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THE COURT: Good morning, everybody.
This is Case Number 20-2924, In re: Zantac
(Ranitidine) Multi District Product Liability Litigation. We are here this morning for a discovery hearing relating to the economic loss complaint and the medical monitoring complaint, consolidated complaints.

It is my understanding that Defendants have served requests for production and interrogatories on the named class representatives, and there is a dispute as to the responses.

Before I get to all of that, let me have the parties make appearances. Let me recognize the Plaintiffs, please.

MS. FEGAN: Good morning, your Honor, Elizabeth Fegan on behalf of Plaintiffs.

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

THE COURT: Good morning. Anyone else on behalf of the Plaintiffs?

MS. WHITELEY: Good morning, your Honor, Conlee Whiteley on behalf of Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Whiteley. On behalf of the Defense?

MS. SHOWALTER: Good morning, your Honor, Annie Showalter, I represent Pfizer, and I will be speaking today for the Defendants.

THE COURT: Good morning. Anyone else on behalf of
the Defense?

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

MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, Christopher Young for the Sanofi Defendants.

MR. DEVEREAUX: Good morning, your Honor, Stephen Devereaux for Boehringer Ingelheim.

MR. SACHSE: Good morning, your Honor, this is Will Sachse also for GSK.

THE COURT: Good morning to all of you gentlemen, but I am confident Ms. Showalter is going to handle this just fine.

MR. SACHSE: Me too.

THE COURT: Good to see all of you. I did have a chance to review the materials that were submitted at Docket Entries 4600 -- I don't think I have ever said that before -and all the attachments, as well as Docket Entry 4633, the response to the motion to compel.

So, I have a couple of preliminary questions to help me frame the issues and frame the discussion this morning.

So, I guess the first question is, it's my understanding that the requests for production and interrogatories that were served relating to the named class representatives in the economic loss and medical monitoring consolidated complaints, Ms. Showalter, is that discovery directed to these Plaintiffs solely in their capacity as the
class representative, or is it meant to be discovery also on the merits of their individual cases as Plaintiffs?

MS. SHOWALTER: No, your Honor, this discovery is directed both to the merits of the individual claims and to class certification related issues.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Fegan, do you agree that is your understanding of the scope of the request?

MS. FEGAN: Yes.

THE COURT: I just want to make sure, if we are responding to a request, we all understand the scope of the request. Thank you.

It appears that the Plaintiffs have objected on multiple legal grounds, but primarily on the grounds of relevance and proportionality to request for production 41 through 52, 56 through 59 and 70, as well as interrogatories 13 and 21 .

I know that since those objections were lodged, the parties have been conferring and at least it appears to me the issues may be more limited than to those specific requests for productions, there has been some limiting.

Let me start with that, if $I$ could.
Ms. Fegan, I am looking, for example, at request for production 41.

MS. FEGAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Let me go back a step.
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It seems to me there are four questions we need to address this morning, and this is the order $I$ would like to address them in. I will give you the agenda.

The first question is: What substantive topics are the Plaintiffs required to collect or search for? That is the relevance question.

Then, once we figure out what you are supposed to look for, we get to the where do you have to look for it question, which to me is the proportionality, Rule $26(\mathrm{~g})$ question. I think those are two sides of the same question, what are you required to do to satisfy your obligations under Rule 26(g) as bounded by the proportionality rules.

Then the next question is, how should that collection occur, search terms, centralized collection of all ESI into one platform, can it be done individually, can it be done by the parties, does it have to be done by the lawyers, those series of questions.

And then last, how does whatever responses are provided get documented such that there is transparency and the Defendants know they have gotten what they are going to get.

I think the Defendants have asked for written signed Rule $26(\mathrm{~g})$ certifications from each of the named Plaintiffs. I am not sure the rule requires that, but I do think there is -in the unique context of an MDL, I think a single discovery response may not be sufficient either, but we can talk about
that. That seems to me to be the least contentious of the issues we need to address today.

That's the order I would like to address them in. So, to save anyone the trouble of saying, of course subject to our later objections, I am going to now ask you questions about what you agree is relevant or not, understanding there are all sorts of objections about where we have to look and how we have to look and all that, but $I$ am putting that to the side for a second.

With that understanding, let me continue my question to Ms. Fegan. It seems to me, for example, request for production 41, which calls for evidence -- prepared by you or on your behalf relating to the allegations in the complaint. I assume you still have a relevance objection to that because that would seem to sweep in some of the topics that are discussed in the pleadings; am I correct?

MS. FEGAN: In part, your Honor. I think that what is important to note here is that in Defendants' chart they note our objections, but they don't note what we did agree to produce.

THE COURT: That is where I am going right now. Maybe this is the easier way to go about it, rather than ask what you have agreed, let me focus on what, it appears from the pleadings anyway, you are objecting to producing, or they are wanting me to order you to produce.

From their pleading $I$ was able to discern the following topics: Cancer risk factors, that is something they have referenced, risky behaviors, other lawsuits, economic losses, alternative causation, and the Statute of Limitations.

Maybe I should turn to Ms. Showalter first. Is that really what is remaining in dispute on the relevance side, understanding you may have other problems with process, but in terms of the relevance question, are those really the six items that are still in dispute?

MS. SHOWALTER: Yes, your Honor. I wasn't sure if you listed other cancer related lawsuits.

THE COURT: I said other lawsuits.

MS. SHOWALTER: Then yes.
THE COURT: Ms. Fegan, do you agree that is at least what is at issue that $I$ need to resolve today?

MS. FEGAN: Some of that we have already agreed to produce. I don't think the other lawsuits issue is still in contention.

The only thing that we have held back is related to divorce or child custody issues, but we have agreed to do a linear review, as well as a search term review for -- that would identify other lawsuits, and I believe we have also produced some information related to that, but $I$ believe that that is a resolved issue.

THE COURT: I think Ms. Showalter was careful to say
it is other cancer related lawsuits, not a divorce or contract dispute over the contractor who built your addition on your house, this is cancer related lawsuits.

Ms. Fegan, you have agreed to produce that information?

MS. FEGAN: Yes.
THE COURT: I will flip it. You are not objecting to the relevance of that information. You may be objecting to the process of how you get it, and what you get, and all that, but you are not objecting to the relevance of that information.

MS. FEGAN: We would contend that it is not relevant, but in order to resolve this dispute we have agreed to produce it.

THE COURT: Okay. But as to the other ones, the cancer risk factors, economic loss, risky behaviors, Statute of Limitations, and alternative causation -- and at some point, Ms. Showalter, I am going to ask you what that means -- those issues are still in dispute. The Plaintiffs are objecting on relevance grounds to those issues.

MS. FEGAN: No, we are not objecting on the basis of economic loss. With respect to economic loss, we have agreed to produce, for example, receipts, evidence of purchase, and ultimately, your Honor, with respect to economic loss and our refund theory, that will also be the subject of expert testimony.

So, that is part of the expert disclosures with respect to our motion for class certification, but with respect to any evidence of out-of-pocket payments for Zantac, those have been and will be produced if we find more.

THE COURT: Okay. Again, you are sort of arguing the next issue, which is fine, but we will get to that in a second. I am just trying to understand what $I$ need to resolve today.

You agree that some evidence of economic loss is relevant, you have agreed to produce it. We just need to resolve an issue of where you have to look, how you have to look, and what you are going to produce, but you have agreed it is relevant, you will produce that.

MS. FEGAN: Absolutely.
THE COURT: Understood. How about cancer risk factors, is that still in dispute as to relevance or simply only as to proportionality and process?

MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, we would contend that cancer risk factors are not relevant, but to resolve the dispute we produced thousands of pages of medical records, so it becomes a proportionality issue.

THE COURT: You are only riding on proportionality on that one, okay.

How about what I believe the Defense calls risky behaviors? I think the paradigm they keep pointing to is smoking, but evidence of risky behaviors, is there an ongoing
relevance objection or just a proportionality objection to that?

MS. FEGAN: There is an ongoing relevance objection, but again, some of that would be captured in the medical records we have produced. The idea that risky behaviors generally is a relevant topic, we would dispute that.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Statute of Limitations related evidence, is there a relevance objection? Again, I am not quite sure exactly what that is, but maybe you two understand it.

MS. FEGAN: I don't understand it.

THE COURT: Let me turn to Ms. Showalter, if you could help us focus more specifically. You talked about, in the pleading at least, evidence of alternative causation and Statute of Limitations related evidence. Can you maybe give us a little flavor of what you think that is?

MS. SHOWALTER: Sure. For example, on statute of Limitations related evidence, if you have a Plaintiff indicating, for example, that they saw a litigation related ad and they thought about responding to that ad, but elected not to do so, and then we find out that some period of potentially years later, whatever the relevant statute of Limitations in one of these dozens of states is, they file their claim and the time has lapsed we'd have a Statute of Limitations argument there. That is one statute of Limitations example.

Your Honor had also asked about alternative causation. That is closely tied in the way we use it in the papers to this risky behaviors type evidence and the cancer risk factors related evidence, those are sort of a piece, your Honor, so those refer to things like smoking.

THE COURT: I understand. That is helpful.
Ms. Fegan, now that we understand a little better the Statute of Limitations concept, do you have a relevance objection to that? If there is evidence, for example, that a client knew five years ago, or had reason to believe five years ago that Zantac causes cancer and they never did anything, is that the kind of thing you think is relevant?

MS. FEGAN: I do, your Honor, and I think that would be captured by the searches we have agreed to do.

THE COURT: All right. So, just a proportionality argument, then, not necessarily a relevance one. Okay. That is helpful to me.

Now, Ms. Showalter, as to the one or two areas where they are continuing to assert a relevance objection -- let me start with the risky behaviors like smoking, sky diving, I don't know what else, eating lots a bacon -- I don't know what you consider to be risky behaviors -- how is that relevant to the medical monitoring complaint?

MS. SHOWALTER: Your Honor, let's take the medical monitoring law of Florida as an example, and it is important to
emphasize that that is only an example because these medical monitoring claims are being brought under many states' law on behalf of the nationwide class. There are seven elements of a Florida medical monitoring claim and the fourth one of those elements -- and here I am quoting the Petito versus A.H. Robins Company case at 750 So.2d 103, the date is 1999.

The fourth element is, and I quote "as a proximate result of that exposure, Plaintiff has a significantly increased risk of contracting a serious latent disease."

That fourth element requires the Plaintiff to demonstrate that it was use of Zantac as opposed to something else that significantly increased the risk that they would contract cancer.

In the Perez versus Metabolife case, for example, that's 218 F.R.D. 262, a Southern District of Florida case, the Court observed that that, quote, "will necessarily depend upon the varied circumstances of the class members' exposure and other factors which may increase the risk of disease."

So, the search terms, for example, around smoking, around bacon eating and obesity, around a history of drinking, and other cancer risk factors go directly to that element of the individual economic loss Plaintiffs' medical monitoring claims and they are also relevant to class certification.

In that same Perez versus Metabolife case the Court declined to certify the class because of observations about
variations in, for example, health histories and other risk factors. So, that is exactly the evidence we are seeking. THE COURT: Very well. Ms. Fegan, let me let you respond to their theory of relevance, at least as to medical monitoring.

MS. FEGAN: Yes, your Honor. I think it is important to frame this that this issue just goes to 27 Plaintiffs in 12 states. So, we are not talking about a lot of nationwide laws, we are talking about 27 Plaintiffs that fit within the medical monitoring group. As we go forward and frame this, it is important to note that 84 of them are solely economic loss Plaintiffs.

Nonetheless, your Honor, whether someone eats bacon is going to be the type of question that could be asked at their deposition. So, I would not agree at all that this is relevant in the context of a deep dive in social media.

We are not contesting that these types of questions can be asked and I understand that gets into proportionality, but ultimately, your Honor, all of the types of information with respect to weight, with respect to whether they smoke, whether they drink, whether their doctors are concerned, whether their doctors require them already to be monitored and therefore for some reason the Defendants might argue that they don't need additional monitoring, that is all going to be in the medical records and that can all be developed there.

They also asserted that they intend to take the depositions of the treating physicians, so all of this is going to be explored. I will not concede that whether someone eats bacon is going to be relevant to the NDMA inquiry, but there are alternative ways to get to this information that do not require this type of deep dive into social media.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Ms. Showalter, let me shift to the other complaint, how is -- how is that same evidence, the risk factors you have talked about, how is that relevant to the economic loss complaint?

MS. SHOWALTER: Sure. As to the economic loss Plaintiffs, there are three sort of buckets of claims, consumer protection claims, warranty claims, and unjust enrichment claims. I will take as my example California law under which the economic loss class Plaintiffs have brought consumer protection claims.

In those cases there are extensive discussions of two important elements, which are reliance and materiality. Those are elements to which the evidence we are seeking about cancer risk factors is directly relevant, and $I$ will use a case to illustrate my point.

In Krouch versus Wal-Mart Stores, 2014 WestLaw 5463333, a Northern District of California case, a Plaintiff suing under the exact same statutes as the economic loss Plaintiffs here, alleged that the oil change window sticker
that Wal-Mart placed on her car caused her injury by leading her to obtain early oil changes.

Now, the Court didn't just look at the date on the sticker and Plaintiff's statement that she relied on the sticker and credit the claim. The Court looked behind the sticker at Plaintiff's actual behavior and found, based on the oil levels when she went to get a change, that it was the check engine light on which she was relying and which therefore caused her alleged damages, and not the sticker itself.

Now, here is the tie-in to our cases, the California class members are alleging that we failed to disclose facts -now I am quoting paragraph 543 from the Florida Plaintiffs' economic loss count -- "that would be considered material by a reasonable consumer, and they were in fact material to Plaintiff and the class members who consider such facts to be important to their purchase decisions."

They are alleging that the facts that Defendants allegedly failed to disclose include that there was a cancer risk related to this product. Defendants' proposed cancer search terms go directly to whether Plaintiffs relied on our alleged omissions and whether those alleged omissions were material.

Again, I will use smoking as an example. Imagine that someone is doubling their cancer risk by smoking despite clear carton warnings about cancer. We are entitled to argue that
that undercuts their purported reliance on our alleged omissions, your Honor. So, that is one example.

THE COURT: Okay. What about the other so-called cancer risk factors or risky behaviors? I understand the smoking one because the argument is you take risks all the time, therefore you wouldn't have relied on this, or it wouldn't have been material. I understand that theory of relevance.

Why does it matter if the person is obese or the person has a bad diet or likes to go sky diving or otherwise engage in risky behaviors? Why would that matter to the economic loss complaint that they are obese?

MS. SHOWALTER: We are entitled to challenge the economic loss element of materiality and reliance using evidence that people who expose themselves to a much higher risk of cancer through not just smoking, but also through diet, through drinking habits, have a weaker argument that the disclosure of a much smaller risk associated with the NDMA levels in Zantac would have changed their purchasing decision, which is what they need to show.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Fegan, I will let you respond.

MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, while that case was not cited in their brief, I would like to address it.

California law is very specific when you are talking
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about safety and safety disclosures, and the case that she cited to you did not deal with a safety disclosure. California law -- when you have an omission of a safety disclosure, or here a cancer risk warning, or the other types of things we have alleged, California law presumes reliance, and California law presumes that that disclosure would be material to a purchasing decision.

So, the idea that under California law you would have to go to each individual's purchasing history or smoking history, or whether they are chubby or not is irrelevant under California law. I am happy after this hearing to provide your Honor with several case cites on that issue.

MS. SHOWALTER: Your Honor --
MS. FEGAN: When you are talking about safety, and actually there are many states that follow that law, when you are talking about safety, materiality can be presumed on a class-wide basis.

THE COURT: Ms. Showalter, I will let you respond.
MS. SHOWALTER: Your Honor, we are entitled to evidence that could be used to rebut that presumption, and those same elements go directly to the class certification issue -- your Honor, those same issues go directly to class certification.

For example, in California in the In Re: Vioxx cases there was an affirmance of the conclusion that whether Merck's
misrepresentations about safety were material and therefore induced reliance was a matter on which individual issues predominated, and on that basis class certification was denied.

So, regardless of whether there is a presumption, we are entitled to evidence that could be used to rebut it and the same evidence goes to whether a class can be certified.

THE COURT: Thank you both very much. Let's move to the next issue.

Let's assume for the sake of further discussion that I agree there is some theory of relevance that all the evidence -- that the six categories of documents or materials that Defendants are asking for are relevant, we get over that hurdle, let's turn to proportionality and Rule 26(g).

Before I do that, Ms. Fegan, I did have to ask you one question about your spreadsheet that was appended to your letter. There is a reference in there to something called class position, and $I$ just wasn't sure what that is, we are not going to turn this over because of class position. Can you just educate me on what that is?

