3 54/17 54/25 |
| maybe [20] 3/25 4/6 7/18 | 47/20 50/20 53/20 54/21 | no nitrosation [1] 41/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 2 & 20 / 6 & 20 / 6 & 20 / 9 & 24 / 3\end{array}$ | Ms. [22] $6 / 7 \begin{array}{llll}\text { a }\end{array}$ | Noah [1] 34/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 8 & 28 / 17 & 31 / 19 & 34 / 21 & 34 / 23\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 15 & 20 / 9 & 21 / 12 & 32 / 25 & 33 / 2\end{array}$ | nobody [3] 42/14 43/12 52 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 5 & 36 / 12 & 39 / 24 & 45 / 23 & 48 / 3 \\ 51 / 22 & 53 / 5 & & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}34 / 15 & 34 / 19 & 37 / 25 & 38 / 3 & 38 / 5\end{array}$ | none [1] 50/6 |
| 51/22 53/5 | 38/9 48/4 48/13 48/17 51/8 | nonsense [1] 22/15 |
| md [1] 1/3 | 51/9 55/1 55/2 | normative [1] 19/7 |
| me [63] | Ms. Finken [11] 21/12 32/25 | not [101] |
| me it [1] 45 | 34/15 34/19 37/25 38/3 38/5 | not accusing [1] 21/15 |
| meaningful [4] 25/14 25/15 | 38/9 48/13 51/8 55/1 | note [2] 37/17 44/8 |
| meaningful [4] 25/14 25/15 | Ms. Luhana [10] 6/7 7/12 | notebook [1] 46/16 |
|  | 13/3 13/4 13/15 20/9 33/2 | notebooks [1] 34/3 |
| meaningful analysis | 48/4 48/17 55/2 | nothing [4] 4/22 16/2 |
|  | Ms. Stipes [1] | 54/20 |
|  | much [6] 19/6 26/11 28/23 | notice [3] 11/12 47/20 47/24 |
| s | 32/20 34/21 52/6 | notices [2] 3/4 3/23 |
| measure [2] 18/4 | multiple [2] 51/18 51/19 | notorious [1] 34/6 |
| measurement [2] 18/16 32/3 | my [25] 4/19 5/10 5/24 6/24 | now [30] 5/22 12/12 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { MedTrack [9] } & 34 / 7 \quad 34 / 25 \quad 35 / 6\end{array}$ | 7/7 14/24 14/24 15/24 18/21 | 15/24 17/5 19/10 20/2 25/4 |
| 36/9 36/13 37/6 38/21 39/6 | 21/16 23/20 23/22 26/25 27/3 | 25/7 26/2 26/7 26/8 26/11 |
|  | 30/5 34/15 37/22 38/10 38/25 | 26/13 26/17 26/25 29/12 |
| meet [6] | 40/12 43/13 49/15 52/19 53/3 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}29 / 13 & 30 / 10 & 33 / 15 & 34 / 6 & 35 / 5\end{array}$ |
| $26 / 20 \quad 26 / 22$ | 54/9 | 35/14 41/15 45/19 45/23 49/3 |
| member [1] 41/21 | myself [1] | 50/9 51/12 52/25 |
| mentioned [2] 35/19 37/14 | N | 3/1 4/24 6/14 |
| message [1] 43/13 | name [3] 15/16 36/9 36 | 31/19 $36 / 1$ 39/19 39/21 $40 / 19$ |
| met [3] 11/2 12/17 $52 / 23$ | named [2] 36/13 36/14 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 44/16 } & 44 / 18 & 44 / 19\end{array}$ |
| ```Mexico [5] 5/5 5/5 29/14 30/6 30/12``` | naming [1] 36/7 | numbers [1] 39/20 |
|  | narrow [5] 12/7 27/22 39/24 | numerical [1] 9/1 |
| Mexico and [1] MICHAEL [2] 2/1 | 45/12 53/25 | NY [1] 1/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { might [12] } & 5 / 25 & 20 / 12 & 35 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { narrowed [1] } & 28 / 23 \\ \text { narrower [1] } & 11 / 24\end{array}$ | 0 |
| 36/3 36/9 37/22 39/18 39/25 | nature [1] 39/11 | object [1] 30/25 |
| $\begin{array}{rrrr}\text { 40/5 } & 40 / 8 & 47 / 8 & 53 / 9\end{array}$ | nauseam [2] 5/23 38/20 | objecting [1] 30/25 |
| million [1] 29/19 | NDA [1] 12/1 | objection [4] 15/7 16/20 |
| Mills [2] 36/20 41 | NDMA [4] 27/11 28/20 31/13 | 21/10 29/1 |
| mind [1] 29/5 | 32/3 | obligation [2] 50/10 50/10 |
| minute [1] 53/13 | NDMA measurement [1] 32/3 | obligations [1] 22/6 |
| misconceptions [1] 38/15 | near [1] 15/11 | obviously [7] 29/4 31/21 |
| missing [8] 36/4 36/4 36/4 | necessarily [3] 24/11 30/22 | 45/18 45/20 50/9 50/25 51/25 |
| 38/23 $41 / 7$ 41/14 $44 / 13$ 45/1 | need [29] $4 / 7$ 12/21 14/14 | occasions $[1]$ $53 / 5$ <br> occur [2] $20 / 14$ $53 / 7$ |
| modern [1] 9/22 | $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 13 & 15 / 14 & 19 / 23 & 20 / 14\end{array}$ | occurred [1] 49/20 |
| molecule [5] 5/4 6/20 37/2 | 20/21 23/17 $24 / 17$ 25/7 $26 / 8$ | OCR [2] 9/13 35/11 |
| $\begin{array}{rl}37 / 4 & 37 / 8 \\ \text { money [2] } & 52 / 8 \\ 52 / 10\end{array}$ | 26/23 30/16 30/19 31/1 31/2 | of that [1] 37/19 |
| money [2] 52/8 52/10 | 31/7 38/11 $42 / 19$ 43/2 43/12 | off [3] 3/21 35/14 41/16 |


| 0 | packaging [1] | placebo [1] 40/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| office [4] 4/19 5/14 7/7 | page [3] $7 / 2$ $23 / 24$ $33 / 18$ <br> pages [3] $4 / 14$ $5 / 16$ $12 / 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plaintiff [4] } \begin{array}{l} \text { P4/6 } 53 / \\ 54 / 1054 / 13 \end{array}, ~ \end{aligned}$ |
| official [3] $2 / 5$ 8/10 $55 / 13$ | paid [4] 25/18 $43 / 6$ 52/8 | PLAINTIFFS [48] 1/10 3/7 3/8 |
| often [3] $4 / 13$ 5/20 19/2 | PALM [3] 1/2 1/5 2/6 | 10/6 13/24 14/6 14/6 14/9 |
| oh [3] 20/10 21/16 45/7 okay [11] 7/10 10/16 15 | paper [25] 8/11 9/3 10/7 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}15 / 13 & 16 / 4 & 17 / 4 & 17 / 23 & 20 / 4\end{array}$ |
| $17 / 7 \quad 32 / 18 \quad 38 / 1 \quad 40 / 10 \quad 40 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 8 & 10 / 16 & 11 / 7 & 13 / 12 & 13 / 12\end{array}$ | 20/17 21/17 22/2 23/16 24/11 |
| 42/10 45/21 52/18 | 13/18 14/18 14/25 15/25 | 24/15 28/5 28/21 29/7 29/7 |