MS. FEGAN: Absolutely. That was just where we were taking a position that, for example, Snapchat or Instagram are not relevant for anyone because Snapchat is designed to immediately delete itself, Instagram is solely pictures. It was just our class position that even if people had those accounts we weren't going to search them.

THE COURT: I see. It wasn't that this particular Plaintiff held a particular position within the class, it was that you are taking a litigation position on behalf of all members of the class.

MS. FEGAN: That is correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying that for me. Let's go to the proportionality question here. Ms. Fegan, it is more your objection, so let me allow you to have the first word on these different things. You started to go down this road, but let me have you fully develop your argument.

MS. FEGAN: Thank you, your Honor. Perhaps I will start with the Vioxx case that Ms. Showalter just mentioned because $I$ was in that case, and there what was really critical evidence was developed either through medical records or through depositions of the Plaintiffs. We did not do search by search terms of emails, of social media, of text messages. So, clearly Vioxx shows that a defense can be developed through traditional discovery.

Your Honor, if I can, I would like to share my screen. I have tried to capture a summary of what we propose to do and why we believe it is proportional.

THE COURT: That is fine. I have read your letter, but if you want to put it up and walk me through it, that is fine.

Try now, Ms. Fegan, you should have that authority. MS. FEGAN: All right. Over the course of the last 18 months we have had a team of lawyers who have spent nearly 1500 hours communicating with our class reps, and the point of that was not just to identify the relevant documents individually, but also to identify relevant sources.

We went through questionnaires, we went through teams of people, we have done followup interviews, and we have done another round of interviews in preparation for the spreadsheets that we provided to the Court and to Defense counsel to ensure that we have a handle on exactly what repositories there were and why they should or should not be searched.

For example, we have agreed to search all text messages for all Plaintiffs. We can get to search terms in a second, but $I$ am focusing here on repositories. With respect to email, we have identified 137 email accounts that may or may not have relevant information, but are used to communicate, and so we have agreed to search those accounts.

We have identified 48 accounts, and we have identified them in our spreadsheets and that is fully disclosed, that we are proposing not to search, for example, because it is solely work related or, for example, it is only for the person to receive spam ad, but they do all of their communicating through a separate account. We have disclosed the specific reasons why we are proposing not to search those accounts.

We have similarly done the same for document repositories such as computers, laptops, tablets, USB drives, and again, we have identified all the potential locations and suggested that it would be appropriate to search 47 of them because the particular Plaintiff may keep documents on it. We don't know what they are, but it appears that we should make sure that we have used our search terms to search that.

We have proposed not to search 75 locations, and as your Honor will see, there are two main reasons in the spreadsheets for that; one, because is a work-related computer and it is only used for work-related information; or two, they don't save documents to the particular locations. Somebody might have an iPad, for example, but they do not save anything to it. Again, we have identified and disclosed all of the locations so that there is full transparency.

Similarly, we have gone through with respect to social media, and we have identified that 58 of the Plaintiffs have Facebook accounts, 27 have Twitter accounts, and 28 have WhatsApp accounts. WhatsApp is kind of a messaging service that may be used similar to text messages.

THE COURT: You need to update this because Facebook has changed its name in the last week. They own WhatsApp.

MS. FEGAN: That's true. Then, your Honor, we have suggested -- and this is kind of the class position column -with respect to social media not to be searched, it's

Instagram, TikTok and Snapchat, but we have nonetheless gone through and identified which Plaintiffs have each of those types of social media applications.

I think focusing here we have really done our due diligence in terms of identifying appropriate sources, and sources are separate from how they will be searched, but the idea that we would go search work emails or work-related laptops, or that type of thing, really does not make sense, and there is no support in the case law for that type of search. We have also gone through and identified search terms that would identify information related to Zantac, Ranitidine or NDMA, which is a portion of the search that we have already conducted, but we will do it again in these additional social media locations.

We have also identified certain risk factors related to the reasons that people were taking Zantac. We have used very broad terms to capture lawsuits, Plaintiff, class action, class representative, and then anything related to the Defendants or to the stores at which they bought Zantac.

That particular search is very broad and broader than what Defendants suggested in terms of the stores. For example, we are going to get a whole lot of CVS ads and potentially receipts that are completely unrelated, but in the first instance we have agreed to collect them and then do the review of them.

THE COURT: Before you move on, if I could go back real quick just to your -- that one, okay.

I understood when you talked about the repositories, you said the 75 that you are not going to search, you are not going to search them because they were either in a work only computer or the person doesn't save documents to that device.

MS. FEGAN: That is generally correct. There were a couple, I believe -- and I can pull up the spreadsheets. There were a couple that said they only save pictures to a USB drive. We put the reasons why we wouldn't search it in there.

THE COURT: Okay. On the email, and you may have said this and $I$ just didn't capture it, the 48 email accounts that you are proposing not to search, what is the dividing line there? Why are you determining those emails should not be searched? Is it because they are only work email accounts or something like that?

MS. FEGAN: Many of them are work email accounts. Some of them -- the person, for example, identified that they had an $A O L$ account or a hot mail account a long time ago, they said they haven't accessed it, they don't know how to access it, but we disclosed it because we wanted it to be clear so they do not contest that at their deposition.

Some of the people said that they just get spam there. So, they have a main email account, so for some people we identified more than one email account and we said, here is
their main gmail account, this is where they get all their communication and we'll search that. Here is the one that they use when somebody asks for their email, and all the spam is going to go there.

THE COURT: I have one of those and use it for shopping only.

MS. FEGAN: Exactly. I will say that shopping only, for example, where they would get their CVS receipts, we did delve into that to ensure we weren't excluding an account where that type of information might lie. So, we have gone through and done that due diligence.

THE COURT: Let me push you to the right side of this chart. What is the factual basis for excluding the Instagram, TikTok, and Snapchat accounts? I think you covered this in your letter, but I want to give you a chance to flesh that out further if you'd like to.

MS. FEGAN: Thank you, your Honor. Instagram is solely pictures, and we don't believe that pictures are relevant. The idea that we go through and identify people holding a cigarette or people sky diving or people on their family vacations -- Instagram is going to be mostly family vacations. The idea that we would have to produce every family vacation where somebody potentially used sun screen because they were on the beach, that can be explored in a deposition. That would just be an overwhelming and fairly
useless production.
With respect to TikTok, your Honor, TikTok is videos that people post. I am not sure if your Honor has been on TikTok.

THE COURT: I know how it works. I can't say I have been on it personally, but $I$ am familiar with what TikTok is and how it works.

MS. FEGAN: People doing dances to preset tunes. We don't believe that there is going to be anything on there.

Again, we talked to them, to the individual Plaintiffs, and nothing about what they have said leads us to believe that anything that they have posted would be relevant to this case. And again, that can be explored and challenged in their deposition, and we are happy to revisit that, but from what we can tell, and having talked to each of the Plaintiffs to confirm, producing their dance videos of their daughters isn't really going to add much to this case.

THE COURT: Okay. And Snapchat?
MS. FEGAN: Snapchat, your Honor, is designed to -the whole purpose of it is designed to immediately delete.

It is not something that we have the ability to change, the way that Snapchat works, but even notwithstanding that, we did talk to each of the 13 people that have Snapchat accounts to confirm that -- for example, one of them just uses it to speak with her daughters, they send funny pictures with
filers on them back and forth to each other. It is not the type of thing that they are using as their communication system for important things like lawsuits, or cancer, or health. It is a fun way to communicate and send silly pictures.

Again, that is something that can be challenged and discussed and the person can be deposed about, but as a general matter, this is not the type of account that is relevant.

THE COURT: Thank you. I cut you off, I think you had moved several slides further into your presentation, so let me let you catch up.

MS. FEGAN: Thank you, your Honor. I covered the Plaintiffs' search terms with respect to searchable information. We have also proposed for Facebook and Twitter profiles to do a linear review, and a linear review is not the use of search terms because this is the type of information that cannot be downloaded in a traditional way and search terms run on it.

So we have offered to go into each person's Facebook account that we have identified and actually look at all of their posts and see if there is anything in there related to any health or medical condition. So, if they are posting about cancer, if they are posting about a reaction to the COVID vaccine, whatever it may be, if it is related to a health or medical condition we have agreed to pull that and produce it, as well as lawsuits.

Again, we didn't limit it to cancer-related lawsuits, but we would go through and actually screen shot and pull that information and produce it.

So, this linear review in the context of the amount of time that it would take us is not captured by the amount of time in Mr. Forrest's declaration where he talks about using search terms and collecting information and how long that might take, but this is something that we think is the most appropriate way to go about it and the least burdensome in terms of just having an attorney look at all the posts in somebody's feed for production.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. FEGAN: I will stop screen sharing, your Honor, unless you have other questions about this.

THE COURT: Not about this, I don't think. Let me look at my notes here. No. I will let you continue if you have any further on your argument on proportionality.

MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, I think we are about at the end here. I think the case law is clear that the idea that there is one post of two Plaintiffs holding cigarettes doesn't justify for every Plaintiff these deep dives that are being suggesting.

Certainly the Plaintiffs that they have identified, they can look at the medical records, they can test it with the treating physicians, they can use that to challenge the
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Plaintiffs, but identifying one picture for a particular Plaintiff does not justify a deep dive into all Plaintiffs for all reasons.

All of the case law is very clear and recognizes that this is expensive and it is not proportional, that the amount of time it would take for someone to review all the pictures they posted on social media is really not relevant, and the cases we have cited recognize, even where there were just ten search terms the Court thought that it would not be appropriate to use those to do a deep dive into social media.

I will actually note that there is a case that just came out this morning, it is in Law 360. There, to the extent that there was a production, the Court limited it to one day, even though it related to an employment issue that had gone on for years relating to someone posting discriminatory things on Facebook related to videos that the person watched that were related to white supremacy, and the magistrate just said the idea that somebody would have to go through years and years of social media is disproportionate to being able to develop through testimony what you are suggesting would otherwise be a deep dive.

So, your Honor, we do ask that the Court look very closely at what we have offered to do, because we haven't taken the position that we won't do it; we just think it needs to be proportional to the needs of the case.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Fegan. You sort of said they can explore that in deposition and see where that leads. Is it your view -- let's say hypothetically they explore this in deposition, and based upon that, they want to then come back to the Court and say, okay -- let's assume I rule in your favor, and they depose your person and your person goes, oh, yeah, there is a whole lot of pictures of me smoking and complaining and whatevering on my social media which we never looked for.

Do you believe that under the current scheduling order the Defendants would be allowed to then say, hey, we want that, give it to us?

MS. FEGAN: I think there are two pieces to that question that $I$ would like to address. The first is, just as we did with Defendants, where information was identified at depositions that hadn't originally been searched, for example, there were particular text messages from one of the Defendant's witnesses that hadn't been searched, then during a deposition we identified that there was relevant information there, we met and conferred, and the Defendant produced it. That is the normal way that this goes about.

If it comes out in a deposition that there is information somewhere that wasn't caught through this process, we are happy to meet and confer.

Your Honor, with respect to the specific example that
you brought up of pictures of smoking, if it is in their depo that they smoked, I don't know that you need a hundred pictures of them smoking. I think there is a balance there to what we are talking about.

If there is a repository that has relevant information that would be caught with search terms, we are happy to meet and confer, but pictures is a thing that, as a general matter, we think is cumulative and disproportionate.

THE COURT: Let me change my hypothetical slightly just so the record is clear. Let's say they testify in their deposition, oh, you know what, I recently remembered I had a different email account that I never told my lawyer about and so that has never been searched.

MS. FEGAN: We would agree to run the search terms, your Honor, absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay. That sort of circles back to one of my first questions of Ms. Showalter, which was, are we doing discovery on the whole case here or are we just doing discovery on class cert? You all are the MDL experts, this is my first one, so I am learning as I go.

I assume, if we get past Daubert and we get past all the other things that Judge Rosenberg is going to do, and the cases get remanded back to their mother ships, there is some additional discovery done at that point, isn't there, on the individual cases?

MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, the class works slightly differently. We do full class merits discovery at this stage and really it is presented at the motion for class certification. Post class certification, if the cases get remanded back to their original courts, they go back as a class and really at that point we are focused on $26(a)(2)$ reports in terms of liability and damages for trial.

So, some of that is presented with the class reports and some of that is going into trial, but at that point we represent a certified class and it becomes about the aggregate and not the individual.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Fegan. Ms. Showalter, you have been very patient, let me allow you to respond to Ms. Fegan's presentation.

MS. SHOWALTER: Of course. There is a lot to unpack there, your Honor.

THE COURT: Take your time, go slowly for Ms. Stipes, and I'm here to listen. Go ahead.

MS. SHOWALTER: Wonderful. Speaking a bit off the top, because I have seen some of their content, but not those exact slides, starting with the sources that Plaintiffs have set forward as the sources that they are not agreeing to search, so it struck me that in the final box they did not include Twitter Messenger, Facebook Messenger.

Their papers are very clear that what they are
proposing to do is a linear review of the feed, but they are declining to search those messaging services, and it is unclear to us why that is when they are used exactly the same way as text messages, and perhaps by some people even more frequently, so those I didn't see.

I also wanted to note that on the search term slide there is some degree of dissidence between what Plaintiffs have said they searched for and the search terms of ours that they are now rejecting.

For example, Plaintiffs have said that they are agreeing to produce information about lawsuits that have to do with cancer, but they have declined many of our search terms that we are proposing they run through, for example, email that go directly to cancer related lawsuits about talc or about asbestos.

I don't see any substantive search terms they have proposed that get at those same issues other than the word "lawsuit", which we would say is unduly narrow, your Honor, and might exclude someone discussing, for example, if they said talc case or asbestos case.

THE COURT: Let me pause you, Ms. Showalter, for a second. I am going to ask Ms. Fegan to respond to your inquiry, because that will inform how you want to deal with the Twitter Messenger and Facebook Messenger. As to the specific search terms, let's put that to the side for the time being.

I'll talk to you about my view on search terms when we get to that. Let's address that separately, if we could.

Ms. Fegan, you didn't talk in your remarks, although it was in the papers, about how you were going to deal with Facebook Messenger and Twitter Messenger. Can you clarify for us what your position is on that?

MS. FEGAN: Yes, your Honor, and I apologize for omitting it from the presentation, but it was in our documents. We have taken the position that it is not relevant. We have -- again, we have disclosed specifically each person that has a messenger -- because they have a Facebook account, you automatically have a Messenger account; same with Twitter, if you have a Twitter account, you automatically have a Twitter Messenger account.

We have gone through and spoken to every Plaintiff and, as a general matter, that is not where they communicate information that is at all relevant. Some people use Facebook Messenger, for example, just with respect to Facebook Marketplace because they sell jewelry on Facebook. Others use it just for their Oculus gaming system.

So, we have gone through and determined that it is not a place where there is relevant information, and again, they can test that during depositions.

But I will also note that, unlike text messages and emails, Messenger is not something that you can just pop in and
run search terms on. Even if it is downloaded, it is not downloaded clean, it is not downloaded pretty, Facebook and Twitter make it very difficult, so there is also a burden and cost that doesn't make sense given what we have learned from our Plaintiffs in terms of the lack of relevant information there.

THE COURT: Thank you for clarifying that.
Ms. Showalter, now that you don't have a moving target anymore, I will let you respond.

MS. SHOWALTER: First I will respond to the remarks that Ms. Fegan just gave. Our declaration that we submitted sets out that you can freely download, for example, your Facebook Messenger account and the search terms --

THE COURT: Hold on one second. I muted that
individual. Go ahead, Ms. Showalter.
MS. SHOWALTER: Our position is that this can be done easily at little to no cost. It won't surprise you, your Honor, that we don't find satisfactory that Plaintiffs simply didn't recollect as a general matter that there was nothing relevant to the issues in this case in their messenger.

This goes directly to the same issue we have with the argument that we can simply figure out during depositions where there might be relevant ESI.

So, the first problem with that is that, as we are painfully aware, all you are entitled to on the day of the
deposition is the Plaintiff's best recollection on that day, and we have all seen many times that those recollections can be incomplete or inaccurate without any intent on the part of the deponent. They simply happen not to remember.

We are entitled to evidence about which to question these Plaintiffs during their deposition, and this goes directly to the argument that the combination of depositions and medical records should suffice for our purposes. It is not surprising that Courts in MDLs like this one frequently require the production of medical records and also the production of some Plaintiffs' personal ESI, because there can be inconsistencies in medical records.

For purposes of this argument, I happened to flip through the 27 medical monitoring Plaintiffs' records before this hearing, and I found at least four examples of medical records where there was a record saying a Plaintiff was a former smoker, and then sometime after that, a record saying they were never a smoker.

There is a clear conflict there, and I don't know how that conflict would be resolved during a deposition of any of these specific people, but one could imagine they might take the position I am actually a never smoker, or that was a scrivener's error, or someone heard me incorrectly, and if there is a contemporaneous picture of that person with a cigarette on social media, we are entitled to show that person
that photo and say, you have testified here today that you are not a smoker, this is a picture of you smoking that came from your social media account. This is important separate contemporaneous evidence that we are entitled to to inform our depositions.