| old [1] 35/10 | 21/11 21/13 21/14 21/17 | 29/12 $29 / 17$ 31/18 $33 / 12$ |
|  | 21/23 23/11 27/2 29/6 29/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 19 & 35 / 23 & 37 / 14 & 42 / 17\end{array}$ |
| one [45] $1 / 11$ 4/4 4/25 6/14 | $30 / 4$ 30/6 30/10 35/10 | 42/20 $42 / 23$ 43/18 45/2 45/8 |
| 6/23 11/25 13/22 17/10 18/19 | paper-wise [4] 21/11 21/13 | 49/24 50/8 51/1 51/10 51/24 |
| 20/1 24/14 27/5 28/5 28/19 |  | 55 |
| 29/15 30/3 31/11 31/15 31/21 | papers | 44/21 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}32 / 14 & 34 / 23 & 35 / 9 & 35 / 18 & 36 / 9\end{array}$ | part [8] 8/24 15/9 | 37/13 44/21 52 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 10 & 36 / 11 & 36 / 11 & 37 / 8 & 38 / 4\end{array}$ | 16/24 17/22 23/20 23/22 | planned [1] 35/23 |
| 38/16 39/5 40/19 41/25 43/3 | participate [1] 14/12 | plant [3] 6/15 23/13 $31 / 12$ <br> platform [1] 9/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}43 / 9 & 43 / 17 & 45 / 4 & 48 / 2 & 48 / 12\end{array}$ | particular [4] 28/16 46/20 | players [1] 38/11 |
| 51/1 51/6 51/11 52/17 53/5 | 49/4 51/12 | pleasure [1] 47/4 |
|  | particularly [1] 49/10 | plus [2] 17/4 35/16 |
| ones [2] 39/23 | parties [12] 11/3 32/13 | point [24] 5/7 7/1 9/14 |
| ongoing [2] 37/24 37/2 | 32/20 42/12 46/19 46/23 | 11/18 15/2 15/7 15/21 17/9 |
| only [8] $5 / 13$ $6 / 9$ $7 / 2$ | $49 / 13$ 51/20 52/7 53/8 53/1 | 20/6 23/8 23/9 33/8 33/9 |
| 11/18 13/7 21/8 54/4 | $55 /$ | $33 / 15$ 33/15 $34 / 11$ 41/12 $43 / 3$ |
| open [3] 29/5 31/22 48/25 | parties if [1] 53/10 | 43/16 $45 / 4$ 46/5 46/24 50/18 |
| optical [1] | partner [2] 4/25 41/ | 53/18 |
| order [6] 20/24 26/10 43/12 | partners [1] 5/9 | points [4] 8/8 14/4 18/4 |
| 43/12 $54 / 9$ 54/23 | parts $[3]$ $13 / 22$ $14 / 2$ $17 / 1$ <br> party $[3]$ $49 / 2$ $49 / 2$ $49 / 14$ | pond [1] 24 |
| ordering [1] 49/7 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { passed [3] } & 18 / 9 & 18 / 10 & 18 / 12\end{array}$ | portion [1] 3/20 |
| ordinary [1] 13/10 | passes [1] 18/8 | posing [1] 51/22 |
| original [1] 8/17 | past [4] 6/6 21/19 24/8 | position [1] 32/9 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Other } & {[26]} & 17 / 9 & 17 / 17 & 18 / 7\end{array}$ | $38 / 14$ | precisely <br> [1] 28/13 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 15 & 22 / 3 & 24 / 9 & 25 / 3 & 28 / 8 \\ 29 / 17 & 29 / 20 & 30 / 3 & 31 / 21 & 33 / 11\end{array}$ | Pauline [2] $2 / 5$ 55/13 | preclinical [1] 33/22 |
|  | pdf [4] 4/20 8/22 9/13 31/5 | precursor [1] 41/22 |
| $34 / 434 / 2135 / 436 / 643 / 3$ | pdf'ing [1] 5/12 | prejudice [3] 49/4 49/17 |
| 49/4 49/5 49/19 | pdf's [4] 4/14 7/7 25/13 | 50/25 |
| otherwise [1] 3 | 25/17 | prejudiced [1] 52/4 |
| ought [1] 33/14 | Peachtree | premature [1] 2 |
| Our [13] 12/12 $12 / 18$ 34/12 | peaks [2] 8/24 17/12 | premise [1] 7/21 |
| 35/9 37/15 37/17 37/17 42/16 | pending [1] | prepared [1] |
| 47/9 47/11 51/15 52/14 54/13 | people [9] 4/19 5/15 5/23 | present [1] 44/24 |
| out [12] 4/13 26/12 $29 / 9$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 39 / 10 & 43 / 22 & 44 / 1 & 48 / 1 & 48 / 6 \\ 49 / 20 \end{array}$ | presumably [1] 27/19 <br> pretty [2] 33/14 36/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 11 & 33 / 25 ~ 37 / 14 ~ & 37 / 19 & 42 / 6\end{array}$ | per [2] 11/2 12/21 | preview <br> [1] <br> 44/9 |
| /8 45/17 4 | percent [9] 11/18 17/21 | previously [3] 8/1 10/25 |
| es | 17/21 18/9 18/10 18/17 18/17 | 53/21 |
| outside [ | 18/21 45/15 | principle [1] 9/ |
| outstanding [5] 32/15 39/9 | percentage [1] 25/11 | print [4] 4/13 22/15 |
| 40/1 53/22 53/22 | performed [1] 9/2 | 27/9 |
| over [11] 4/22 7/12 13/20 | Personally [1] 37/21 | printed [3] 10/21 17/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}19 / 23 & 35 / 22 & 36 / 6 & 38 / 3 \\ 38 / 14\end{array}$ |  |  |
| 39/13 $39 / 18$ 47/7 | pharmaceutical [1] $41 / 13$ <br> Philadelphia [2] $1 / 12 \quad 1 / 23$ | printing [2] 10/22 $13 / 8$ <br> printout [1] 7/7 |
| over you [1] 38/3 | phrase [1] 17/7 | printouts [1] 19/1 |
| over-the-counter [1] 13/20 | physical [2] 15/25 19/13 | priority [1] 38/3 |
| overall [1] 36/1 overburdened [1] | pick [2] 35/12 47/5 | probably [2] 38/19 53/14 |
| overlap [1] 11/8 | picture [3] 27/10 27/10 | problem [2] 41/8 53/3 |
| overlaps <br> [1] 26/5 | 27/12 [3] 13/21 13/21 14/1 | problems [1] 51/11 |
| own [1] 29/22 | pieces [3] 13/21 13/21 14/11 PIER [5] 34/25 36/10 36/14 | procedural [1] 48/23 <br> proceed [3] 29/22 29/22 |
| P | 39/14 39/16 | 54/15 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { P.m [1] } & 47 / 9 \\ \text { PA [2] } & 1 / 12 \\ \text { package } & \text { [1] } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Pierce [1] 2/6 <br> Pierce/West [1] 2/6 <br> pipeline [1] 12/5 <br> place [2] 11/5 29/10 | proceedings [1] $55 / 10$    <br> process [6] $8 / 8$ $13 / 19$ $18 / 3$  <br> $36 / 16$ $49 / 15$ $51 / 3$   <br> produce [22] $4 / 10$ $4 / 14$ $5 / 19$  |