Your Honor, you asked a question that goes to this, but I think it bears reiterating. The timeline here is tight, and the idea that we would set depositions of 110 people and their health care providers, and then after those depositions search social media, get productions, do additional depositions where needed, it just isn't realistic under the schedule that the MDL Court has provided, and as to Plaintiffs' statements about declining to search Instagram, TikTok, and Snapchat.

So, first of all, we disagree for the reasons I have just explained with the blanket position that photos and videos are irrelevant to the issues in this case.

It is also not true, your Honor, that that is all those sources contain. There are direct messaging features, or DMs, on Instagram, on TikTok, on Snapchat, where Plaintiffs can effectively text each other back and forth for all intents and purposes. Those are also a part of what can be collected and searched in those sources.

Your Honor, it is also not true that Snapchat is purely ephemeral. We cite a big sanctions case in our brief about that precise issue, that there is content that is
retained on Snapchat that is searchable, that is proper ESI discoverable in a case like this.

Your Honor, this, I just have to reiterate, is our one bite at the apple as to these 110 people's individual cases as to class certification in a nationwide MDL, the putative class for which encompasses millions of people and which is seeking billions of dollars in damages.

We have proposed search terms that we think are narrowly tailored, but it is also worth mentioning that there wasn't much of a discussion about them up until this point. We provided them, they responded with their 13, and it isn't that there isn't productive room at the margins to tailor it at all further. You know, this is where we are today and we just think that wholly excluding these searches based on blanket assertions about what can be done through depositions and medical records and the relevance of pictures and videos is just highly prejudicial.

THE COURT: Understood. Okay. I will come back to search terms in one second.

Let me ask, Ms. Fegan, can you respond directly to their expert's position that Twitter Messenger and Facebook Messenger, it isn't that hard to download and search?

I took a quick look at your chart while I was listening to Ms. Showalter. My quick looking at the column of Twitter Messenger, I think there were less than ten people for
which you said they even had a Twitter Messenger account that they used. Can you respond to that argument?

Your position seems to be you can't do it, it is very burdensome, it is hard to do. Their expert says, no, it is not, there is a free tool, just go do it. Can you just address that?

MS. FEGAN: Yes, your Honor. There are two pieces to it. My first position was that we did talk to them about those sources and determined that they don't use them in the way that Ms. Showalter is suggesting. So, what I am suggesting in the first instance is there is not going to be relevant information there.

In the second instance, they talked a lot about free tools. Free tools are not how we are going to go about this. We are going to go about this through an expert who can do the appropriate collection, and when it is downloaded, it doesn't download in the traditional sense of being clean, but there are ways to do it, it just takes more time and it is disproportionate given the fact that we have done the leg work to talk to the Plaintiffs and identify relevant spaces.

On that point, your Honor, there is something that I would like to note. During the course of working on discovery with Defendants, and in particular Sanofi, the issue came up about the use of teams, and the use of teams is another chatting function that is used in corporations, and Sanofi
said, look, we have talked to all of our people, and they use it to schedule meetings, they use it to do this or that. They don't use it for substantive discussions.

We went down that path, and at the end of the day, part of discovery is not the other side saying you have to exhaust every repository; it's you have to speak with your clients, you have to understand where potential information may exist and then you have to disclose what you are or aren't searching.

So, this idea that the Defendants now want to say just because a repository exists it must be searched is beyond what discovery requires.

Your Honor, I am not aware of any other class action, MDL or not, that has required what the Defendants are suggesting here.

THE COURT: Okay. Just real quick, and I will turn back to Ms. Showalter, when you said -- I asked Facebook Messenger and Twitter Messenger, you said you conferred with your clients, and $I$ think you said they said they don't use it for that purpose, and $I$ just want to be careful.

There is a difference between saying -- for example, I have a Twitter account, I don't do much with it. I probably have a Twitter Messenger account somewhere, I have never used it because I couldn't figure out how to use it if I wanted to. I have a Facebook account, which I don't use very much, and we
have a Facebook Messenger functionality that my children use to communicate with my wife and me, but we don't use it for anything else.

I just want to be clear, when you are making this representation right now and in the spreadsheet, if it says on the spreadsheet no, is that that the client says $I$ have Twitter Messenger and I don't use it at all, or $I$ have Twitter Messenger, but $I$ don't use it for these purposes?

MS. FEGAN: Where we have said no, the N is intended to mean that they don't have it. Where we have said yes -- and I think we have tried to be very clear with respect to Facebook Messenger and Twitter, although we didn't go into reasons, we disclosed if they do have it.

What we could update the Court with and certainly Defendants with is what each person told us in terms of for example, one person only uses it for selling jewelry on Facebook Messenger, another only uses it in connection with his Oculus gaming VR system.

So, just because it exists doesn't mean that it is a relevant repository. That is part of the leg work we have done and the representations that we are making to the Court.

Your Honor, I would like to note one thing. It wasn't until after Defendants insisted on this hearing that they gave us their search terms. We have been going down this path for 18 months, and we are really at a time where it is time to
narrow, determine what the relevant issues are, get to the discovery and get to depositions.

THE COURT: I understand. I am going to deal with search warrants -- search terms -- sadly, most of what I know about all these messenger services and Facebook is from signing search warrants where the Government is going to get all this stuff. Anyway, search terms in a second.

Ms. Showalter, I want to give you a chance to respond to the one thing -- well, you can respond to anything else you want, but in particular, Ms. Fegan just said they are not aware of any other class action or large scale MDL where this level of social media related discovery has been ordered. Do you have an example where that has been addressed? And then otherwise address any other comments that Ms. Fegan has made.

MS. SHOWALTER: Sure. Let me first start with some other comments she has made, and then $I$ might call on Mr. Oot because $I$-- this is also my first MDL, your Honor, but I believe that similar social media discovery was ordered in the TDF litigation where I think Facebook Messenger has been one of the largest produced ESI sources, and in the Essure litigation.

We are by no means asking for something novel here, and I want to reiterate, your Honor, with respect to questioning Plaintiffs about whether generally there is anything relevant on their messaging history, that is problematic for clear reasons. To the extent it is true that
only 30 some-odd or 40 some-odd people have this freely downloadable, easily searchable source in a billion-dollar case, we think that there is no reason why they shouldn't go about collecting that ESI and running the search terms.

It is essentially taking the same position that we should just go into a deposition and ask Plaintiffs whether they have any recollection about ever posting or messaging something related to these topics. All you are getting is their best recollection on that day, unless Plaintiffs are representing that their clients were in real time going back and looking at what they had in fact messaged.

THE COURT: I guess the question is this: What is the baseline we start from? You seem to start from the assumption that the evidence you want exists, and they need to go find it because it exists. I don't know that that is the right baseline. Why is there reason to believe that on anybody's Facebook Messenger feed there is going to be relevant evidence? MS. SHOWALTER: I think, your Honor, the question arises on behalf of Defense because we have 110 people here who are concerned enough about their exposure that they have sued, and across those 110 people, and across what we see as relevant topics as broad as cancer risk factors like smoking, excessive drinking, obesity, people are saying that they have nothing in their ESI that is relevant to those topics.

It is a surprising assertion, your Honor, when you
consider how much the average American uses various social media platforms and the various categories of evidence we are talking about, that there is truly one page of producible ESI in this case.

THE COURT: I hear you, I understand that, but one could also say, well, they need to go search their trash can because they may have thrown out a picture of them smoking and they need to go look through every scrapbook they have going back to when they were 18 years old, and all the pictures of them from college because maybe they were drinking at a college party.

There is a point at which -- that is when the proportionality rule kicks in, that is my job. I understand. So, I am not necessarily disagreeing with you, but you understand to sit there and simply say they have to look everywhere that $I$ can think of because there might be something that I might want to use is a lot of mights piled on top of one another and it gets speculative after a point, doesn't it?

MS. SHOWALTER: That is not what we are asking for, your Honor. We are asking for productions related to commonly used social media sources, sources that are used to communicate and post information. We are not asking Plaintiffs to go through their trash cans. We are asking for discovery of traditional ESI sources in a multi district litigation.

THE COURT: I understand that, but again, can you make
that as a cross-cutting statement? Let me tell you, my parents could be Plaintiffs in this lawsuit, you know, they -- I have disclosed this, my father took Zantac. He is 88 years old, there is no chance he has a Facebook Messenger account or Twitter feed or anything of that sort.

I understand for certain generations of people the use of social media is ubiquitous and there is reason to believe there would be evidence, but how do I make the generalized conclusion that across these 110 people all of them are going to have this and therefore it should be looked for?

MS. SHOWALTER: In the case of someone like your Honor's father where there is no account, of course we wouldn't require a search. That seems to be the case for many, many of these Plaintiffs, that there simply is no messenger, there is no active email, there is no Twitter, and we can't ask Plaintiffs to search a source that doesn't exist. We acknowledge that, we are not fighting that point.

THE COURT: I guess where you are drawing the line is that they are trying to exclude certain sources based upon the client saying that was only a work email, I never used it for anything other than work, or it is my spam account that $I$ use for junk spam, or $I$ don't save anything on that device, things of that sort.

So, you are objecting to the Plaintiffs making that kind of unilateral decision that we are going to accept that
representation from the client, not go behind it, not double check it, and we are just going to accept it and act upon it.

At a high level, is that kind of where your objection is, that their process doesn't go far enough, that they shouldn't rely on the clients' representation and they should go beyond that?

MS. SHOWALTER: As to these critical sources of information, your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: All right. That's helpful, thank you very much. I apologize, Ms. Showalter, I sort of took you aside and asked you some questions. If you want to go back and respond further to anything else, $I$ will let you look at your notes, and if you want to phone a friend to Mr. Oot, I think you get at least one of those. So, you can talk to him if you need to.

MS. SHOWALTER: I think that the only other that I would emphasize, your Honor, is $I$ just don't want to stray away from the point that there are wholesales sources that are being excluded here, right, not just because they have asked a client and it doesn't exist, but because they are just asserting there is unlikely to be any relevant information there in anybody's account.

I just don't want that point to get lost in the shuffle, and I certainly don't want to silence Mr. Oot, but I think having cited TDF and Essure, those are two examples of litigations where this material has been produced.

THE COURT: Thank you. I am certainly not suggesting Mr. Oot needs to speak, but you mentioned he might want to speak up. If you do, I am happy to hear from him, but if there is nothing else to add -- Mr. Oot, anything else you want to add in terms of answering that particular question about other large scale MDLs or classes where this sort of discovery was ordered?

MR. OOT: Yes, your Honor. Ms. Showalter is doing a great job. I will just add that Judge Milazzo in the Taxotere litigation and Judge North ruled that social media is relevant. There is even a required certification under pretrial order 71-A that Plaintiffs need to submit to saying that they searched the relevant sources, and we could provide that to your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Pretrial order 71-A in this case or in the Taxotere litigation?

MR. OOT: In the Taxotere litigation.
THE COURT: I can find it. Thank you. Look, I hear you. Ms. Fegan, correct me if $I$ am wrong, $I$ don't hear the Plaintiffs saying social media is irrelevant and it shouldn't be searched. I hear them saying they are making a proportionality argument, some should be searched and some shouldn't, and we are just disagreeing about where that line is.

Am I correct, Ms. Fegan, you are not making a
categorical argument that social media in toto should not be searched?

MS. FEGAN: Correct, your Honor. We followed the same exact path that the Defendants did in terms of their clients identifying the relevant depositories and offering to search those. That is the process we went through as we went through meet and confers with the Defendants, and they said, look, we need to focus here on this marketing repository, but not on this human resources category, and that is the way that discovery works.

We would not ask the Defendants to go run our search terms in their human resources functions because they have talked to their clients and there wouldn't be relevant information as we have defined it here. It is a balancing, and certainly as lawyers, our job is to work with our clients and make representations to the court and then allow those representations to be tested and meet and confer if it is discovered that there is something we didn't know about.

That is the normal discovery process, your Honor, particularly here where we are talking about already having invested 1500 hours with each of these Plaintiffs and we are suggesting basically starting anew, and we have suggested a process that makes sense based on the education and the information we have already gathered.

THE COURT: Again, to summarize your position, tying
it back to the rules, Rule $26(g)$ doesn't require -- I should just quote Mr. Oot, last year he made this argument better than I am going to make it now, but that it doesn't require a comprehensive review of every document and every source known to mankind. It requires a reasonable search under all of the circumstances to try to find discoverable evidence, but it is not endless.

Your position is, the process you laid out to me is a reasonable process and what it has generated, to the extent you are not looking -- I am sorry, that the outcome it has generated is proportional to the needs of the case. And Ms. Showalter is saying it is not a reasonable process because you should be downloading it to these free tools, you should have a common ESI hub, and should be searching in different techniques, and therefore it is not proportional to the needs of the case.

Ms. Fegan, did I more or less summarize your position correctly as applying it to the rule?

MS. FEGAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Showalter, did I more or less summarize your position at a high level, applying it to the rules? You are saying their process is not reasonable under Rule $26(\mathrm{~g})$, and therefore what they are proposing is not proportional to the needs of the case, you need more?

MS. SHOWALTER: Correct, your Honor, that both the
process itself is deficient in its operation and in its scope. THE COURT: Okay, that is helpful. Thank you. I am not going to rule from the bench today on this one, $I$ have a lot to think about and $I$ want to go back and review some of the materials before I -- but I will get a written order out very quickly because $I$ know this is an important topic for everybody.

Let me talk about two other issues, the first one is somewhat easy, the second one I am going to make easy for me and hard for you.

The easy one is, I think the Defendants asked for individualized Rule 26(g) certifications. Technically, there is no such thing as a Rule 26(g) certification, it is the signing of the discovery response that is the certification under the rule. That is usually when you are in a one party or two party case and it's a little easier to say, when you get this signed by a Defense lawyer, it is certifying for that one Defendant. Here, if the Plaintiffs sign it, are they signing it for 110 people? It gets a little more confusing.

I am going to throw this back to you in this way, going all the way back to what I said when the tables were turned. I think there is a need for transparency and I think there is a need that the Defendants are entitled to walk the Plaintiffs down to what they did, what they have given, what they are holding back and why. You were very good about
following that to date.
At the end of the process, whatever rulings I make, there will then be a process after my rulings, and at some point that will end. At that point, I do believe that the Defendants are entitled to have some certification from the Plaintiffs that everything that is coming has come, there is nothing else we're holding back, et cetera, the equivalent of what Rule $26(g)$ would require.

So, you can do an amended discovery response, you can work amongst yourselves and come up with some other certification. I am not going to micro manage that process. I don't imagine the Plaintiffs are objecting to providing that sort of representation at the end of the process.

Am I correct, Ms. Fegan?
MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, generally, that is correct. I am objecting to what they propose to be a Rule 26(g) certification, but I have no issue with, as we go through this and the scope of the Court's order, doing amended responses to the RFPs and being very clear for each person, like we did in our spreadsheet, about what was searched and what it was searched for. We have tried to be very transparent and there would be no reason for us to change tacks.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to order you to do that, but the format in which that sort of transparent assurance is done, I am going to let you work that out with the other side.

I am not adopting their proposal, you haven't been heard on that. I am confident that the parties, and if necessary with the special master, can come up with an inoffensive document that everybody can agree to and can sign. I will leave it at that.

Let me circle up to search terms. Here is my view on search terms, folks. You know your case better than I do, so what $I$ generally say when parties come to me and say they can't decide on search terms is, you can each submit your proposed search terms, and me knowing absolutely nothing about the deep intricacies of your case, I will pick one or the other. I may not have a rational process by which I can pick one or the other, but I will pick one, and that is what I will order and you will live with it; or you can continue to talk to each other and try to agree on search terms, which is always the preferred method here.

So, I will give you that option. I haven't issued my ruling yet, but when $I$ issue my ruling $I$ will leave open the question of which -- if you all want to live on the two proposed sets of search terms you have submitted to me I will pick one. I am not going to split the baby, I am not going to share. I am going to pick one or the other.

If you want to talk amongst yourselves and either propose agreed upon search terms, or each side wants to propose modified search terms, I will pick one or the other. I am not
going to split the baby.
That is the process $I$ employ with search terms. I try to push it back on the parties because I am just not in a position to really assess that at the depth that you can assess it. I joke when I say I won't impose a rational process. I will, but my rational process is not going to be as good as what you can develop on your own, but if you want to, that is the way I do it. Each side submits a proposal and I pick one.