| P | 19/10 25/5 37/18 49/6 54/11 | d [1] 37/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| produce... [19] 8/12 11/22 | questioning [1] 52/5 questions [11] 13/3 1 | relating [4] 3/5 37/15 40 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 25 & 12 / 4 & 12 / 9 & 13 / 11 & 19 / 5\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { questions } \\ 31 / 17 & 32 / 8 \quad 32 / 15 & 46 / 11 & 48 / 23\end{array}$ | relative [2] 5/24 9/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 7 & 22 / 18 & 22 / 22 & 23 / 24 & 28 / 9\end{array}$ | 51/15 51/21 53/22 53/22 | relevant [4] 31/13 37/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 25 & 29 / 6 & 29 / 15 & 29 / 16 & 29 / 20 \\ 30 / 4 & 32 / 17\end{array}$ | quick [1] 48/5 | 39/25 40/8 |
| produced [30] 7/22 7/23 | quickly [2] 26/10 45/1 | remedy [8] $42 / 18$ 42/19 $42 / 20$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 11/18 } & 11 / 19 & 12 / 7 & 12 / 16 \\ 15 / 9 / 17\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { quit [2] } & 21 / 13 & 47 / 8 \\ \text { quite [2] } & 37 / 23 & 51 / 22 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lllll} \begin{array}{c} 42 / 21 \end{array} 43 / 18 & 49 / 5 & 49 / 9 & 49 / 1 \\ \text { remembers [1] } & 38 / 19 \end{array}$ |
| 15/9 16/20 16/25 19/15 19/17 |  | reminds [1] 20/20 |
| 19/19 19/19 $21 / 14$ 21/17 | R | repeating [1] |
| 21/19 21/23 23/23 27/15 | raise [2] 27/5 53/18 | rephrase [1] |
| 27/20 29/19 33/21 33/23 | raised [2] 8/1 53/21 | report [2] 35/21 35/22 |
| 33/23 34/2 34/3 35/7 38/22 | raises [1] 46/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Reporter [3] } & 2 / 5 & 55 / 13 & 55 / 14\end{array}$ |
| prod | ran [2] 32/2 46/15 | reports [1] 34/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 10/23 } & 11 / 17 & 15 / 7 & 16 / 14 \\ 16 / 14\end{array}$ | RANITIDINE [5] 1/4 3/2 4/12 | represent [1] 8/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 20 & 21 / 13 & 22 / 2 & 22 / 4 & 29 / 7\end{array}$ | 28/20 37/12 | representative [2] 11/25 |
| 33/12 39/1 | rank [1] 55/ | 20/7 |
| product [4] 3/2 $44 / 17$ 46/8 | w [5] 17/5 17/7 18/1 | request [5] 29/16 44/4 50/22 |
| $46 / 11$ production [15] | re [2] | requested [2] |
| production [15] 4/16 11/5 | reach [3] 19/9 23/9 24/1 | requesting [2] 39/12 51/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}12 / 8 & 12 / 14 & 13 / 9 & 16 / 5 \\ 16 / 16 / 12\end{array}$ | reached [1] 19/7 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { requests [6] } & 16 / 5 & 16 / 11\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 13 & 16 / 19 & 16 / 23 ~ 27 / 18 ~ & 35 / 3 \\ 35 / 9 & 38 / 17 & 45 / 24\end{array}$ | react [1] $22 / 1$ | 16/13 16/19 16/22 51/15 |
| 35/9 38/17 45/24 production and [1] | read [4] 4/4 25/13 30/5 | requires [1] 11/3 |
| PRODUCTS [1] 1/5 | 43/25 | rescheduled [1] 53/13 |
| professional [2] 43/15 50/10 | readily [1] 15/12 | resides [1] 9/ |
| progress [4] 33/20 34/18 | reading [6] 3/25 4/20 5/15 | resolve [2] 31/17 46/24 |
| 34/20 48/8 | 5/23 7/8 25/16 | respect [3] 5/6 5/17 40 |
| project [1] 15/16 | eal [2] 41/7 48/5 | respectfully [2] 4/17 41/13 |
| Promeco [9] 5/1 5/5 6/15 | realize [1] 48/21 | respects [4] 17/10 19/1 |
| 6/18 7/2 7/6 10/16 21/4 | really [13] 12/24 $14 / 1417 / 5$ | $34 / 21$ 34/21 |
| 22/11 |  | respond [6] 8/1 12/23 13 |
| promise [3] 18/20 23/6 24/1 | 39/8 40/12 44/22 47/22 50/14 | 32/4 44/4 |
| proof [1] 20/24 | reasonable [1] 33/10 | responded [1] 14/19 |
| proper [1] 53/8 | reasonably [3] 10/22 12/19 | responding [1] |
| proportional [2] 21/24 28/6 |  | ponse [5] 29/16 |
| proportionality [2] 4/16 |  | 52/1 52/3 55 |
| 5/20 | receive <br> [1] 38/1 | responsive [2] 16/19 16/22 |
| proposal [2] 11/24 12 | recent [1] 38/24 | restore [1] 15/11 |
| propounded [1] 16/11 | reciprocal [1] 4/18 | result [1] 49/18 |
| protocol [2] 11/2 39/20 | recitation [1] 13/8 | retained [1] 51/14 |
| prove [5] 22/9 23/21 23/23 | recognition [1] 35/12 | retrospectively [1] 27 |
| $23 / 25 ~ 24 / 24 ~$ provide [1] 39/3 | recommended [1] 27/25 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { review [3] 9/14 } & \text { 9/19 } \\ \text { rel/20 }\end{array}$ |
| provide [1] 39/3 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { record [15] } & 8 / 10 & 10 / 13 & 11 / 25\end{array}$ | reviewed [3] 3/23 14/7 39/23 |
| provided [3] 14/18 $34 / 17$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 12 & 13 / 17 & 15 / 18 & 17 / 9 & 17 / 18\end{array}$ | reviewers [1] 9/12 |
|  | 17/22 18/12 18/22 21/2 29/21 | reviewing [1] 9/11 |
| proving [1] 25/2 | 44/11 55/10 | Rico [5] 4/19 5/13 $7 / 7$ 25/12 |
| PTO [9] 8/13 10/15 24/6 | records [43] 4/1 6/6 6/8 7/4 | 30/5 |
| 42/20 42/24 43/7 44/3 46/1 | 8/3 8/5 8/10 8/12 8/14 9/2 | right [12] 10/11 12/12 15/10 |
| $48 / 10$ l | 9/5 10/5 10/7 10/16 10/20 | 17/10 19/25 20/19 23/9 23/25 |
| publication [1] 41/1 | 11/17 11/18 11/20 11/21 | 25/7 26/17 31/9 52/6 |
| Puerto [5] 4/19 5/13 | 11/23 12/5 12/10 12/15 13/9 | ripe [1] 24/4 |
| 25/12 30/5 | 13/17 13/22 14/3 14/7 14/10 | risk [3] 29/23 37/4 41/1 |
| pulled [3] 27/17 27/19 391 | 14/20 14/25 15/9 16/1 16/1 | river [1] 46/16 |
| purpose [1] 8/22 | 16/2 16/5 16/13 16/17 16/18 | road [3] 29/11 29/18 33/8 |