Any questions about that, Ms. Fegan?
MS. FEGAN: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Ms. Showalter?
MS. SHOWALTER: No questions about that, your Honor, I suppose just the observation that depending on how you rule, there has been no explanation of how search terms will be applied under the methodology they are proposing for some of these. I assume we would have that conversation once we learn more from you.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you for clarifying that. My intention is, $I$ am going to do an order that addresses three of the four questions maybe that $I$ have framed for this hearing, right.

What are the relevant topics, although I think we have really narrowed that down substantially, but it seems to me there is still some dispute as to whether some of the cancer risk factors and some of the risky behavior evidence is really
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discoverable and should be searched for at all. I will resolve that issue.

I will presage that one, $I$ am inclined to find that it is relevant. I think Ms. Showalter has articulated as to both the medical monitoring and the economic loss complaint a theory under which that sort of evidence could be relevant. I am going to give it deeper thought, but that is my inclination right now.

Then I have to resolve the question of what needs to be searched, and that is what we have really been talking about here. Do the Plaintiffs need -- is the Plaintiffs' -- the process that the Plaintiffs have laid out, is that enough under Rule 26(g)? Do they need to do more? Do they need to look at Facebook Messenger, do they need to look at Twitter Messenger? I need to resolve that issue. Okay.

After I resolve those two issues, then I think we can get to the question of having now been told what they have look for and where they have to look for it, you can maybe talk and say, okay, given the Judge's rulings, now we know what search terms to apply.

Because if I rule that you are not entitled to evidence of cancer risk factors, then all those search terms drop out. If I say you are entitled to them, maybe the Plaintiffs are more pliable about agreeing to some search terms that target that because now they know they are going to have
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to do it.

So, yes, Ms. Showalter, that is a long way to answering your observation, but also clarifying for the parties that that is my intention, is to issue an order as to the first two issues, and then throw it back to you as to agreed upon search terms and as to the fourth issue, which was the certification.

MS. SHOWALTER: Understood.

THE COURT: Any other questions, sort of either process related questions or clarifications, Ms. Showalter, on behalf of the Defense?

MS. SHOWALTER: I just want to make absolutely clear, as to the second issue, you will be ruling both on what they are required to search and how they are being required to search it. So, on our contentions, for example, that a linear review of Facebook does not capture posts on other people's walls or comments and it's -- okay.

THE COURT: I phrased it maybe the flip side of what you are talking about, which is whether their proposed process comports with Rule 26(g). If it does not, I have to think about whether if $I$ say it does not, I am going to then tell them what they have to do to get it to comply with Rule $26(\mathrm{~g})$, or whether $I$ will just say it doesn't comply with Rule 26(g), give me a proposal for how you can get there. I am not there every day, $I$ don't know.

Yes, Ms. Showalter, does that clarify your question? MS. SHOWALTER: Yes, your Honor, thank you. THE COURT: All right. Ms. Fegan. MS. FEGAN: She just mentioned something that we haven't discussed, so I would like to address it. She mentioned, for example, if $I$ am on my Facebook profile and I don't make a post, but $I$ am scrolling through and $I$ post on somebody's wall, hey, you look fat, or that outfit makes you look chubby, that type of information is not information that you just download. There is an activity section and it requires an entirely different process.

So, I just want to be clear, when we talk about Facebook, we have offered to do a linear review of posts somebody has made, all their vacation pictures, all their pictures of them smoking, all their posts about whether smoking is good for you or not, all the lawsuits they have been involved in, but we would object to this idea that $I$ need to produce the post of me being rude to you and telling you that you look chubby in whatever outfit you're wearing. I do want to be very clear about that.

Secondarily, your Honor, I appreciate the process that you have set out. It sounds like it is going to be iterative as we go forward, so just in terms of timing, I want to be sure that when we get there, that it is going to take time to work with each of these Plaintiffs because it is not a centralized
system, and one of the ways that we have thought about this, just to put a thought in your Honor's court, although we don't necessarily need to rule on it now, is that part of the discovery protocol for the Defendants, and $I$ believe it is PTO 54, required (inaudible) file productions 15 days before a deposition.

So, one of the ways that we may start to think about this as we go forward, because the Defendants are starting to push us for deposition dates, and we think it is appropriate to start talking about a deposition plan, is this could be a way to roll it out and do it in a way that is not 115 people in 30 days, which is what Defendants want us to do, but doing it in a way that is going to be reasonable, controllable, and manageable as we go through and working with all the 100 plus class members.

THE COURT: Again, the parties can work through that. You have worked through a lot more complicated things than that issue. It would seem to me, for example -- well, to the extent the Plaintiffs have already agreed they are going to produce certain things, I assume they are in the process of collecting and processing and producing, or should be, producing and collecting all the stuff you have already agreed to produce.

To the extent -- I'm sorry, yes, Ms. Fegan.
MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, I want it to be clear that we are going to apply -- we have already produced a lot. We are
going to apply these search terms one time in this next process. So, we are not going to take it and do multiple iterative groups of search terms. So, once we get the set search terms, and whatever your Honor orders us to run them on, they will be run or the linear review will be conducted. We are not doing searches of 111 now and another set in 30 days. THE COURT: Understood. That is beyond the scope of what I am going to rule on today, but I understand. Yes, Ms. Showalter, go ahead. MS. SHOWALTER: I just wanted to respond briefly on the Facebook. This gets to the how issue here, right, is that that advocates for a very one-sided collection just of things people have posted on their walls, not of what they have posted in groups, not of what they have messaged privately, not of what they have posted on other people's walls, and I will direct you to our declarations by X1 and by Mr. Acker. Those things can be centrally downloaded, search terms will be applied, and clearly things like the example Ms. Fegan gave would drop out in a relevance review of these posts.

THE COURT: I understand.
MR. OOT: Your Honor, may I say one thing?
THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Oot.
MR. OOT: It's related to the linear review and I think this was also covered in the declaration. A liner review of a social media feed is not a chronological review, so you
are not necessarily capturing everything in the feed because Facebook has an algorithm that runs and presents information to you as you are looking at the feed. That is why we are suggesting using litigation support tools like X1 and the tools that Mr. Acker suggested.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. Let me go back one last time. Ms. Showalter, I don't think $I$ have actually ruled on anything, but not waiving any objections you may have to anything I have said or done here this morning, have $I$ at least addressed all the issues and given you the opportunity to be heard on all the issues you wanted to be heard on this morning?

MS. SHOWALTER: Yes, your Honor, you have given me the opportunity to be heard on all those issues. I would just reiterate the importance of our declarations as it goes to the importance of the collection method here.

THE COURT: I understand. Ms. Fegan, again, not waiving any objections you might have either today or later to whatever I have said or done this morning, have you at least been heard on all of the issues you want to be heard on?

MS. FEGAN: Yes, your Honor. I would also ask that you take a look specifically at pages 5 and 6 of Mr. Forrest's declaration.

THE COURT: I did read both declarations before today, but I will be happy to go back and read them again.

All right. Well, thank you, everybody, it has been a very interesting hearing. I have some work to do. I will try to get an order out as quickly as I can. For the time being, we will be in recess, and I look forward to actually meeting some of you in person in a few weeks.

Have a good day, everybody, and have a good weekend. (Thereupon, the hearing was concluded.)
* * *
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| $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 13 & 23 / 24 & 24 / 22 & 27 / 14\end{array}$ | easy [3] 50/9 50/9 50/11 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 10/8 } & 10 / 25 & 11 / 8 & 11 / 14 \\ 11 / 15\end{array}$ |
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| $\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 10 & 39 / 3 & 39 / 4 & 39 / 5 & 39 / 15 \\ 39 / 18 & 40 / 2 & 40 / 22 & 41 / 13 & 42 / 1\end{array}$ | economic [18] 3/5 4/23 8/3 |  |
| $45 / 8 \quad 47 / 3 \quad 51 / 4 \quad 51 / 9 \quad 51 / 23$ | 9/15 9/21 9/21 9/23 10/8 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 43 / 14 & 43 / 17 & 44 / 2 & 45 / 8 & 49 / 6\end{array}$ |
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| 54/13 $54 / 13$ 54/14 $55 / 1 \quad 55 / 22$ | $17 / 1454 / 5$ | exact [3] $15 / 24$ $32 / 21$ $48 / 4$ <br> exactly [5] $11 / 9$ $14 / 2$ $21 / 11$ |
| 56/13 56/19 57/11 57/12 58/2 | economic loss [1] 14/11 | 25/7 33/3 |
|  | educate [1] 19/19 | example [39] 5/22 7/11 9/22 |
| doctors [2] 14/21 14/22 | education [1] 48/23 | 11/17 11/19 11/25 12/9 12/25 |
| document [3] $22 / 1149 / 4$ 52/3 | effectively [1] 37/20 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}13 / 1 & 13 / 14 & 13 / 19 & 14 / 1 & 15 / 14\end{array}$ |
| documented [1] 6/19 | either [6] 6/25 20/15 24/5 | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 23 & 17 / 2 & 18 / 24 & 19 / 21 & 21 / 13\end{array}$ |
| documents [6] 19/11 21/5 | 55/9 59/18 | $\begin{array}{llll}21 / 21 & 21 / 22 & 22 / 13 & 23 / 21\end{array}$ |
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| 46/19 49/1 49/3 55/23 | ELIZABETH | lude [2] |
| doing [7] 26/8 31/17 31/18 |  | xclude [2] 33/19 |
| 47/8 51/18 57/12 58/6 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 / 1241 / 3 \\ & 47 / 451 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | [3] 25/9 25/13 |
| dollar [1] 43/2 | email [13] 21/16 21/16 24/11 | $38 / 14$ |
| dollars [1] 38/7 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} \\ 24 / 12 & 24 / 15 & 24 / 17 & 24 / 24\end{array}$ | Executive [1] 2/1 |
| don't [38] 4/15 7/19 8/17 | 24/25 25/3 $31 / 12 \quad 33 / 13 \quad 45 / 15$ | exhaust [1] 40/6 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 11 & 12 / 21 & 12 / 21 & 14 / 24 & 22 / 6\end{array}$ | 45/20 | exist [3] $40 / 845$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}22 / 12 & 24 / 20 & 25 / 18 & 26 / 9 & 28 / 15\end{array}$ | emails [4] 20/17 23/7 24/14 | exists [4] 40/11 $41 / 19$ 43/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}31 / 2 & 33 / 16 & 35 / 8 & 35 / 18 \\ 39 / 9 & 36 / 19\end{array}$ | $34 / 25$ [4] | $43 / 15$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}39 / 9 & 40 / 3 & 40 / 19 & 40 / 22 & 40 / 25\end{array}$ | emphasize [2] 13/1 46/16 | expensive [1] 29/5 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}41 / 2 & 41 / 7 & 41 / 8 & 41 / 10 \\ 45 / 22 & 46 / 16 & 46 / 22 & 46 / 23\end{array}$ |  | expert [4] 9/24 10/1 39/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}45 / 22 & 46 / 16 & 46 / 22 & 46 / 23\end{array}$ | employment [1] 29/ | $39 / 15$ |
| $47 / 19$ $59 / 7$ | encompasses [1] 38/6 | expert's [1] 38/2 |
| 59/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { encompasses [1] } 38 / 6 \\ & \text { end [5] } 28 / 1940 / 4 \quad 51 / 251 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | experts [1] 31/19 |
| $\begin{array}{cccll}\text { done [16] } & 6 / 15 & 6 / 15 & 6 / 16 \\ 21 / 8 & 21 / 8 & 22 / 1 & 23 / 4 & 25 / 11\end{array}$ | $51 / 13$ | explained [1] 3 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}21 / 8 & 21 / 8 & 22 / 1 & 23 / 4 & 25 / 11 \\ 31 / 24 & 35 / 16 & 38 / 15 & 39 / 19\end{array}$ | endless [1] 49 | explanation [1] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 24 & 35 / 16 & 38 / 15 & 39 / 19 \\ 41 / 20 & 51 / 25 & 59 / 9 & 59 / 19\end{array}$ | engage [1] 17/1 | explore [2] 30/2 30/3 |
| $\begin{array}{rl}41 / 20 & 51 / 25 \\ \text { double } & \text { 59/9 } \\ \text { dell } & 59 / 19\end{array}$ | engine [1] 16/8 | explored [3] 15/3 25/2 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { double [1] } & 46 / 1 \\ \text { doubling [1] 16/24 }\end{array}$ | enough [3] 43/20 46/4 54 | 26/13 |
| doubling [1] 16/24 | enrichment [1] 15/14 | expose [1] 17/1 |
| down [5] 20/10 40/4 41/24 | ensure [2] 21/10 25/9 | exposure [3] 13/8 |
| 50/24 53/23 | entirely [1] 56/11 | $43 / 20$ |
| $\begin{array}{rlll}\text { download [4] } \\ 39 / 17 & 56 / 10 & \\ \text { chen }\end{array}$ | entitled [12] 16/25 17/13 | extensive [1] 1 |
| $39 / 1756 / 10$ downloadable [1] 43/2 | $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 19 & 19 / 5 & 35 / 25 & 36 / 5\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { extent [5] } & 29 / 12 & 42 / 25 & 49 / 9\end{array}$ |
| downloadable [1] 43/2 downloaded [6] 27/16 35/1 | $37 / 4$ 50/23 51/5 54/21 54/23 | 57/18 57/23 |
| downloaded [6] 27/16 35/1 35/2 35/2 39/16 58/17 | Entries [1] 4/15 |  |
| downloading [1] 49/13 | Entry [1] | F |
| dozens [1] 11/23 | ephemeral [1] | F.R.D [1] |
| drawing [1] 45/1 | equivalent [1] 51/7 | Facebook [30] 22/18 22/2 |
| drink [1] 14/21 | error [1] 36/23 | 27/13 27/18 29/16 32 |
| drinking [4] 13/20 17/17 | ESI [10] 6/14 35/23 36/11 | 33/24 34/5 34/11 $34 / 17$ 34/18 |
| 43/23 44/10 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}38 / 1 & 42 / 20 & 43 / 4 & 43 / 24 & 44 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 19 & 35 / 2 & 35 / 13 & 38 / 21 & 40 / 17\end{array}$ |
| drive [3] 1/11 2 | 44/24 49/14 | 40/25 41/1 41/11 41/17 $42 / 5$ |
| drives [1] 22/2 | ESQ [8] 1/10 1/14 1/18 1/21 | 42/19 43/17 45/4 54/14 55/16 |
| drop [2] 54/23 | 2/1 2/4 2/7 2/10 | 56/6 56/13 58/11 59/2 |
| due [2] 23/4 2 | essentially [1] 43/ | fact [3] 16/14 39/19 43/11 |
| during [6] $30 / 18$ 34/23 3 | Essure [2] 42/20 46/24 | factors [15] 8/2 9/15 10/15 |
| 36/6 36/20 39/22 | et [1] 51/7 | 10/18 12/3 $13 / 18$ 13/21 14/2 |
|  | even [8] 19/24 26/22 29/8 | 15/9 15/20 17/4 23/15 43/22 |
| E | 29/14 33/4 35/1 39/1 47/11 | 53/25 54/22 |
| each [17] 6/22 18/9 23/2 | ever [2] 4/15 43/7 | facts [3] 16/11 16/15 16/17 |
| 26/15 26/23 27/1 27/18 34/10 | every [8] 25/22 28/21 34/15 | factual [1] 25/13 |
| 37/20 41/15 48/21 51/19 52/9 | 40/6 44/8 49/4 49/4 55/25 | failed [2] 16/11 16/18 |
|  | everybody [5] 3/1 50/7 52/4 | fairly [1] 25/25 |