| pursuant [1] 3/4 | 17/4 24/10 29/13 54/12 | ROBIN [1] 2/5 |
| push [1] 31/5 | recur [1] 53/14 | ROOPAL [3] 1/14 3/8 25/13 |
| put [5] 10/20 19/3 22/24 | reduced [1] 5/21 | ROSENBERG [6] 1/3 $2 / 5$ 33/3 |
| 24/6 31/17 | reference [1] 14/9 | 43/8 43/21 52/24 |
| 0 | referring [1] 10/4 | rule [18] 4/16 4/18 6/2 |
|  | regard [1] 35/17 | 20/14 20/21 $24 / 7$ 24/22 $26 / 15$ |
| quality [2] 6/16 6/18 <br> question [18] 6/10 9/16 9/16 | regular [1] 34/14 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 26 / 17 & 32 / 9 & 33 / 11 & 33 / 13 & 40 / 10\end{array}$ |
| $9 / 24 \quad 13 / 25 \quad 14 / 1 \quad 14 / 15 \quad 14 / 19$ | regulatory [1] 34/2 | 42/21 42/24 43/12 43/19 44/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 20 & 18 / 19 & 19 / 7 & 19 / 9 & 19 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { REINHART [1] } & 1 / 8 \\ \text { relate [2] } 33 / 24 & 39 / 19\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lccc\|} \hline \text { rules [3] } & 4 / 18 & 5 / 20 & 22 / 7 \\ \text { ruling [4] } & 25 / 23 & 29 / 2 & 29 / 24 \end{array}$ |


| R | seeing [2] 8/16 36/3 | sobeit [1] 49/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ruling... [1] 43/6 | seek [1] | some [47] 4/1 4/2 10/ |
| Russian [1] $42 / 7$ | seeking | $\text { 16/12 17/4 17/9 19/11 } 20 /$ |
| S | seemed [1] 3/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}25 / 25 & 30 / 18 & 30 / 19 & 31 / 20 & 33 / 8\end{array}$ |
| SACHSE [18] 1/21 3/17 3/21 | seems [5] 9/17 24/23 33 | $34 / 2135 / 10$ 35/23 35/23 |
| $32 / 25$ 33/16 $38 / 13$ 38/25 39/3 | seen [1] 4/15 | $36 / 18$ 37/7 37/10 37/22 38/15 39/9 40/3 40/6 40/7 42/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}39 / 13 & 40 / 4 & 40 / 14 & 42 / 15 & 45 / 6\end{array}$ | send [2] 20/1 31/5 |  |
| 45/16 Sachse's [2] | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { sense } & {[3]} & 25 / 8 & 33 / 7 & 48 / 7\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}46 / 13 & 46 / 20 & 46 / 24 & 47 / 21\end{array}$ |
| $\text { safety [5] } 37 / 2 \quad 37 / 12 \quad 37 / 15$ | sentence [1] 4/4 | 49/13 49/25 50/6 51/22 53/7 |
| 37/18 44/15 | separate [4] 9/5 10/8 15 49/5 | 53/22 |
| said [22] 11/24 12/6 12/9 | September [2] 32/2 53/1 | $\begin{array}{\|rrr} \text { somebody [6] } & 22 / 10 & 2 \\ 43 / 13 & 43 / 17 & 44 / 23 \\ \hline 151 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 17 & 21 / 10 & 22 / 2 & 22 / 3 & 23 / 15\end{array}$ | sequencing [1] 25/8 | someone [2] 49/7 49/10 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}28 / 15 & 29 / 7 & 30 / 15 & 31 / 23 & 33 / 3 \\ 33 / 8 & 37 / 24 & 39 / 4 & 41 / 10 & 42 / 7\end{array}$ | served [2] 11/12 44/13 | something [17] 9/4 9/17 9/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 33 / 8 & 37 / 24 & 39 / 4 & 41 / 10 & 42 / 7 \\ 42 / 12 & 42 / 18 & 49 / 7 & 50 / 12 \end{array}$ | session [1] 41/9 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}10 / 9 & 13 / 11 & 18 / 7 & 22 / 13 & 23 / 12\end{array}$ |
| same [8] 5/4 6/9 7/5 24 | set [2] $47 / 1$ 47/2 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 28 / 20 & 33 / 3 & 35 / 1 & 36 / 12 & 36 / 14\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 33/18 } & 34 / 14 & 41 / 23 & 48 / 18\end{array}$ | sets [1] 49/2 | 42/13 $43 / 13$ 47/15 51/17 |
| samples [1] 22/18 | setting [1] 49/1 | Sometimes [1] 20/21 |
| sampling [1] 20/7 | several [3] 10/5 36/7 38/1 | somewhere [3] 18/23 45/2 |
| San [1] 1/19 | shaking [1] 30/14 |  |
| Sanofi [7] 5/3 5/6 5/9 6/21 | ared [1] 23/5 | sophisticated [2] 8/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}6 / 21 & 7 / 3 & 21 / 5 \\ \text { saw [2] } & 30 / 14 & 41 / 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { she [6] 6/7 6/21 31/3 } \\ & 38 / 443 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | sorry [3] 10/12 38/4 51/9 sort [8] 17/5 17/15 17/25 |
| saw [2] 30/14 41/10 | Sheehan [1] 40 | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 28 / 2 & 34 / 10 & 35 / 16 & 36 / 2\end{array} 36 / 16$ |
| say [37] 6/5 7/24 12/17 $13 / 7$ | sheet [4] 34/7 35/19 37/6 | sounds [1] 34/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 10 & 15 / 16 & 17 / 15 & 17 / 21 & 18 / 9\end{array}$ | 44/18 [4] 34/7 35/19 37/6 | source [3] 9/6 17/24 17/24 |
| $18 / 12$ $18 / 13$ $18 / 15$ $20 / 10$ <br> $10 / 12$ $21 / 13$ $22 / 7$ $23 / 9$ | shocked [1] 42/ | sources [1] 17/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}20 / 12 & 21 / 13 & 22 / 7 & 23 / 9 & 28 / 15 \\ 29 / 2 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 10 & 33 / 9 & 34 / 12\end{array}$ | shoot [1] 38/12 | SOUTHERN [1] 1/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 2 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 10 & 33 / 9 & 34 / 12 \\ 34 / 18 & 34 / 19 & 35 / 17 & 36 / 18\end{array}$ | shopping [1] 54/1 | Spalding [2] 2/1 3/15 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}34 / 18 & 34 / 19 & 35 / 17 & 36 / 18 \\ 36 / 24 & 41 / 16 & 43 / 5 & 45 / 6\end{array}$ | short [1] 7/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Spanish [9] } & 4 / 13 & 4 / 14 & 4 / 14\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 24 & 41 / 16 & 43 / 5 & 45 / 6 & 49 / 1 \\ 50 / 3 & 50 / 13 & 51 / 6 & 51 / 25 & 54 / 1\end{array}$ | SHORTNACY [26] $2 / 1$ | 4/20 5/12 5/16 11/20 25/13 |