| F | 49/13 | $56 / 22 \quad 56 / 24 \quad 57 / 13 \quad 57 / 19$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| familiar [1] 26/6 | freely [2] 35/12 43/1 | $57 / 25 \text { 58/1 58/2 58/8 }$ |
| family [3] 25/21 25/22 25/23 | frequently [2] 33/4 36/9 <br> friend [1] 46/13 | gone [7] 22/16 $23 / 1 \quad 23 / 10$ 25/10 29/14 34/15 34/21 |
| far [1] $46 / 4$ | Ft [1] 2/16 | good [18] $3 / 1 \begin{array}{llll} & 3 / 12 & 3 / 14 & 3 / 16\end{array}$ |
| father [2] 45/3 45/12 | full [2] 22/15 32/2 | 3/18 3/20 $3 / 22$ 3/25 $4 / 2 \quad 4 / 6$ |
| favor [1] 30/6 | fully [2] 20/10 21/20 | 4/8 4/10 4/13 50/25 53/6 |
| features [1] 37/18 | fun [1] 27/4 | 56/16 60/6 60/6 |
| Federal [1] 60/13 | function [1] 39/25 | gotten [1] 6/20 |
| feed [7] 28/11 33/1 43/17 | functionality [1] 41/ | Government [1] 42 |
| 45/5 58/25 59/1 59/3 | functions [1] 48/12 | great [1] 47/9 |
| FEGAN [30] 1/10 3/12 5/6 | funny [1] 26/25 | grounds [3] 5/13 5/13 9/19 group [1] 14/10 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}5 / 22 & 7 / 11 & 8 / 14 & 9 / 4 & 12 / 7 & 14 / 3 \\ 17 / 21 & 19 / 14 & 20 / 8 & 21 / 1 & 30 / 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cl} \text { further [6] } & 19 / 9 \\ 28 / 17 & 38 / 13 \\ 46 / 12 \end{array}$ | groups [2] 58/3 58/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 12 & 33 / 22 & 34 / 3 & 35 / 11 & 38 / 20\end{array}$ | G | GSK [2] 4/3 4/9 |
| 42/10 $42 / 1447 / 19$ 47/25 |  | ess [3] 4/20 43/10] |
| 49/17 51/14 53/9 56/3 57/23 |  | H |
| 58/18 59/17 | gathered [1] 48/24 | habits [1] |
| Fegan's [1] 32/14 | gave [3] 35/11 41/23 58/18 | had [10] $12 / 1$ 12/10 $19 / 24$ |
| FeganScott [1] 1/11 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { general [4] } & 27 / 6 \\ 31 / 7 & 34 / 16\end{array}$ | 21/3 24/19 27/8 29/14 31/11 |
| Ferguson [1] 1/14 few [1] 60/5 | 35/19 | 39/1 43/11 |
| fighting [1] | generalized [1] | hadn't [2] 30/16 30/18 |
| figure [3] 6/7 35/22 40/24 | generally [5] 11 | handle [2] 4/11 21/11 |
| file [2] 11/23 57/5 | 42/23 51/15 52/8 | happen [1] 36/ |
| filers [1] 27/1 | generations [1] 45/6 | happy <br> [6] 18/11 26/14 |
| final [1] 32/23 | gentlemen [1] 4/10 | 31/6 47/3 59/25 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 43 / 14 & 47 / 18 & 49 / 6 & 54 / 3 \end{array}$ | get [35] 3/10 6/8 6/19 6/20 | hard [3] 38/22 39/4 50/10 |
| ine [4] 4/11 10/6 20 | 9/9 9/9 10/6 15/5 16/7 19/12 | Hardy [1] 2/4 |
| 20/25 | 21/14 23/22 $24 / 23$ 25/1 $25 / 8$ | has [26] 5/20 11/24 |
| first [17] 4/20 6/4 8/5 20/9 | 31/21 31/21 31/23 32/4 33/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 10 & 22 / 22 & 26 / 3 & 31 / 5 & 31 / 13\end{array}$ |
| 23/23 30/14 31/17 31/19 |  | $\begin{array}{lllll}34 / 11 & 37 / 12 & 40 / 14 & 42 / 12\end{array}$ |
| 35/10 35/24 37/14 39/8 39/11 | /13 $46 / 2250 / 550 / 16$ 54/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}42 / 13 & 42 / 14 & 42 / 16 & 42 / 19 & 45 / 4\end{array}$ |
| 42/15 42/17 50/8 55/4 | 55/22 55/24 56/24 58/3 60/3 | 46/25 49/9 49/10 51/6 53/14 |
| fit [1] 14/9 | get remanded [1] | 54/4 56/14 59/2 60 |
| five [2] 12/10 12/10 | gets [4] 14/18 $44 / 18$ 50/19 58/11 | have [204] <br> haven't [5] 24/20 29/23 52/1 |
| FL [3] $1 / 5 \mathrm{l} / 16 \quad 2 / 16$ | getting [1] | haven't [5] |
| flavor [1] 11/16 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { GILBERT [3] } & 1 / 14 & 1 / 15 & 3 / 14\end{array}$ | having [5] 26/15 28/10 46/24 |
| $\text { flip [3] } 9 / 7 \text { 36/13 55/18 }$ | give [8] 6/3 11/15 25/15 | 48/20 54/17 |
| Floor [1] 1/12 | 30/12 42/8 52/17 54/7 55/24 | he [5] 28/6 45/3 45/4 47/2 |
| FLORIDA [5] $1 / 112 / 25$ | given [6] 35/4 39/19 50/24 | 49 |
| 13/15 16/12 | 54/19 59/11 59/13 | health [5] 14/1 27/3 27/21 |
| focus [3] 7/23 11/13 48/8 | i1 [1] | 7/23 37 |
| focused [1] 32/6 | go [48] 5/25 7/22 13/21 | hear [5] 44/5 47/3 47/18 |
| focusing [2] 21/15 23/4 | $18 / 22 \quad 20 / 7 \quad 20 / 10 \quad 23 / 7 \quad 24 / 1$ | heard [7] 36/23 52/1 59/1 |
| folks [1] 52/7 | $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 4 & 25 / 19 & 27 / 18 & 28 / 2\end{array}$ | 59/12 $59 / 14$ 59/20 59/20 |
| follow [1] 18/15 followed [1] $48 / 3$ | 29/18 $31 / 20$ 32/5 $32 / 17$ 32/18 | hearing [7] 3/4 18/11 $36 / 15$ |
| followed [1] 48/3 |  | 41/23 53/20 60/2 60/7 |
| following [2] $8 / 2$ 51/1 followup [1] | $\begin{array}{lllllllll} & 41 / 12 & 43 / 3 & 43 / 6 & 43 / 14 & 44 / 6\end{array}$ | held [2] 8/19 20/2 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { followup [1] } & 21 / 8 \\ \text { foregoing [1] } & 60 /\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}44 / 8 & 44 / 22 & 46 / 1 & 46 / 4 & 46 / 6\end{array}$ | help [2] 4/18 11/13 |
| ormat [1] 51/24 | $46 / 11$ 48/11 50/4 51/17 56/23 | helpful [4] $12 / 6$ 12/17 $46 / 9$ |
| mat [1] 56/17 | 57/8 57/14 58/9 59/7 59/25 | 50/2 |
| ormer [1] [2] $28 / 6$ | goes [8] 14/7 19/6 30/6 | her [5] 16/1 16/1 16/2 16/9 |
| forth [2] 27/1 37/20 | $30 / 21$ 35/21 36/6 37/6 59/15 | 26/25 |
| forward [5] 14/10 32/22 | going [60] 4/11 6/20 7/5 | here [31] 3/4 7/18 13/5 |
| 56/23 57/8 60/4 | 7/21 9/17 $10 / 11$ | 15/25 16/10 18/4 20/7 21/15 |
| found [2] 16/6 36/ | 15/2 15/4 19/18 19/25 23/22 | 23/4 24/25 25/2 28/16 28/19 |
| four [3] 6/1 36/15 53/20 | 24/4 24/5 25/4 25/21 26/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 18 & 32 / 18 & 37 / 1 & 37 / 7 & 40 / 15\end{array}$ |
| fourth [4] 13/4 13/7 13/10 | 26/17 31/22 $32 / 9$ 33/22 34/4 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 42 / 21 & 43 / 19 & 46 / 18 & 48 / 8 & 48 / 14\end{array}$ |
| 55/6 [4] | $\begin{array}{lllllll}39 / 11 & 39 / 14 & 39 / 15 & 41 / 24 & 42 / 3\end{array}$ | 48/20 50/18 $52 / 6$ 52/16 $54 / 11$ |
| frame [4] 4/19 4/19 14/7 | 42/6 43/10 $43 / 17$ 44/8 45/9 | 58/11 59/9 59/16 |
| 14/10 | 45/25 46/2 49/3 50/3 50/9 | hey [2] 30/11 56/8 |
| framed [1] 53/20 | 50/20 50/21 51/11 51/23 | high [2] 46/3 49/21 |
| free [4] $39 / 5$ 39/13 $39 / 14$ | 51/25 52/21 52/21 52/22 53/1 | higher [1] 17/15 |
| free [4] 39/5 39/13 39/14 | 53/6 53/19 54/7 54/25 55/21 | highly [1] 38/17 |


| H | individual's [1] 18/ | just [67] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| him [2] 46/14 47/3 | individualized [1] 50/1 | justify [2] 28/21 29 |
| his [1] 41/17 | induced [1] 19/2 | K |
| histories [1] 14/1 | inform [2] 33/23 37/4 | Kanner [1] 1/18 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { history [4] } \\ 42 / 24 \end{gathered} \quad 13 / 20 \quad 18 / 9 \quad 18 / 10$ | information [32] 8/23 9/5 | keep [2] 10/24 22/5 |
| Hold [1] 35/14 | 9/8 9/10 14/19 15/5 21/17 | kicks [1] 44/13 |
| holding [4] 25/20 28/20 | 22/11 $23 / 11$ 25/10 $27 / 13$ | kind [5] 12/12 22/19 22/24 |
| 50/25 51/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}27 / 15 & 28 / 3 & 28 / 7 & 30 / 15 & 30\end{array}$ | 45/25 46/3 |
| HON [1] 2/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 30 / 23 & 31 / 5 & 33 / 11 & 34 / 17 & 34 / 2 \\ 35 / 5 & 39 / 11 & 40 / 7 & 44 / 22 & 46 / 8 \end{array}$ | King [1] $2 / 8$ <br> knew [1] $12 / 10$ |
| Honor [76] | $\begin{array}{lllll} 46 / 20 & 48 / 14 & 48 / 24 & 56 / 9 & 56 / 9 \end{array}$ | know [20] 5/17 6/ |
| Honor's [2] 45/12 57/2 | $59 / 2$ | 12/21 22/6 24/20 26/5 31/2 |
| HONORABLE [1] 1/8 <br> hot [1] 24/19 | Ingelheim [1] 4/7 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 31 / 11 & 36 / 19 & 38 / 13 & 42 / 4 & 43 / 15\end{array}$ |
|  | injury [1] 16/1 | 45/2 48/18 50/6 52/7 54/19 |
| house [1] 9/3 | inoffensive [1] 52/3 | 54/25 55/25 |
| how [28] 6/13 6/18 $7 / 7$ 9/9 | inquiry [2] 15/4 33/23 | knowing [1] 52/10 |
| 10/10 10/14 10/23 12/22 15/8 | insisted [1] 41/23 | known [1] 49/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 8 & 15 / 9 & 23 / 6 & 24 / 20 & 26 / 5\end{array}$ | Instagram [8] 23/1 25/13 25/17 | Kopelowitz [1] 1/14 <br> Krouch [1] 15/22 |
| 26/7 28/7 33/23 34/4 36/19 | $125 / 13 \text { 25/17 25/ }$ | Krouch [1] 15/22 |
| 39/14 40/24 44/1 45/8 53/13 | ce [3] 23/24 39/11 | L |
| 53/14 55/14 55/24 58/11 | 39/13 [3] 23/24 39/11 | LA [1] 1/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { hub [1] } & 49 / 14 \\ \text { human [2] } & 48 / 9 & 48 / 12\end{array}$ | intend [1] 15 | lack [1] 35/5 |
| human [2] 48/9 48/12 | intended [1] 41/9 | laid [2] 49/8 54/12 |
| $\begin{array}{lr}\text { hundred [1] } & 31 / 2 \\ \text { hurdle [1] 19/13 }\end{array}$ | intent [1] 36/3 | lapsed [1] 11/24 |
| hurdle [1] 19/13 hypothetical [1] 31/9 | intention [2] 53/19 55/4 | laptops [2] 22/2 23/8 |
| hypothetical [1] 31/9 hypothetically [1] 30/3 | intents [1] 37/20 | large [2] $42 / 1147$ |
| hypothetically [1] 30/3 | interesting [1] 60/2 | largest [1] 42/20 |
| I | interrogatories [3] 3/8 4/22 | last [5] 6/18 21/2 22/22 |
| I'll [1] 34/1 | interviews [2] 21/8 21/9 | latent [1] 13/9 |
| I'm [2] 32/18 57/23 | intricacies [1] 52/11 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { later [3] } & 7 / 5 & 11 / 22 & 5\end{array}$ |
| idea [10] 11/5 18/8 23/7 | invested [1] 48/21 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { law [14] } & 12 / 25 & 13 / 2 & 15 / 15\end{array}$ |
| 25/19 25/22 28/19 29/18 37/8 | involved [1] 56/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 25 & 18 / 3 & 18 / 5 & 18 / 6 & 18 / 8\end{array}$ |
| 40/10 56/17 | iPad [1] 22/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 11 & 18 / 15 & 23 / 9 & 28 / 19 & 29 / 4\end{array}$ |
| identified [15] 21/16 21/19 | irrelevant [3] 18/10 37/16 | 29/12 |
| 21/19 $22 / 3 \quad 22 / 14$ 22/17 $23 / 2$ | 47/20 | law under [1] 15/15 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}23 / 10 & 23 / 15 & 24 / 18 & 24 / 25 \\ 27 / 19 & 28 / 23 & 30 / 15 & 30 / 19\end{array}$ | is [326] | laws [1] 14/8 |
| $\begin{array}{cccl}27 / 19 & 28 / 23 & 30 / 15 & 30 / 19 \\ \text { identify [6] } & 8 / 22 & 21 / 5 & 21 / 6\end{array}$ | isn't [6] 26/17 31/24 37/11 | lawsuit [2] 33/18 45/2 |
| $\begin{array}{\|crrr} \text { identify [6] } & 8 / 22 & 21 / 5 & 21 / 6 \\ 23 / 11 & 25 / 19 & 39 / 20 & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 38/11 38/12 38/22 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { lawsuits [14] } & 8 / 3 & 8 / 11 & 8 / 12\end{array}$ |
| identifying [3] 23/5 29/1 | issue [23] 8/15 8/17 8/24 | 8/17 8/22 9/1 9/3 23/17 27/3 |
| 48/5 | 10/6 10/10 $10 / 20$ 14/7 18/12 | 27/25 28/1 $33 / 11$ 33/14 $56 / 16$ |
| IL [1] | 18/22 19/8 29/14 35/21 37/25 | lawyer [2] 31/12 50/17 |
| illustrate [1] 15/21 | 39/23 51/17 52/18 54/2 54/15 | lawyers [3] 6/16 21/3 48/15 |
| imagine [3] 16/23 36/21 | 55/4 55/6 55/13 57/18 58/11 | leading [1] 16/1 |
| 51/12 | issued [1] 52/17 | leads [2] 26/11 30/2 |
| immediately [2] 19/23 26/20 | issues [20] 4/19 5/5 5/19 | learn [1] 53/16 |
| importance [2] 59/15 59/16 | 7/2 8/20 9/18 9/19 18/22 | learned [1] 35/4 |
| important [9] 7/18 12/25 | 19/2 $33 / 17$ 35/20 $37 / 16$ 42/1 | learning [1] 31/20 |
| 14/6 14/11 15/18 16/16 27/3 | $50 / 8$ 54/16 55/5 59/10 59/11 | least [10] 5/18 7/1 8/14 |
| 37/3 50/6 | 59/14 59/20 | 11/14 14/4 28/9 36/15 46/1 |
| impose [1] 53/5 | it [212] | 59/10 59/19 |
| inaccurate [1] 36/3 | it's [6] 4/20 22/25 40/6 | leave [2] 52/4 52/18 |
| inaudible [1] 57/5 | 50/16 55/17 58/23 | leg [2] 39/19 41/20 |
| inclination [1] 54/7 | items [1] 8/8 | legal [1] 5/13 |
| inclined [1] 54/3 | iterative [2] 56/22 58/3 | Leon [1] 1/15 |
| include [2] 16/18 32/24 | its [3] 22/22 50/1 50/1 | less [3] 38/25 49/17 49/20 |
| incomplete [1] 36/3 | itself [3] 16/9 19/23 50/1 | let [32] 3/10 3/11 5/21 5/25 |
| inconsistencies [1] 36/12 | J | 15/7 17/21 18/18 20/8 |
| incorrectly [1] 36/23 | jewelry [2] 34/19 41/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 20/10 } & 25 / 12 & 27 / 9 & 27 / 10 & 28 / 15\end{array}$ |
| increase [1] $13 / 18$  <br> increased [2] $13 / 9$ $13 / 12$ | job [3] 44/13 47/9 48/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll}28 / 16 & 31 / 9 & 32 / 13 & 33 / 21 & 35 / 9\end{array}$ |
|  | joke [1] 53/5 | 38/20 $42 / 15$ 45/1 $46 / 12$ 50/8 |
|  | JUDGE [4] 1/9 31/22 47/9 | 51/25 52/6 59/7 |
| individual [9] 512510 | 47/10 | let's [10] 12/24 19/7 19/9 |
| 19/2 26/10 31/25 32/11 35/15 $38 / 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Judge's [1] 54/19 } \\ & \text { junk [1] } 45 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 19 / 13 & 20 / 7 & 30 / 3 & 30 / 5 & 31 / 10 \\ 33 / 25 & 34 / 2 & & & \end{array}$ |


| L | 35/3 $35 / 4 \quad 44 / 25$ 45/8 $48 / 16$ | Merck's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| letter [3] 19/16 20/23 25/15 | 49/3 $50 / 9$ 51/2 $55 / 12$ 56/7 | merits [3] 5/2 5/4 32/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { level [3] } & 42 / 11 & 46 / 3 & 49 / 21\end{array}$ | makes [2] $48 / 23$ $56 / 8$  <br> making [5] $41 / 4$ $41 / 21$ $45 / 24$ | messaged [2] $43 / 11$ $58 / 14$ <br> messages [6] $20 / 17$ $21 / 14$ |
| levels [2] 16/7 17/19 | 47/21 47/25 | $\begin{array}{rlll}\text { messag } \\ 22 / 20 & 30 / 17 & 33 / 4 & 34 / 24\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { liability [3] } 1 / 5 \text { 3/3 } 32 / 7 \\ & \text { lie [1] } 25 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | manage [1] 51/11 | messaging [5] 22/19 33/2 |
| light [1] 16/8 | manageable [1] 57 | 37/18 42/24 |
| like [21] 6/2 $7 / 3 \mathrm{l}$ 12/5 $12 / 20$ | mankind [1] 49 | messenger [32] |
| 17/24 20/20 24/16 25/16 27/3 | many [7] 13/2 18/15 24/17 | 33/24 $33 / 2434 / 5$ 34/5 $34 / 11$ |
| 30/14 36/9 38/2 39/22 41/22 | 33/12 36/2 45/13 45/13 | 34 |
| 43/22 45/11 51/19 56/5 56/22 | margins [1] 38/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 13 & 35 / 20 & 38 / 21 & 38 / 22\end{array}$ |
| 58/18 59/4 | marketing [1] | 38/25 39/1 $40 / 18$ 40/18 40/23 |
| likes [1] 17/10 | Marketplace [1] 34/ | 41/1 41/7 41/8 41/12 41/17 |
| limit [1] 28/1 | Mart [2] 15/22 16/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll}42 / 5 & 42 / 19 & 43 / 17 & 45 / 4 & 45 / 14\end{array}$ |
| Limitations [9] 8/4 9/16 | master [1] 52/3 | 54/14 54/ |
| 11/7 11/15 11/18 11/22 11/24 | material [7] 16/13 | met [1] 30/1 |
| 11/25 12/8 | 16/22 17/7 18/6 19/1 46/25 | Metabolife [2] 13/14 |
| limited [2] 5/19 29/13 | materiality [3] 15/18 17/14 | method [2] 52/16 59/16 |
| limiting [1] 5/20 |  | methodology [1] 53/15 |
| line [3] $24 / 13$ 45/18 47/23 | materials [3] | Miami |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { linear [9] } & 8 / 21 \\ \text { 27/14 }\end{array}$ | matter [8] 17/9 17/11 19/2 | might [12] 14/23 22/13 25/10 |
| 28/4 33/1 $58 / 23$ | 27/7 31/7 $34 / 16$ 35/19 60/10 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 28 / 7 & 33 / 19 & 35 / 23 & 36 / 21 & 42 / 16\end{array}$ |
| liner [1] 58/24 | may [17] 5/19 6/25 8/7 9/8 | 44/16 44/17 47/2 59/18 |
| listed [1] 8/11 | 13/18 21/16 21/16 22/5 22/20 | mights [1] 44/17 |
| listen [1] 32/18 | 24/11 27/23 40/7 44/7 52/11 | Milazzo [1] 47/9 |
| listening [1] 38/24 | 57/7 58/21 59/9 | millions [1] 38 |
| litigation [11] 1/5 3/3 | maybe [9] 7/21 8/5 11 | misrepresentations [1] 19/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 11/19 } & 20 / 3 & 42 / 19 & 42 / 20 ~ 44 / 24\end{array}$ | 11/15 $44 / 10$ 53/20 54/18 | modified [1] 52/25 |
| 47/10 $47 / 16 \quad 47 / 17$ 59/4 | 54/23 55/18 | monitored [1] 14/22 |
| litigations [1] 46/25 | md [1] 1/3 | monitoring [12] 3/5 |
| little [5] 11/16 12/7 35/17 | MDL [7] 6/24 31/19 37/12 | 12/23 12/25 13/2 13/4 13/22) |
| 50/16 50/19 | 38/5 40/14 42/11 42/17 | $14 / 5$ 14/10 14/24 36/14 54/5 |
| live [2] 52/14 52/19 | MDLs [2] 36/9 47/6 | months [2] 21/3 41/2 |
| LLC [1] 1/18 | me [51] 3/10 3/11 $4 / 12$ 4/19 | more [15] 5/19 10/ |
| LLP [3] 1/21 2/4 2/8 | 5/18 5/21 5/25 6/1 6/9 7/1 | 20/8 24/25 33/4 39/18 49/1 |
| locations [5] 22/3 22/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}7 / 10 & 7 / 11 & 7 / 23 & 7 / 25 & 11 / 12\end{array}$ | 49/20 $49 / 24 \quad 50 / 19$ 53/17 |
| 22/12 22/15 23/14 | $\begin{array}{llll}12 / 17 & 12 / 19 & 14 / 3 & 15 / 8 \\ 19 / 19\end{array}$ | 54/13 54/24 57/17 |
| lodged [1] 5/17 | $\begin{array}{llll}20 / 6 & 20 / 8 & 20 / 10 & 20 / 24 \\ 27 / 9 & 25 / 12\end{array}$ | morning [19] 3/1 3/4 3/12 |
| long [3] 24/19 28/7 55/2 | ll 9 28/15 $30 / 7$ 31/9 32/13 | 3/14 3/16 3/18 3/20 3/22 |
| look [28] 6/7 6/8 7/7 7/8 | $32 / 23$ 33/21 36/23 38/20 41/2 | $3 / 254 / 24 / 64 / 84 / 104 /$ |
| 10/10 10/11 $16 / 3$ 27/19 $28 / 10$ | $50 / 952 / 6 \quad 52 / 8 \quad 52 / 10 \quad 52 / 20$ | most [2] 28/8 42/4 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 28/16 } & 28 / 24 & 29 / 22 & 38 / 23 & 40 / 1\end{array}$ | $53 / 2355 / 24 \quad 56 / 18 \quad 57 / 18 \quad 59 / 7$ | mostly [1] 25/21 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}44 / 8 & 44 / 15 & 46 / 12 & 47 / 18 & 48 / 7\end{array}$ | 59/13 | mother [1] 31/23 |
| $54 / 13$ 54/14 54/17 54/18 $56 / 8$ <br> $56 / 9 \quad 56 / 19$ <br> $59 / 22$ <br> $10 / 4$ | mean [2] 41/10 41/19 | motion [3] 4/17 10/2 32/3 |
| $56 / 9$ $56 / 19$ looked 5] | means [2] 9/17 42/21 | move [2] 19/7 24/1 |
| looked [3] $16 / 5$ 30/9 45/10 | meant [1] 5/1 | moved [1] 27/9 |
| looking [5] 49/10 59/3 | media [23] 14/16 15/6 20/17 | moving [1] 35/8 |
| 49/10 $59 / 3$ loss [17] | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 22 / 17 & 22 / 25 & 23 / 3 & 23 / 14 & 29 / 7\end{array}$ | $\text { Mr [11] } 28 / 6 \quad 42 / 16 \quad 46 / 1$ |
| loss [17] 3/5 4/23 9/15 9/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 29 / 10 & 29 / 19 & 30 / 8 & 36 / 25 & 37 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}46 / 23 & 47 / 2 & 47 / 4 & 49 / 2\end{array}$ |
| 9/21 9/23 10/8 13/22 14/11 | $37 / 10 \quad 42 / 12 \quad 42 / 18 \quad 44 / 2 \quad 44 / 21$ | $58 / 22 \quad 59 / 5 \quad 59 / 22$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 10 & 15 / 11 & 15 / 15 & 15 / 24\end{array}$ | 45/7 47/10 $47 / 20 \quad 48 / 1 \quad 58 / 25$ | Ms [22] $3 / 20 \quad 4 / 11 \quad 8 / 14 \quad 9 / 17$ |
| 16/13 17/12 17/14 54/5 | medical [23] $3 / 5$ 4/23 $10 / 19$ |  |
| losses [1] 8/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 4 & 12 / 23 & 12 / 24 & 13 / 1 & 13 / 4\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 12 & 32 / 13 & 33 / 21 & 35 / 11\end{array}$ |
| lost [1] 46/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 22 & 14 / 4 & 14 / 9 & 14 / 25 & 20 / 15\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 35 / 15 & 46 / 10 & 47 / 19 & 51 / 14 & 55 / 2\end{array}$ |
| lot [9] 14/8 23/22 30/7 | 27/21 27/24 28/24 $36 / 8 \quad 36 / 10$ | 55/10 56/1 57/23 58/9 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 32 / 15 & 39 / 13 & 44 / 17 & 50 / 4 & 57 / 17 \\ 57 / 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 36 / 12 & 36 / 14 & 36 / 15 & 38 / 16 & 54 / 5\end{array}$ | Ms. [39] 4/24 5/6 5/22 7/11 |
| $\text { lots [1] } 12$ | meet [4] 30/24 31/6 48/7 | 8/5 8/25 9/4 11/12 12/7 |
|  | /17 | 12/18 14/3 15/7 19/14 20/8 |
| M | meeting [1] 60/4 | 20/13 21/1 $32 / 17$ 33/22 34/3 |
| ade [4] 42/14 42/16 | meetings [1] 40/2 | 35/8 38/20 38/24 39/10 40/17 |
|  | members [4] 16/11 16/15 20/4 | 42/8 42/10 $42 / 14$ 47/8 47/25 |
| strate [2] 1/9 29/17 |  | 49/12 49/17 49/20 53/9 53/11 |
| strate [2] $\text { [1] } 24 / 19$ | members' [1] 13/17 | 54/4 56/3 58/18 59/7 59/17 |
| $\text { main [3] } 22 / 9 \quad 24 / 24 \quad 25 / 1$ | mentioned [4] 20/13 47/2 | Ms. Fegan [20] 5/6 5/22 7/11 |
| make [14] 3/11 5/9 | 56/4 56/6 | 9/4 12/7 14/3 19/14 20/8 |

## M

Ms. Fegan... [7] 42/14 47/25 49/17 53/9 56/3 58/18 59/17
Ms. Showalter [18] 4/24 8/5 8/25 11/12 12/18 15/7 20/13 $35 / 8 \quad 38 / 24 \quad 39 / 10 \quad 40 / 17 \quad 42 / 8$ 47/8 $49 / 1249 / 20 \quad 53 / 11 \quad 54 / 4$ 59/7
Ms. Stipes [1] 32/17
much [9] $17 / 15$ 17/18 $19 / 7$
26/17 38/10 40/22 40/25 44/1 46/10
multi [2] 3/3 44/24
multiple [2] 5/13 58/2
must [1] 40/11
muted [1] 35/14
my [31] $3 / 7$ 4/20 $7 / 10 \quad 15 / 14$ 15/21 20/20 28/16 $30 / 8 \quad 31 / 9$ $31 / 1231 / 17 \quad 31 / 19 \quad 34 / 1 \quad 38 / 24$ 39/8 $41 / 1$ 41/2 $42 / 1744 / 13$ 45/1 45/3 45/21 51/3 52/6 52/17 52/18 53/6 53/18 54/7 55/4 56/6

## N

name [1] 22/22
named [3] 3/8 4/22 6/22
narrow [2] 33/18 42/1
narrowed [1] 53/23
narrowly [1] 38/9
nationwide [3] 13/3 14/8 38/5
NDMA [3] 15/4 17/18 23/12
nearly [1] 21/3
necessarily [5] 12/16 13/16 44/14 57/3 59/1
necessary [1] 52/2
need [25] 6/1 7/2 8/15 $10 / 7$ 10/9 14/24 17/20 22/21 31/2 43/14 $44 / 6$ 44/8 $46 / 1447 / 12$ 48/8 49/24 50/22 50/23 54/11 54/13 $54 / 13 \quad 54 / 14 \quad 54 / 15$
56/17 57/3
needed [1] 37/11
needs [7] 29/24 29/25 47/2 49/11 49/15 49/24 54/9
never [8] $12 / 11 \quad 30 / 8 \quad 31 / 12$ 31/13 36/18 36/22 40/23 45/20
New [1] 1/19
next [4] 6/13 $10 / 6$ 19/8 $58 / 1$
no [22] 1/3 5/3 9/20 23/9 28/16 35/17 39/4 41/6 41/9 $\begin{array}{llllll}42 / 21 & 43 / 3 & 45 / 4 & 45 / 12 & 45 / 14\end{array}$ 45/15 45/15 50/13 51/17
51/22 53/10 53/12 53/14
nonetheless [2] 14/13 23/1
normal [2] 30/21 48/19
North [1] 47/10
Northern [1] 15/23
not [117]
not the [1] 27/14
note [9] 7/18 7/18 7/19
14/11 29/11 33/6 34/24 39/22 41/22
notes [2] 28/16 46/12
nothing [6] 26/11 35/19

43/23 47/4 51/7 52/10
notwithstanding [1] 26/22
novel [1] 42/21
November [2] $1 / 5$ 60/12
now [19] $7 / 5$ 7/21 $12 / 7$ 12/18
16/3 16/10 16/12 21/1 33/9
35/8 $40 / 10 \quad 41 / 5$ 49/3 $54 / 8$
54/17 54/19 54/25 57/3 58/6
Number [1] 3/2
NW [2] 2/2 $2 / 5$

## 0

obese [2] 17/9 17/12
obesity [2] 13/20 43/23
object [1] 56/17
objected [1] 5/12
objecting [9] 7/24 9/7 9/8
9/10 9/18 9/20 45/24 51/12 51/16
objection [9] $7 / 14$ 11/1 $11 / 1$
11/3 11/8 12/9 12/19 20/8 46/3
objections [6] 5/17 7/5 7/7 7/19 59/9 59/18
obligations [1] 6/11
observation [2] 53/13 55/3
observations [1] 13/25
observed [1] 13/16
obtain [1] 16/2
occur [1] 6/14
Oculus [2] 34/20 41/18
odd [2] 43/1 43/1
off [2] 27/8 32/19
offered [3] 27/18 29/23 56/13
offering [1] 48/5
Official [2] 2/15 60/13
oh [2] 30/6 31/11
oil [3] 15/25 16/2 16/7
okay [21] 9/14 10/5 10/22 $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 7 & 12 / 16 & 17 / 3 & 24 / 2 & 24 / 11\end{array}$ 26/18 28/12 30/5 31/16 38/18 $40 / 16$ 47/15 50/2 51/23 54/15 54/19 55/17 59/6
old [2] 44/9 45/3
omission [1] 18/3
omissions [3] 16/21 16/21 17/2
omitting [1] 34/8
once [3] 6/7 53/16 58/3
one [55] 6/14 10/22 11/23
11/25 12/16 $12 / 18$ 13/4 17/2
$\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 5 & 19 / 14 & 22 / 10 & 24 / 2 & 24 / 25\end{array}$
25/2 25/5 26/24 28/20 29/1
29/13 30/17 31/16 31/20
35/14 $36 / 9 \quad 36 / 21 \quad 38 / 3 \quad 38 / 19$ 41/16 $41 / 22 \quad 42 / 9 \quad 42 / 19 \quad 44 / 3$ 44/5 44/17 46/14 50/3 50/8 50/9 50/11 50/15 50/17 52/11 52/12 52/13 52/21 52/22 52/25 53/8 54/3 57/1 57/7 58/1 58/12 58/21 59/7
one page [1] 44/3
one-sided [1] 58/12
ones [1] 9/14
ongoing [2] 10/25 11/3
only [16] 8/19 10/16 10/21
13/1 21/22 22/11 24/5 24/9