| 50/3 50/13 51/6 51/25 54/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}6 / 7 & 7 / 15 & 7 / 20 & 13 / 2 & 13 / 5\end{array}$ | 25/17 |
| saying [15] 8/2 8/21 21/19 | 13/13 19/21 21/9 21/15 22/24 | speak [3] 22/17 31/23 39/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}22 / 17 & 22 / 21 & 23 / 12 & 23 / 14\end{array}$ | $24 / 9 \text { 25/4 26/2 26/21 30/14 }$ | speaking [1] 23/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 15 & 24 / 10 & 24 / 11 & 25 / 24\end{array}$ | 31/10 32/15 48/4 48/15 50/17 | speaks [1] 41/22 |
| 30/22 42/15 42/17 45/25 | $51 / 18 \quad 53 / 23 \quad 54 / 24$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { special [11] } & 7 / 13 & 26 / 22 & 31 / 2\end{array}$ |
| says [9] 14/12 18/8 26/14 | should [8] $4 / 3$ 19/5 $19 / 19$ |  |
| 26/15 28/20 28/20 28/20 32/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 26/1 } & 28 / 24 & 41 / 19 & 47 / 19 & 50 / 5\end{array}$ | 52/20 53/4 53/9 |
| 41/15 | show [9] 6/23 6/24 20/7 | specific [9] 8/1 14/15 $14 / 18$ |
| says we [1] 2 | 20/24 21/12 26/21 28/17 31/6 | 15/14 15/14 15/22 $23 / 10$ |
| scan [1] 8/14 | 31/13 | $28 / 2150 / 25$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { scanning [1] } & 8 / 21 \\ \text { schedule [2] } & 52 / 21 & 52 / 25\end{array}$ | showing [1] 40/23 | specifically [3] 11/19 22/19 |
| schedule [2] 52/21 52/25 | showing better [1] 40/23 | $53 / 23$ |
| scheduled [2] 44/1 52/24 | shudder [1] 54/17 | specification [3] 17/20 18/1 |
| Scheidweiller [4] 6/17 6/25 20/25 23/21 | side [11] 22/3 29/24 43/1 | $31 / 14$ |
| 20/25 23/21 <br> science [1] 44/ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}43 / 3 & 46 / 22 & 48 / 10 & 49 / 4 & 49 / 5\end{array}$ | specifications [1] 27/ |
| science [1] 44/ scientific [1] | 53/4 53/11 53/15 | specificity [1] 23/3 |
| scientists [1] | side for [1] 46/22 | spend [6] 7/7 23/20 23/2 |
| scope [1] 11/4 | sides [4] 26/7 28/3 29/24 | 25/16 25/22 43/23 |
| Scotland [1] 42/5 | 45/14 | spending [1] |
| SCOTUS [1] 20/20 | Signature [1] | spent [1] 25 |
| scrambled [1] 10 | significant [1] 11/ | spirit [1] 40/1 |
| screen [2] 3/21 54/24 | similar [2] 15/4 | spreadsheet [8] 3 |
| search [2] 9/23 39/22 | simple [2] 31/16 51/14 | 38/21 38/24 39/6 39/17 39/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { searching [3] } 36 / 1239 / 1 \\ & 39 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lrlll} \text { simply [1] } & 33 / 9 & & \\ \text { since [3] } & 27 / 18 & 33 / 6 & 48 / 6 \end{array}$ | spreadsheet that [1] 39/6 |
| second [9] 6/3 12/19 14/21 | single [1] 37/18 | squabbles |
| 19/9 21/25 22/17 39/12 44/11 | sir [2] 4/8 6/13 | Square [1] 1/1 |
| 48/2 | sit [2] 24/17 29/8 | stages [1] 13/19 |
| secretion [1] | situation [1] 29/11 | stake [1] 23/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { secretion } \\ \text { see [15] } & 4 / 23 & 18 / 2 & 31 / 15\end{array}$ | six [1] 18/6 | stalemate [2] 49/23 50/7 |
| 33/16 35/7 36/12 36/20 38/2 | Sixer's [1] 34/16 | stand [1] 12/22 |
| 39/10 39/16 45/10 45/24 | slow [1] 34/19 | standing [1] 20/21 |
| 46/13 $46 / 19$ 52/24 | slowed [1] 46/21 | standpoint [2] 21/7 27/3 |
| seed [1] 31/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { snapshot [1] } 34 / 7 \\ & \text { so [77] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { staring [1] } 20 / 18 \\ & \text { start [4] } 3 / 7 \text { 15/6 } 16 / 7 \end{aligned}$ |


| S | r [1] | e [65] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| start... [1] 33/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { take [18] } & 3 / 20 & 4 / 12 & 6 / 17 \\ 6 / 19 & 12 / 3 & 12 / 22 & 22 / 13 & 29 / 23\end{array}$ | Thereupon [1] 55/7 |
| started [1] 35/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 30 / 5 & 36 / 11 & 39 / 8 & 43 / 25 & 44 / 1 \end{array}$ | $11 \text { 11/13 11/20 12/10 }$ |
| starting [2] 5/7 20/6 | 47/24 $49 / 7$ 49/8 $49 / 12$ 53/6 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 13 & 13 / 8 & 14 / 11 & 19 / 5 & 24 / 10\end{array}$ |
| statement [1] 31/12 <br> STATES [3] 1/1 1/9 41/22 | taken [6] 8/25 11/5 20/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}28 / 16 & 29 / 20 & 32 / 15 & 34 / 13 & 35 / 7\end{array}$ |
| STATES [3] $1 / 1$ $1 / 9$ $41 / 22$ <br> status [3] $1 / 8$ $3 / 3$ $33 / 2$ | 20/25 40/15 50/18 | $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 10 & 35 / 17 & 35 / 23 & 35 / 24\end{array}$ |
| stick [1] 54/8 | taking [6] 10/21 24/8 34/1 | 37/11 39/21 40/6 42/3 46/6 |
| still [14] 9/14 11/6 33/3 | 34/24 39/10 53/14 | they [100] |
| 33/19 34/16 35/15 38/23 | talk [3] 18/20 | they're [1] |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 25 & 39 / 9 & 42 / 16 & 43 / 10 & 44 / 18\end{array}$ | talked [4] $6 / 6$ $6 / 7$ $8 / 7$ $26 / 1$ <br> talking [8] $6 / 9$ $13 / 14$ $18 / 16$  | $\begin{array}{\|ccccc} \text { thing [18] } & 6 / 9 & 6 / 23 & 12 / 15 \\ 12 / 19 & 27 / 5 & 31 / 21 & 32 / 14 & 34 / 23 \end{array}$ |
| Stipes [4] 2/5 51/8 51/9 | 25/3 31/24 44/12 44/16 44/17 | 35/4 36/6 36/18 36/24 37/9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stipes [4] } 2 / 5 \text { 51/8 51/9 } \\ & 55 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | targeted [1] 23/16 | 39/12 41/25 48/21 49/19 51/6 |
| stop [8] 6/3 11/17 12/17 | team [1] 34/15 | things [21] 8/21 9/23 14/25 |
| 22/2 29/7 29/21 43/3 43/4 | teammates [1] 37 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 1 & 15 / 3 & 16 / 4 & 16 / 7 & 16 / 10\end{array}$ |
| store [4] 10/19 10/19 11/13 | tee [6] 24/21 26/19 26/19 | $\begin{array}{lll}16 / 22 & 18 / 5 & 19 / 5 \\ 20 / 21 ~ 29 / 20\end{array}$ |
| 41/23 | 42/20 43/17 45/13 | $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 15 & 31 / 19 & 36 / 19 & 36 / 20 & 39 / 2\end{array}$ |
| stored [6] 8/10 11/14 13/9 | d [1] 43/12 | 39/11 46/21 48/24 |
| 13/23 14/3 53/24 | teeing [1] 45/25 | think [59] |
| story [1] 38/5 | tees [1] 44/23 | thinking [1] 48 |
| Street [3] 1/12 1/22 2/2 | 1 [13] 4/6 6/22 16/ | Third [1] 1/15 |
| strong [1] 52/19 | 20/23 33/1 42/20 42/23 49/21 | thirds [6] 41/3 41/12 41 |
| struggling [1] 36/ | 52/11 52/14 54/11 | 41/16 41/24 44/12 |
| stuck [1] 51/2 | 54/14 | thirty [1] 47/15 |
| studies [24] $33 / 4 \quad 33 / 22 \quad 35 / 8$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { elling } & {[7]} & 10 / 3 & 19 / 11 \\ 28 / 22 & 29 / 21 & 30 / 17 & 45 / 5 \end{array}$ | Thomsen <br> [4] 6/19 |
| 35/10 35/14 35/20 36/1 37/3 | tens [3] 4/14 5/15 7/8 | 23/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 4 & 37 / 6 & 37 / 8 & 37 / 10 & 37 / 12\end{array}$ | terminated [1] 35/24 | those [22] 8/10 8/11 8/12 |
| $39 / 9$ 39/11 $39 / 15$ 40/8 40/22 | terms [11] 5/24 12/10 $12 / 14$ | 9/2 11/6 11/10 11/18 15/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}44 / 12 & 44 / 13 & 44 / 15 & 44 / 20 \\ 45 / 20 & 46 / 6 & \end{array}$ | 16/10 $27 / 5$ 33/18 $39 / 25$ 45/24 | 16/12 16/14 23/14 27/24 |
| /20 46/6 | 45/25 46/4 51/16 | 28/11 34/9 35/3 36/3 37/4 |
| $39 / 20 \quad 39 / 21$ | test [8] 18/8 18/9 18/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}39 / 11 & 40 / 5 & 44 / 14 & 44 / 15 & 52 / 9\end{array}$ |
| stuff [14] 10/21 16/3 16/12 | 18/12 18/13 31/14 32/2 46/15 | though [2] 8/16 29 |
| 21/21 22/11 25/25 26/2 26/4 | testing [16] 4/11 5/6 5/17 | thought [2] 43/8 48/2 |
| 26/5 28/9 30/6 33/11 41/20 | 6/6 8/6 9/1 $9 / 6$ 14/1 17/4 | thousands [4] 4/14 5/15 7/ |
| 44/22 | $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 24 & 25 / 15 & 27 / 23\end{array}$ | 7/8 [4] 6/13 25/16 29/18 |
| sub [2] 10/4 | 31/13 31/18 31/25 | three [4] 6/13 25/16 29/18 |
| sub-universe [2] 10/4 10/8 | text [1] 22/10 | 51/13 |
| submit [2] 4/17 22/9 | than [7] 8/3 9/23 31/6 33/22 | through [12] 1/8 7/4 18/3 |
| submitted [1] 3/23 | 40/23 46/17 49/1 | 25/17 31/16 40/6 42/12 43/1 |
| subset [1] 12/7 | thank [16] 4/8 26/14 31/23 | 43/2 46/3 48/12 52/9 |
| substantive [1] 51/21 | 32/13 32/20 32/22 32/23 | throw [1] 34/12 |
| such [1] 16/7 | 38/13 $44 / 6$ 47/25 $48 / 5$ 54/16 | Thursday [6] 6/19 6/25 21/1 |
| suggest [3] 5/11 46/18 53/11 | 4/17 54/20 55/4 55/6 | 22/11 23/23 47/13 |
| suggested [1] 53/9 | that [417] | tight [1] 49/11 |
| suggesting [2] 23/17 24/14 | that's [3] 24/9 38/5 53/16 | time [24] 6/1 7/25 10/24 |
| suggestion [2] 23/19 48/13 | the Sixer's [1] 34/16 | 20/21 23/4 24/6 24/19 24/2 |
| suit [1] 52/15 | their [14] 3/6 4/12 8/17 | 25/1 25/3 25/12 25/18 25/22 |
| Suite [3] 1/12 1/18 2/2 | 16/4 29/22 $30 / 9$ 34/5 43/4 | 30/11 30/12 34/7 34/14 36/16 |
| summarize [1] 28/2 | 44/24 44/25 44/25 46/9 49/2 | 40/19 41/21 42/11 43/25 |
| supplement [1] | 54/3 | 51/22 53/6 |
| suppose [2] 5/2 | them [27] $4 / 3$ 7/5 $7 / 6$ 8/12 | time-consuming [1] 36/16 |
| supposed [1] 30/11 | 8/17 10/7 11/17 11/19 11/24 | timeframes [1] 28/14 |
|  | 12/13 12/17 16/14 17/3 20/8 | times [6] 4/17 5/21 13/16 |
| 16/9 22/1 27/7 31/2 33/17 | 22/3 22/8 25/7 29/14 29/21 | 19/3 42/13 51/19 |
| $33 / 18$ 48/16 | 30/10 32/11 32/17 35/12 | timing [2] 49/3 49/3 |
| surprising [1] | 38/22 41/24 44/21 50/22 | titles [1] 8/15 |
| Susanne [3] 6/19 20/25 23/23 | themselves [4] 8/3 13/17 | to do [1] 42/23 |
| switch [1] 30/15 | 17/11 31/19 | today [23] 6/22 12/22 12/25 |
| system [2] 14/16 | then [33] 5/9 6/16 7/3 $7 / 15$ | 13/1 13/1 21/21 24/3 24/9 |
| systems [1] 11/7 | 11/21 11/24 13/2 14/23 18/19 | 26/25 29/8 30/25 31/24 34/8 |
|  | 19/15 20/9 21/5 27/16 27/22 | 34/15 38/18 41/1 41/10 42/1 |
| T | 32/8 32/10 32/17 33/12 35/22 | 43/13 47/2 51/20 52/16 54/18 |
| table [1] 20/1 <br> tablets [1] 8/9 <br> tabular [2] 8/25 17/12 | $\begin{aligned} & 36 / 10 \quad 36 / 24 \quad 41 / 17 \text { 43/1 } 43 / 21 \\ & 44 / 3 \quad 47 / 2250 / 3 \quad 50 / 351 / 2 \\ & 51 / 2252 / 1053 / 25 \quad 54 / 12 \\ & \text { theory }[1] \quad 54 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | ```today's [1] 38/22 together [4] 8/14 43/15 46/4 46/23 told [10] 7/13 11/16 11/19``` |