24/15 25/6 25/7 41/16 41/17 43/1 45/20 46/15
OOT [9] 2/4 4/2 42/16 46/13
46/23 47/2 47/4 49/2 58/22
open [1] 52/18
operation [1] 50/1
opportunity [2] 59/11 59/14
opposed [1] 13/11
option [1] 52/17
or messaging [1] 43/7
order [14] 6/2 7/3 7/25 9/12 30/10 47/11 47/15 50/5 51/18
51/23 52/13 53/19 55/4 60/3
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { ordered [3] } & 42 / 12 & 42 / 18 & 47 / 7\end{array}$
orders [1] 58/4
original [1] 32/5
originally [1] 30/16
Orleans [1] 1/19
Ostrow [1] 1/14
other [38] 8/3 8/7 8/11 8/12 8/17 8/22 9/1 9/14 13/18
$\begin{array}{lllllll}13 / 21 & 14 / 1 & 15 / 8 & 17 / 3 & 18 / 4\end{array}$
27/1 28/14 31/22 33/17 37/20
$\begin{array}{llllll} & 40 / 5 & 40 / 13 & 42 / 11 & 42 / 14 & 42 / 16\end{array}$
45/21 46/15 47/5 50/8 51/10
51/25 52/11 52/13 52/15
52/22 52/25 55/9 55/16 58/15
Others [1] 34/19
otherwise [3] 17/10 29/20 42/14
our [29] $7 / 4$ 7/19 $9 / 2310 / 2$ $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 10 & 16 / 20 & 17 / 1 & 19 / 24 & 21 / 4\end{array}$ 21/20 22/7 23/4 33/12 $34 / 8$ 35/5 35/11 35/16 36/8 37/4 $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 24 & 38 / 3 & 40 / 1 & 48 / 11 & 48 / 15\end{array}$ $48 / 15$ 51/20 55/15 58/16 59/15
ours [1] 33/8
out [19] 6/7 10/3 11/21
25/15 29/12 30/22 35/12
35/22 40/24 44/7 49/8 50/5
51/25 54/12 54/23 56/22
57/11 58/19 60/3
out-of-pocket [1] 10/3
outcome [1] 49/10
outfit [2] 56/8 56/19
over [4] 9/2 19/12 $19 / 18$ 21/2
overwhelming [1] 25/25
own [2] 22/22 53/7

## P

PA [1] 1/23
page [1] 44/3
pages [2] 10/19 59/22
painfully [1] 35/25
PALM [3] $1 / 2$ 1/5 $2 / 16$
papers [3] $12 / 2$ 32/25 $34 / 4$
paradigm [1] 10/24
paragraph [1] 16/12
parents [1] 45/1
part [7] 7/17 10/1 36/3 37/21 40/5 41/20 57/3
particular [10] 20/1 20/2
22/5 22/12 23/20 29/1 30/17 39/23 42/10 47/5
particularly [1] 48/20
parties [8] 3/10 5/18 6/16

| P | 29/2 32/21 33/7 33/10 35/5 | ess [28] 8/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| parties... [5] 52/2 52/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 35 / 18 & 36 / 6 & 37 / 19 & 39 / 20 & 42 / 23 \\ 43 / 6 & 43 / 9 & 44 / 22 & 45 / 2 & 45 / 14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 30 / 23 & 46 / 4 & 48 / 6 & 48 / 19 & 48 / 23 \\ 49 / 8 & 49 / 9 & 49 / 12 & 49 / 22 & 50 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| 53/3 55/3 57/16 | $43 / 6$ 43/9 44/22 45/2 45/14 $45 / 16 \quad 45 / 24 \quad 47 / 12 \quad 47 / 20$ | $49 / 8$ $49 / 9$ $49 / 12$ $49 / 22$ $50 / 1$ <br> $51 / 2$ $51 / 3$ $51 / 11$ $51 / 13$ $52 / 12$ |
| party [3] 44/11 50/15 50/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}48 / 21 & 50 / 18 & 50 / 24 & 51 / 6 & 51 / 12\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 53 / 2 & 53 / 5 & 53 / 6 & 54 / 12 & 55 / 10\end{array}$ |
| past [2] $31 / 21$ $31 / 21$ <br> path [3] $40 / 4$ $41 / 24$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 54/11 } & 54 / 12 & 54 / 24 & 56 / 25\end{array}$ | 55/19 56/11 56/21 57/20 58/2 |
| patient [1] 32/13 | 57/19 ${ }^{\text {a }}$, $713 / 2216 / 1$ | process after [1] 51/3 |
| PATRICK [2] 2/4 4/2 | Plaintiffs' [7] 13/22 16/12 | processing [1] 57/21 |
| Pauline [2] 2/15 60/13 | 27/12 36/11 36/14 37/12 | produce [16] 7/20 7/25 8/17 |
| pause [1] 33/21 | plan [1] 57/10 | 9/4 9/12 9/22 10/9 10/11 <br> $10 / 12 \quad 25 / 22 \quad 27 / 24 \quad 28 / 3 \quad 33 / 11$ |
| $\begin{array}{llr}\text { payments [1] } & 10 / 3 \\ \text { Peachtree [1] } & 2 / 8\end{array}$ | platform [1] 6/15 | 56/18 57/19 57/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peachtree [1] } \quad 2 / 8 \\ & \text { people [28] } 17 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | platforms [1] 44/2 | produced [8] 8/23 10/4 10/19 |
| 23/16 $24 / 23$ 24/24 $25 / 20$ | pleading [2] 8/1 11/14 | 11/5 30/20 42/20 46/25 57/25 |
| 25/20 25/20 26/3 26/8 26/23 | pleadings [2] 7/16 7/24 | producible [1] 44/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}33 / 4 & 34 / 17 & 36 / 21 & 37 / 8 & 38 / 6\end{array}$ | please [1] 3/11 | producing [4] 7/24 26/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}38 / 25 & 40 / 1 & 43 / 1 & 43 / 19 & 43 / 21\end{array}$ | pliable [1] 54/24 | 57/21 57/21 |
| 43/23 45/6 45/9 50/19 57/11 | plus [1] 57/14 | product [2] |
| 58/13 | pocket [1] 10/3 | production [10] 3/8 4/21 |
| people holding [1] 25/20 | point [15] 9/16 15/21 21/4 | 5/14 5/23 7/12 26/1 28/11 |
| people's [3] 38/4 55/16 | $31 / 24$ 32/6 32/9 38/10 39/21 | 29/13 36/10 36/10 |
| 58/15 | $44 / 12 \quad 44 / 18 \quad 45 / 17 \quad 46 / 17$ $46 / 2251 / 4 \quad 51 / 4$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { productions } \\ 44 / 20 ~ 57 / 5}}{ }$ [4] 5/20 37/10 |
| Perez [2] 13/14 13/24 | pointing [1] 10/24 | productive [1] |
| perhaps [2] 20/12 33/4 | Ponce [1] 1/15 | PRODUCTS [1] 1/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { period [1] } & 11 / 21 & & \\ \text { person [16] } & 17 / 9 & 17 / 10 & 21 / 22\end{array}$ | pop [1] 34/25 | profile [1] 56/6 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { person [16] } & 17 / 9 \text { 17/10 } 21 / 22 \\ 24 / 6 & 24 / 18 & 27 / 6 & 29 / 16 & 30 / 6\end{array}$ | portion [1] 23/12 | profiles [1] 27/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 6 & 24 / 18 & 27 / 6 & 29 / 16 & 30 / 6 \\ 30 / 6 & 34 / 10 & 36 / 24 & 36 / 25 & 41 / 15\end{array}$ | position [22] 19/17 19/18 | proper [1] 38/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 6 & 34 / 10 & 36 / 24 & 36 / 25 & 41 / 15 \\ 41 / 16 & 51 / 19 & 60 / 5 & & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 19/21 } & 19 / 24 & 20 / 2 & 20 / 3 & 22 / 24\end{array}$ | proportional [6] 20/22 29/5 |
| $41 / 16$ person's chel | 29/24 $34 / 6$ 34/9 $35 / 16$ 36/22 | 29/25 49/11 49/15 49/24 |
| person's [1] 27/18 | 37/15 38/21 39/3 39/8 $43 / 5$ | proportionality [14] 5/14 |
| personal [1] 36/11 | 48/25 49/8 49/17 49/21 53/4 | 6/9 6/12 10/16 10/20 10/21 |
| personally [1] | post [7] 26/3 28/20 32/4 | 11/1 12/15 14/18 19/13 20/7 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Petito [1] } & 13 / 5 \\ \text { Pfizer [1] } & 3 / 23\end{array}$ | 44/22 56/7 56/7 56/18 | 28/17 44/13 47/22 |
| Pfizer [1] ${ }^{\text {Philadelphia [1] }} 1 / 23$ | posted [5] 26/12 29/7 58/13 | proposal [3] 52/1 53/8 55/24 |
| Philadelphia [1] 1/23 | 58/13 58/15 | propose [4] 20/21 51/16 |
| hoto [1] | posting [4] 27/21 27/22 | 52/24 52/24 |
|  | 29/15 43/7 | proposed [8] 16/19 22/8 |
| hrased [1] 55/18 | posts [6] 27/20 28/10 55/16 | 27/13 33/17 38/8 52/9 52/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { physicians [2] 15/2 } & \text { 28/25 }\end{array}$ | 56/13 56/15 58/19 | 55/19 |
| pick [7] 52/11 52/12 52/13 | potential [2] 22/3 40 | proposing [7] |
| 52/21 52/22 52/25 53/8 | potentially [3] 11/21 23/22 | 24/13 33/1 33/13 49/23 53/15 |
| picture [4] 29/1 36/24 37/2 |  | rotection [2] 15/13 15/16 |
| 44/7 | precise [1] 37/25 <br> predominated [1] 19/3 | $\begin{array}{lrrl} \begin{array}{ll} \text { protocol [1] } & 57 / 4 \\ \text { provide [2] } & \text { 18/11 } \end{array} & 47 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| pictures [15] 19/23 24/9 | preferred <br> [1] $52 / 16$ | provided [4] $6 / 19$ 21/10 |
| 25/18 25/18 26/25 27/4 29/6 | prejudicial [1] 38/17 | 37/12 38/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}30 / 7 & 31 / 1 & 31 / 2 & 31 / 7 & 38 / 16\end{array}$ |  | providers |
| 44/9 56/14 56/15 | preliminary [1] 4/18 | providers [1] 37/9 |
| pictures to [1] 24/9 | preparation [1] 21/9 | providing [1] 51/12 |
| piece [1] 12/4 | ared [1] 7/12 | proximate |
| pieces [2] 30/13 39/7 | presage [1] 54/3 | РTO [1] 57/ |
| Pierce [1] 2/16 | presentation [3] 27/9 32/14 | pull [3] 24/8 27/24 28/2 |
| piled [1] 44/17 | 34/8 | purchase [2] 9/22 16/16 |
| Piper [1] 2/11 | presented [2] 32/3 32/8 | purchasing [3] 17/19 18/7 |
| place [1] 34/22 | presents [1] 59/2 | 18/9 [1] |
| placed [1] 16/1 | preset [1] 26/8 | purely [1] 37/2 |
| Plaintiff [12] 11/18 $13 / 8$ | presumed [1] 18/16 | purported [1] 17/ |
| 13/10 15/23 16/15 20/2 $22 / 5$ | presumes [2] 18/5 18/6 | purpose [2] 26/20 40/20 |
| 23/17 28/21 29/2 34/15 36/16 | presumption [2] 18/20 19/ | purposes [4] 36/8 36/13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plaintiff's } 36 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | ```pretrial [2] 47/11 47/15 pretty [1] 35/2``` | $\begin{array}{llll} 37 / 21 & 41 / 8 \\ \text { push [3] } & 25 / 12 & 53 / 3 & 57 / \end{array}$ |
| PLAINTIFFS [57] 1/10 3/11 | primarily [1] 5/13 | put [4] 20/24 24/10 33/25 |
| 3/13 $3 / 15$ 3/17 $3 / 19$ 4/25 5/2 | privately [1] 58/14 | 57/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}5 / 12 & 6 / 5 & 6 / 22 & 9 / 18 & 14 / 7 \\ 14 / 4 / 9\end{array}$ | probably [1] 40/22 <br> problem [1] 35/24 | putative [1] 38/5 <br> putting [1] 7/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}14 / 12 & 15 / 12 & 15 / 15 & 15 / 25\end{array}$ | problematic [1] 42 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 20 & 20 / 16 & 21 / 14 & 22 / 17 & 23 / 2\end{array}$ | problems [1] 8/7 | Q |
| 26/11 26/15 28/20 28/23 29/1 | proceedings [1] 60/10 | question [22] 4/20 6/4 6/6 |


| Q |
| :---: |
| question... [19] 6/8 6/9 |
| 6/10 6/13 7/10 8/8 14/14 |
| 19/15 20/7 30/14 36/5 37/6 |
| 43/12 43/18 47/5 52/19 54/9 |
| 54/17 56/1 |
| questioning [1] 42/23 |
| questionnaires [1] 21/7 |
| questions [13] 4/18 6/1 6/1 |
| 7/5 14/17 28/14 31/17 46/11 |
| 53/9 53/12 53/20 55/9 55/10 |
| quick [4] 24/2 38/23 38/24 |
| 40/16 |
| quickly [2] 50/6 60/3 |
| quite [1] 11/9 |
| quote [3] 13/7 13/16 49/2 |
| quoting [2] 13/5 16/12 |

## R

RANITIDINE [3] 1/4 3/3 23/11 rather [1] 7/22
rational [3] 52/12 $53 / 5 \quad 53 / 6$
re [3] 1/4 3/2 18/24
reaction [1] 27/22
read [3] 20/23 59/24 59/25
real [3] 24/2 40/16 43/10
realistic [1] 37/11
really [14] 8/6 8/8 20/14
23/4 23/8 26/17 29/7 32/3
32/6 41/25 53/4 53/23 53/25
54/10
reason [6] $12 / 10$ 14/23 $43 / 3$
43/16 45/7 51/22
reasonable [6] 16/14 49/5
49/9 49/12 49/22 57/13
reasons [8] 21/24 22/9 23/16
24/10 29/3 37/14 41/12 42/25
rebut [2] 18/20 19/5
receipts [3] 9/22 23/23 25/8
receive [1] 21/23
recently [1] 31/11
recess [1] 60/4
recognize [2] 3/11 29/8
recognizes [1] 29/4
recollect [1] 35/19
recollection [3] 36/1 43/7
43/9
recollections [1] 36/2
record [4] 31/10 36/16 36/17
60/10
records [11] 10/19 11/5
14/25 20/15 28/24 36/8 36/10
36/12 36/14 36/16 38/16
refer [1] 12/5
reference [1] 19/16
referenced [1] 8/3
refund [1] 9/24
regardless [1] 19/4
REINHART [1] 1/8
reiterate [3] 38/3 42/22
59/15
reiterating [1] 37/7
rejecting [1] 33/9
related [31] 5/5 8/11 8/19
8/23 9/1 9/3 11/8 11/15
$\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 18 & 11 / 19 & 12 / 4 & 16 / 19 & 21 / 22\end{array}$
22/10 22/11 23/7 23/11 23/15

23/18 27/20 27/23 28/1 29/14 29/16 29/17 $33 / 14 \quad 42 / 12 \quad 43 / 8$ 44/20 55/10 58/23
relating [4] $3 / 4$ 4/22 $7 / 13$ 29/15
relevance [20] 5/14 6/6 7/14 8/6 8/8 9/8 9/10 9/19 10/15 $11 / 1$ 11/3 11/8 12/8 12/16 12/19 14/4 17/8 19/10 38/16 58/19
relevance grounds [1] 9/19
relevant [47] 7/6 9/11 10/9 10/12 10/18 11/6 11/22 12/12 $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 22 & 13 / 23 & 14 / 15 & 15 / 4 & 15 / 10\end{array}$ 15/20 19/12 19/22 21/5 21/6 21/17 25/19 26/12 27/7 29/7 $30 / 19 \quad 31 / 5 \quad 34 / 9 \quad 34 / 17 \quad 34 / 22$
35/5 35/20 35/23 39/11 39/20 41/20 42/1 42/24 43/17 43/21 43/24 46/20 47/10 47/13 48/5 48/13 53/22 54/4 54/6
reliance [5] 15/18 17/1
17/14 18/5 19/2
relied [3] 16/4 16/20 17/6
rely [1] 46/5
relying [1] 16/8
remaining [1] 8/6
remanded [2] 31/23 $32 / 5$
remarks [2] 34/3 35/10
remember [1] 36/4
remembered [1] 31/11
Reporter [3] 2/15 60/13 60/14
reports [2] 32/6 32/8
repositories [4] 21/11 21/15 22/2 24/3
repository [5] 31/5 40/6 40/11 41/20 48/8
represent [2] 3/23 32/10
representation [4] 41/5 46/1 46/5 51/13
representations [3] 41/21 48/16 48/17
representative [2] 5/1 23/18 representatives [2] 3/9 4/23
representing [1] 43/10
reps [1] 21/4
request [6] 5/7 5/10 5/11 5/14 5/22 7/11
requests [3] 3/8 4/21 5/19
require [7] 14/22 15/6 36/9 45/13 49/1 49/3 51/8
required [7] 6/5 6/11 40/14 47/11 55/14 55/14 57/5
requires [5] 6/23 $13 / 10$ 40/12 49/5 56/11
resolve [9] $8 / 15$ 9/12 $10 / 7$ 10/10 10/18 54/1 54/9 54/15 54/16
resolved [2] 8/24 36/20
resources [2] 48/9 48/12
respect [15] 9/21 9/23 10/2 10/2 14/20 14/20 21/15 22/16 22/25 26/2 27/12 30/25 34/18 41/11 42/22
respond [13] 14/4 17/22
18/18 32/13 33/22 35/9 35/10 38/20 39/2 42/8 42/9 46/11