| T | 24 | was [49] 4/1 4/5 5/1 5/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| told... [7] 12/17 16/16 | understood [3] 4/5 26/7 53/4 | 6/15 6/18 6/19 6/21 7/ |
| 21/17 25/5 32/11 41/10 45/16 | undertook [1] 8/11 unduly [2] 21/20 22/18 | $10 / 24$ 11/9 11/22 12/20 13/3 |
| tolerance [2] 17/20 $18 / 6$ | unfold [1] 51/12 | $13 / 10 \quad 13 / 11 \quad 18 / 17 \text { 23/21 }$ |
| tolerances [2] 18/5 18/8 tomorrow [10] 6/17 6/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { unilaterally } & \text { [2] } & 11 / 22 & 12 / 16\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 23 & 27 / 14 & 27 / 15 & 31 / 14 & 32 / 2\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{rlll} \\ 20 / 25 & 22 / 10 & 23 / 21 \quad 24 / 12 & 30\end{array}$ | Union [1] 41/22 | $33 / 136 / 12$ 37/3 38/21 39/13 |
| 30/16 31/4 50/22 | UNITED [3] 1/1 1/9 41/22 | 40/15 $40 / 22$ 40/24 40/25 41/5 |
| took [2] 6/14 40/21 | units [1] 18/7 <br> universe [2] 10/4 10/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 41 / 10 & 42 / 1 & 43 / 9 & 45 / 16 & 48 / 2 \\ 48 / 2 & 53 / 7 & 53 / 7 & 53 / 8 & 53 / 24 \end{array}$ |
| top [1] 34/10 | unnecessary [2] 31/16 31/22 | $55 / 7$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { topic [1] } & 48 / 23 \\ \text { Torsten [2] } & 6 / 14 \end{array}$ | unprint [1] 31/5 | was about [1 |
| total [1] 6/1 | unsuccessful [1] | wasn't [4] 10/25 42/5 42/6 |
| tougher [1] 52/6 | until [6] 9/16 19/9 20/15 | 42/7 |
| tracking [2] 34/22 34/23 | 23/19 40/18 46/8 | waste [3] 6/1 25/1 25/18 |
| TRACY [6] 1/10 3/9 5/22 | untoward [1] 5/1 | watch [1] 40/20 |
| 25/14 40/20 51/9 | up [27] 3/20 6/23 17/20 | watching [1] 51/12 |
| transcript [2] 26/21 55/9 | 20/24 $24 / 21 \quad 26 / 19$ 26/19 | WATTS [35] 1/17 1/17 |
| transcripts [1] 6/24 | 26/21 31/6 34/12 35/12 36/22 | 3/12 4/6 5/25 7/13 7/15 7/25 $8 / 4 \quad 8 / 21 \quad 9 / 4 \quad 9 / 10 \quad 14 / 14$ |
| transfer [1] 7/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 42 / 20 & 43 / 12 & 43 / 17 & 44 / 23 & 45 / 6\end{array}$ | $\text { 17/14 } 20 / 9 \quad 20 / 16 \quad 23 / 4 \quad 2$ |
| anslate [1] 11/20 | 45/8 $45 / 13$ 45/25 $46 / 8 \quad 49 / 12$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 13 & 25 / 9 & 25 / 12 & 25 / 21 & 30 / 2\end{array}$ |
| transpired [1] 7/17 | 53/1 | 32/10 38/2 38/4 40/6 40/11 |
| trial [4] 33/4 37/19 | up with [1] 26/21 | 44/12 47/6 48/19 50/20 52/12 |
| trials [12] 33/25 37/16 | update [1] 34/17 | 55/2 |
| 38/19 38/21 40/1 41/3 41/7 | updated [2] 38/18 52/20 | Watts' [1] 44/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 41 / 14 & 41 / 17 & 41 / 23 & 42 / 3 & 43 / 24\end{array}$ | updates [1] 34/14 | waving [1] 38/ |
| tried [1] 11/10 | upload [1] 7/9 | way [16] 4/23 7/2 10/23 $14 / 8$ |
| trip [1] 43/24 | upon [3] 10/18 11/12 40/3 | 14/22 15/15 19/23 22/22 |
| triple [1] 34/ | us [29] 7/9 10/23 11/20 12/1 | 26/19 35/14 39/21 43/17 |
| trouble [1] | 12/14 12/17 14/9 20/10 20/12 | 45/10 45/13 49/5 53/11 |
| true [3] 17/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}20 / 12 & 21 / 24 & 24 / 12 & 27 / 1 & 27 / 20\end{array}$ | ways [1] 15/15 |
| truly [1] 53/16 | 29/13 $35 / 15$ 39/3 $40 / 5$ 42/18 | we [275] |
| try [5] 8/2 41/13 41/17 | $46 / 11$ 49/21 49/21 51/15 52/6 | we'll [1] 52/16 |
| 41/20 46/23 | 52/7 54/3 54/7 54/11 54/14 | we're [2] 12/4 54/6 |
| trying [8] $3 / 24$ 9/24 $19 / 8$ | usable [2] 10/22 27/20 | week [8] 7/1 26/23 |
| 24/24 29/9 37/1 43/15 46/4 | use [2] 12/15 18/5 | 38/14 40/3 45/6 45/8 55/5 |
| turn [5] 4/6 7/15 32/24 | useable [2] 12/20 28/6 | weekend [3] 39/13 47/3 47/13 |
| 33/15 35/22 | used [1] | eeks [5] 12/2 36/7 45/23 |
| two [23] 4/24 10/18 12/1 | usually [1] 47/5 | 2 47/5 |
| 12/12 15/3 17/10 27/24 28/11 | V | eiss [1] |
| $39 / 2$ 40/5 41/3 41/12 41/14 |  | well [11] 13/24 16/8 27/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}41 / 16 & 41 / 24 & 44 / 12 \\ 45 / 18\end{array}$ | valor [1] 41/19 | $\begin{array}{cccccl}\text { well } \\ 29 / 12 & 30 / 12 & 40 / 9 & 43 / 15 & 46 / 3\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}45 / 19 & 45 / 20 & 45 / 23 & 47 / 2 & 47 / 5\end{array}$ | value [2] 19/18 31/15 | 48/7 50/18 53/1 |
| 53/23 two-fold [1] 12/ | values [1] 9/1 | well-known [1] |
| two-fold [1] two-thirds [6] | vendor [1] 8/13 | went [4] 27/16 35/5 39/1 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccl}\text { two-thirds [6] } & 41 / 3 & 41 / 12 \\ 41 / 14 & 41 / 16 & 41 / 24 & 44 / 12\end{array}$ | Venn [1] 14/24 | 43/8 |
| $\begin{array}{cr}41 / 14 & 41 / 16 \\ \mathbf{T X ~ [ 1 ] ~} & 1 / 19\end{array}$ | versions [1] 15/8 | were [18] 3/4 3/23 7/5 |
| TX [1] $1 / 19$ type [3] \%/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { versus [3] } 11 / 7 & 25 / 13 & 27 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 10 / 16 & 11 / 18 & 20 / 23 & 29 / 6 & 31 / 18\end{array}$ |
|  | very [14] $13 / 10$ 14/15 $28 / 15$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll} & 35 / 11 & 35 / 20 & 37 / 3 & 39 / 5 & 39 / 10\end{array}$ |
| types [2] 27/24 31/18 <br> typically [1] 46/9 | 29/21 32/5 32/6 32/20 40/24 | 41/3 42/7 53/3 53/23 |
|  | 41/9 43/7 43/22 47/22 49/11 | WEST [3] 1/2 1/5 2/6 |
| U | /16 | hat [136] |
| timatel | view [1] 49/15 | whatever [10] 3/21 18/3 18/6 |
| unable [1] 51 | W | 21/9 24/21 25/22 25/23 31/ |
| unclear [1] | wait [1] 23/19 | whatsoever [2] 41/3 41/11 |
| underlying [7] 7/20 17/5 | waiver [1] 23/12 | when [25] $6 / 5$ 6/6 $18 / 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { underlying [7] } 7 / 2017 / 5 \\ & 17 / 817 / 1618 / 15 \\ & \hline 17 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | waiving [2] 23/9 30/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 17 & 27 / 8 & 28 / 15 & 30 / 15 & 31 / 25\end{array}$ |
| understand [28] 3/24 6/4 6/5 | wake [2] 45/6 45/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 1 & 32 / 2 & 33 / 9 & 35 / 19 & 36 / 1\end{array}$ |
| 7/10 8/20 9/24 11/13 12/6 | want [61] | $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 8 & 36 / 24 & 37 / 11 & 39 / 21 & 40 / 22\end{array}$ |
|  | want versus [1] 27/9 | 44/20 49/7 52/22 52/24 53/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 23 & 18 / 2 & 19 / 8 & 19 / 10 & 19 / 23\end{array}$ | wanted [7] 7/16 13/10 $27 / 1$ | 53/14 53/21 |
| 20/2 25/4 29/25 29/25 30/14 | 33/7 49/19 53/6 53/18 | where [30] 12/22 $12 / 25$ 12/25 |
| 40/13 46/20 49/12 51/3 52/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wants [5] } 13 / 3 \text { 17/15 29/15 } \\ & 38 / 548 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | 13/1 15/17 15/22 17/6 26/8 27/15 27/18 28/10 29/10 |
| understanding [3] 14/10 | warehouse [1] 41/24 | 29/11 33/7 33/16 33/21 34/5 |


| W | wrong [2] 3/25 25/19 |
| :---: | :---: |
| where... [13] 34/12 35/15 | Y |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 1 & 36 / 3 & 37 / 8 & 37 / 21 & 42 / 9\end{array}$ | year [2] 12/1 44/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}45 / 5 & 45 / 19 & 45 / 24 & 52 / 5 & 52 / 7\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} \text { yes [6] } & 4 / 8 & 6 / 13 & 7 / 24 & 19 / 24 \end{array}$ |
|  | 44/16 53/20 |
| wherever [1] $35 / 1$   <br> whether [16] $4 / 3$ $4 / 10$ $18 / 9$ |  |
| 18/13 18/17 19/4 19/18 21/19 | York |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}31 / 5 & 33 / 1 & 37 / 3 & 45 / 2 & 49 / 3\end{array}$ | you [254] |
| 49/9 49/14 53/8 | you I [1] 33 |
| which [37] 5/5 7/7 7/9 7/21 | you're [3] 20/18 22/13 48/19 |
| 8/24 9/1 9/6 9/9 10/7 10/9 | $8 / 7 \quad 8 / 23 \quad 12 / 4 \quad 12 / 23 \quad 13 / 6$ |
| 10/9 $111 / 2$ 13/3 $14 / 15$ 14/25 | $\text { 13/7 13/7 13/16 } 14 / 2 \quad 16 / 24$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 3 & 16 / 5 & 16 / 5 & 16 / 15 & 16 / 15\end{array}$ | $19 / 22 \quad 22 / 24 \quad 23 / 8 \quad 23 / 11 \quad 25 / 1$ |
| 16/19 16/20 $17 / 15$ 18/4 19/13 | $25 / 22 \quad 26 / 15 \quad 26 / 16 \quad 28 / 23$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 8 & 24 / 24 & 34 / 3 & 34 / 25 & 37 / 9\end{array}$ | 29/16 $31 / 11$ 32/23 $33 / 17$ |
| $39 / 14$ 39/23 $39 / 25 \quad 40 / 14$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 13 & 38 / 19 & 39 / 17 & 43 / 7 & 44 / 7\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ccc}40 / 21 & 43 / 3 \quad 54 / 9 \\ \end{array}$ | 45/22 $46 / 11 \quad 47 / 2 \quad 47 / 4 \quad 47 / 12$ |
| while [3] 34/16 45/25 46/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}47 / 17 & 48 / 16 & 50 / 18 & 51 / 6 & 51 / 19\end{array}$ |
| who [10] 5/1 5/10 6/15 6/18 | 52/13 $54 / 12 \quad 54 / 20 \quad 54 / 22$ |
| $6 / 19$ $49 / 22$ | $54 / 2555 / 255 / 6$ |
| why [19] 11/12 $12 / 6 \quad 19 / 23$ | yourself [1] 52/24 |
| 24/18 26/9 27/12 29/19 29/25 | Z |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 12 & 40 / 7 & 40 / 8 & 41 / 3 & 41 / 5\end{array}$ | ZANTAC [7] 1/4 3/2 $13 / 20$ |
| 42/3 46/6 52/8 52/10 53/12 | $15 / 1634 / 3 \quad 39 / 10 \quad 40 / 23$ |
| 53/16 | Zoom [2] 1/8 40/20 |
| will [96] | Zoom [2] 1/8 40/20 |
| willing [6] 23/2 23/15 23/15 |  |
| 33/10 37/22 38/11 |  |
| wiped [2] 42/6 42/8 |  |
| wise [4] 21/11 21/13 21/14 |  |
| 21/17 |  |
| wish [1] 52/22 |  |
| within [3] 10/3 18/7 39/16 |  |
| without [3] 41/24 49/17 |  |
| 50/24 |  |
| witness [4] 37/18 41/1 41/2 |  |
| 41/10 |  |
| won't [2] 18/13 30/22 |  |
| Wood [3] 40/21 41/1 42/2 |  |
| word [2] 18/5 31/10 |  |
| words [4] 20/11 22/24 23/14 |  |
| 50/13 |  |
| work [9] 4/22 25/14 32/7 |  |
| 40/5 43/2 46/17 47/13 48/15 |  |
| 52/9 |  |
| working [8] 34/5 43/1 43/14 |  |
| 46/3 46/3 46/19 46/23 47/7 |  |
| working night [1] 47/7 |  |
| Works [1] 47/14 |  |
| world [4] 9/22 15/17 $26 / 8$ |  |
| 45/10 |  |
| would [52] 4/17 6/22 8/16 |  |
| 8/17 9/12 9/14 9/19 9/21 |  |
| 10/11 11/1 11/2 14/17 15/10 |  |
| 15/22 16/9 17/17 17/19 17/21 |  |
| 17/25 18/16 18/22 19/5 19/6 |  |
| 19/13 20/6 20/13 22/1 $22 / 18$ |  |
| 22/21 $22 / 23$ 24/3 $24 / 18$ 25/3 |  |
| 29/10 $32 / 19$ 35/21 $37 / 16$ 39/4 |  |
| $39 / 6$ 40/9 41/25 41/25 43/24 |  |
| 45/11 $45 / 22$ 46/1 $47 / 17$ 50/13 |  |
| 50/16 51/15 52/3 54/1 |  |
| would react [1] $22 / 1$ |  |
| wouldn't [1] 18/22 |  |
| written [2] 31/19 47/24 |  |