58/10
responded [1] 38/11
responding [2] 5/10 11/20
response [4] 4/17 6/25 50/14 51/9
responses [3] 3/9 6/18 51/18
result [1] 13/8
retained [1] 38/1
review [18] 4/14 8/21 8/21
23/24 27/14 27/14 28/4 29/6
33/1 49/4 50/4 55/16 56/13
58/5 58/19 58/23 58/24 58/25
revisit [1] 26/14
RFPs [1] 51/19
riding [1] 10/21
right [14] 7/21 12/15 15/7 21/2 25/12 $41 / 5$ 43/15 $46 / 9$ 46/18 53/21 54/8 56/3 58/11 60/1
risk [22] 8/2 9/15 10/14 $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 18 & 12 / 3 & 13 / 9 & 13 / 12 & 13 / 18\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 21 & 14 / 1 & 15 / 9 & 15 / 20 & 16 / 19\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 24 & 17 / 4 & 17 / 16 & 17 / 18 & 18 / 4\end{array}$ 23/15 43/22 53/25 54/22
risks [1] 17/5
risky [11] 8/3 9/15 10/23
10/25 11/5 12/3 12/20 12/22 17/4 17/11 53/25
road [1] 20/10
ROBERT [2] 1/14 $3 / 14$
ROBIN [1] 2/15
Robins [1] 13/5
roll [1] 57/11
room [1] 38/12
ROSENBERG [3] $1 / 3$ 2/15 $31 / 22$
round [1] 21/9
rude [1] 56/18
rule [24] 6/9 6/11 6/22 6/23 $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 13 & 30 / 5 & 44 / 13 & 49 / 1 & 49 / 18\end{array}$ $49 / 23$ 50/3 50/12 50/13 50/15 51/8 51/16 53/13 54/13 54/21 55/20 55/22 55/23 57/3 58/8
ruled [2] 47/10 59/8
rules [3] 6/12 49/1 49/22
ruling [3] 52/18 52/18 55/13
ruling I [1] 52/18
rulings [3] 51/2 51/3 54/19
run [7] $27 / 17$ 31/14 $33 / 13$
35/1 48/11 58/4 58/5
running [1] 43/4
runs [1] 59/2
S
SACHSE [2] 1/21 4/9
sadly [1] 42/4
safety [7] 18/1 18/1 18/2 18/3 $18 / 14$ 18/16 $19 / 1$
said [27] 4/15 8/12 24/4 24/9 24/11 24/20 24/23 24/25 $\begin{array}{lllllll}26 / 11 & 29 / 17 & 30 / 1 & 33 / 8 & 33 / 10\end{array}$ 33/19 39/1 40/1 40/17 40/18 40/19 40/19 41/9 41/10 42/10 48/7 50/21 59/9 59/19
sake [1] 19/9
same [14] 6/10 13/24 15/8 $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 24 & 18 / 21 & 18 / 22 & 19 / 6 & 22 / 1\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 3 & 33 / 17 & 34 / 12 & 35 / 21 & 43 / 5\end{array}$ 48/3

| S | several [2] 18/12 | $24 / 24 \text { 25/10 27/9 27/18 } 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San [1] 2/ | share [2] 20/20 52/22 <br> sharing [1] 28/13 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 28 / 4 & 29 / 22 & 31 / 10 & 31 / 13 & 31 / 20 \\ 32 / 8 & 32 / 23 & 33 / 5 & 34 / 21 & 35 / 3 \end{array}$ |
| Sanofi [3] 4/5 39/23 39/25 | she [7] 16/4 16/7 $16 / 8$ 18/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 24 & 37 / 14 & 39 / 10 & 40 / 10\end{array}$ |
| satisfactory [1] 35/18 | 42/16 56/4 56/5 | $\begin{array}{llllll}41 / 19 & 44 / 14 & 45 / 24 & 46 / 14 & 51 / 9\end{array}$ |
| satisfy [1] 6/11 | shift [1] 15/ | $\begin{array}{llllll}52 / 7 & 52 / 17 & 55 / 2 & 55 / 15 & 56 / 5\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { save [6] } & 7 / 4 & 22 / 12 & 22 / 13\end{array}$ | ships [1] 31/23 | $\begin{array}{llll} 56 / 12 & 56 / 23 & 57 / 7 & 58 / 2 \\ 58 / 25 \end{array}$ |
| 24/6 24/9 45/22 | shopping [2] 25/6 25 | so-called [1] 17/3 |
| $\begin{array}{\|llllll} \text { saw [1] } & 11 / 19 & & & \\ \text { say }[21] & 8 / 25 & 25 / 7 & 26 / 5 & 30 / 3 \end{array}$ | shot [1] 28/2 | So.2d [1] 13/6 |
| say [21] 8/25 25/7 26/5 30/3 30/5 30/11 31/10 33/18 37/1 | should [19] 6/13 8/5 21/1 | social [23] 14/16 $15 / 6$ 20/17 |
| //10 44/6 44/15 50/16 52/8 | 21/12 21/12 22/6 24/14 36/8 | 22/16 22/25 23/3 23/13 29/7 |
| 52/8 53/5 54/19 54/23 55/21 | $43 / 6$ 45/10 $46 / 5$ 47/22 48/1 | 29/10 29/19 30/8 36/25 37/3 |
| 55/23 58/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}49 / 1 & 49 / 13 & 49 / 13 & 49 / 14 & 54 / 1\end{array}$ | 37/10 $42 / 12$ 42/18 $44 / 1$ 44/21 |
| saying [12] 7/4 36/16 36/17 | 7/21 | 45/7 47/10 47/20 48/1 58/25 |
| 40/5 40/21 43/23 45/20 47/12 | shouldn't [4] 43/3 46 | solely [5] 4/25 14/11 19/23 |
| 47/20 47/21 49/12 49/22 |  |  |
| says [3] 39/4 41/5 41/6 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { SHOWALTER } & {[32]} & 2 / 1 & 3 / 23 & 4 / 11\end{array}$ | $8 / 23 \quad 9 / 16 \quad 10 / 8 \quad 11 / 4 \quad 11 / 21$ |
| scale [2] 42/11 47/6 | 4/24 8/5 8/25 9/17 11/12 | 14/23 19/10 24/18 24/23 |
| schedule [2] 37/11 40 | 12/18 15/7 18/18 20/13 31/17 | 24/24 31/23 32/8 32/9 32/20 |
| scheduling [1] 30/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 12 & 33 / 21 ~ 35 / 8 ~ 35 / 15 ~ & 38 / 24\end{array}$ |  |
| scope [5] 5/7 5 <br> 51/18 58/7 | 39/10 40/17 42/8 46/10 47/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}43 / 1 & 43 / 1 & 46 / 11 & 47 / 22 & 47 / 22\end{array}$ |
|  | 49/12 49/20 53/11 54/4 55/2 | 50/4 51/3 51/5 51/10 53/15 |
| screen | 55/10 56/1 58/9 59/7 | 53/24 53/24 53/25 54/24 60/2 |
| 28/13 | shows [1] | 60/5 |
| scrivener's [1] 36/23 | shuffle [1] | some-odd [2] |
| scrolling [1] 56/ | ide [9] 7/8 8/6 25/12 33/25 | somebody [5] 22/12 25/3 |
| search [81] | 51/25 52/24 53 | 29/18 56/1 |
| searchable [3] | sided [1] | somebody's [2] |
| 43/2 | sides [1] | someone [8] 14/13 15/3 $16 / 24$ |
| searched [18] 21/12 22/25 | ign [2] 50/18 | 29/6 29/15 33/19 36/23 45/11 |
| 23/6 24/15 30/16 30/18 31/13 | gnature [1] 60/1 | something [14] 8/2 13/11 |
| 33/8 37/22 40/11 47/13 47/21 | signed [2] 6/21 50/17 | 19/16 24/16 $26 / 21$ 27/5 28/8 |
| 47/22 48/2 51/20 51/21 54/1 | significantly [2] 13/8 13/12 | 34/25 39/21 42/21 43/8 44/16 |
| $54 / 10$ - | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { signing [3] } & 42 / 5 & 50 / 14 & 50 / 18 \\ \text { silence [1] } & 46 / 23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 48 / 18 \text { 56/4 } \\ \text { sometime [1] } \end{array} 36 / 17$ |
| searches [3] 12/14 38/14 | silly [1] 27 | somewhat [1] |
|  | similar [2] 22/20 | somewhere [2] 30/23 40/23 |
| arching [2] <br> econd [10] 7 | similarly [2] 22/1 22/16 | sorry [2] 49/10 57/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} 33 / 22 & 35 / 14 & 38 / 19 & 39 / 13 & 42 / 7 \end{array}$ | simply [6] 10/15 35/18 35/22 | sort [13] 10/5 12/4 15/12 |
| 50/9 55/13 | 36/4 44/15 45/14 | 30/1 31/16 45/5 45/23 46/10 |
| Secondarily | since [1] 5/17 | 47/6 51/13 51/24 54/6 55/9 |
| section [1] 56/10 | single [1] 6 | sorts [1] 7/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { see [8] } & 4 / 13 & 20 / 1 & 22 / 9 & 27 / 20\end{array}$ | sit [1] 44/ | sounds [1] |
| $30 / 2$ 33/5 33/16 43/21 | six [2] 8/8 19/11 | source [3] 43/2 45/16 $49 / 4$ |
| seeking [3] 14/2 15/19 | sky [3] 12/20 17/10 25/20 | sources [16] 21/6 23/5 23/6 |
| seem [3] $7 / 15$ 43/13 $57 / 18$ | slide [1] 33/6 | 32/21 32/22 37/18 37/22 39/9 |
| seems [6] 6/1 $7 / 1$ 7/11 $69 / 3$ | slides [2] 27/9 32 | 42/20 44/21 44/21 44/24 |
| 45/13 53/23 | slightly [2] 31/9 32/1 | 45/19 46/7 46/17 47/13 |
| seen [2] 32/20 36/ | slowly [1] | SOUTHERN [2] 1/1 13/15 |
| sell [1] 34/19 | smaller [1] 17/18 | spaces [1] 39/20 |
| selling [1] 41/16 | smoke [1] 14/20 | Spalding [1] 2 |
| send [2] 26/25 27/4 | smoked [1] $31 / 2$   <br> smoker [4] $36 / 17$ $36 / 18$ $36 / 22$ | spam [5] 21/23 24/23 25/3 $45 / 21 \quad 45 / 22$ |
| $\underset{48 / 23}{\boldsymbol{s e n s e}}\left[\begin{array}{llll} 4] & 23 / 8 & 35 / 4 & 39 / 17 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 37 / 2 \\ \text { smoking [17] } & 10 / 25 & 12 / 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { speak [4] } \\ & 47 / 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| separate [3] 21/24 23/6 37/3 | 12/20 13/19 16/23 16/24 17/5 | speaking [2] 3/23 |
| separately [1] 34/2 series [1] 6/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 16 & 18 / 9 & 30 / 7 & 31 / 1 & 31 / 3\end{array}$ | special [1] 52/3 |
| rious [1] | 37/2 43/22 44/7 56/15 56/15 | specific [6] 5/19 17/25 |
| ved [2] | Snapchat [12] 19/21 19/22 | 21/24 30/25 33/24 36/21 |
| $\text { rvice [1] } 22 / 19$ | 23/1 25/14 26/18 26/19 26/22 | specifically [3] 11/13 34/10 |
| services [2] 33/2 42/5 | 26/23 $37 / 13$ 37/19 37/23 38/1 | 59/22 [1] |
| set [5] 32/22 37/8 56/22 | so [58] 4/18 4/20 7/3 10/1 | speculative [1] 44/18 |
| 58/3 58/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 19 & 11 / 21 & 12 / 4 & 12 / 15 & 13 / 19\end{array}$ | spent [1] 21/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lrl} \boldsymbol{\operatorname { s e t s }}[\mathbf{2 ]} & 35 / 12 & 52 / 20 \\ \text { seven [1] } & 13 / 3 \end{array}$ | 17/3 18/8 19/4 20/8 20/17 <br> 21/18 22/15 24/21 24/24 | spoken [1] 34/15 <br> spreadsheet [4] 19/15 4 |



| T | turned [1] 50 | $\left[\begin{array}{llll} {[4]} & 26 / 24 & 41 / 16 & 4 \end{array}\right]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```those... [1] 59/14 though [1] 29/14 thought [5] 11/20 29/9 54/7 57/1 57/2``` | ```Twitter [21] 22/18 27/13 32/24 33/24 34/5 34/12 34/13 34/13 35/3 38/21 38/25 39/1 40/18 40/22 40/23 41/6 41/7 41/12 45/5 45/15 54/14``` | $\begin{aligned} & \left.\begin{array}{llll} 44 / 1 \\ \text { using [4] } & 17 / 14 & 27 / 2 & 28 \end{array}\right) \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { 59/4 } \end{array} \\ & \text { usually }[1] \end{aligned} 50 / 15$ |
| thousands [1] 10/19 | two [15] 6/10 11/9 12/18 | V |
| three [2] 15/12 53/19 <br> through [37] 1/8 5/15 5/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 15 / 17 & 22 / 9 & 22 / 11 & 28 / 20 & 30 / 13 \\ 39 / 7 & 46 / 24 & 50 / 8 & 50 / 16 & 52 / 19 \end{array}$ | vacation [2] $25 / 23$ $56 / 14$ <br> vacations [2] $25 / 21$ $25 / 22$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 16 & 17 / 16 & 17 / 17 & 20 / 15\end{array}$ | $54 / 16 \quad 55 / 5$ | vaccine [1] 27/23 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 16 & 20 / 18 & 20 / 24 & 21 / 7 & 21 / 7 \\ 21 / 23 & 22 / 16 & 23 / 2 & 23 / 10 & 25 / 10\end{array}$ | tying [1] 48/25 | variations [1] 14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 21 / 23 & 22 / 16 & 23 / 2 & 23 / 10 & 25 / 10 \\ 25 / 19 & 28 / 2 & 29 / 18 & 29 / 20 & 30 / 23 \end{array}$ | type [10] $12 / 3$ 14/14 $15 / 6$ | varied [1] 13/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 33 / 13 & 34 / 15 & 34 / 21 & 36 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 8 & 23 / 9 & 25 / 10 & 27 / 2 & 27 / 7\end{array}$ | various [2] 44/1 4 |
| 38/15 $39 / 15$ 44/8 $44 / 23 \quad 48 / 6$ | 27/15 56/9 | versus [4] 13/5 13 |
| 48/6 51/17 56/7 57/14 57/16 | types $23 / 3$ | very [21] 14/3 17/25 19/7 |
| throw [2] 50/20 55/5 | U | 23/17 23/20 29/4 29/22 32/13 |
| thrown [1] | ubiquitous [1] | 46/9 50/5 50/25 51/19 51/21 |
| tie-in [1] | ultimately [2] 9/23 14/19 | 56/20 58/12 60/2 |
| tied [1] 12/2 | unclear [1] 33/2 | videos [5] 26/2 26/1 |
| tight [1] 37/7 | under [15] 6/11 $13 / 2$ 15/15 | 37/15 38/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { TikTok [8] } & 23 / 1 & 25 / 14 & 26 / 2\end{array}$ | 15/24 18/8 18/10 30/10 37/11 | view [3] 30/3 34/1 52/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 2 & 26 / 4 & 26 / 6 & 37 / 13 & 37 / 19\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 47 / 11 & 49 / 5 & 49 / 22 \\ 54 / 6 & 54 / 12 & \end{array}$ | Vioxx [3] 18/24 20/13 20/18 <br> VR [1] 41/18 |
| time [16] 11/24 17/6 24/19 | undercuts |  |
| 28/5 28/6 29/6 32/17 33/25 | understand [19] 5/10 10/7 | W |
| $\begin{aligned} & 39 / 18 ~ 41 / 25 ~ 41 / 25 ~ 43 / 10 \\ & 56 / 24 ~ 58 / 1 ~ 59 / 7 ~ 60 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | 11/10 11/11 12/6 12/7 14/18 | Wacker [1] 1/11 |
| timeline [1] 37/7 | 17/4 17/7 40/7 42/3 44/5 | waiving [2] 59/8 59/18 |
| times [1] 36/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}44 / 13 & 44 / 15 & 44 / 25 & 45 / 6 & 58 / 8\end{array}$ | Wal [2] 15/22 16/1 |
| timing [1] 56/23 | 58/20 59/17 | Wal-Mart placed [1] 16/1 |
| to produce [1] | understanding [6] 3/7 4/21 | Wal-Mart Stores [1] 15/22 |
| to text [1] 22/20 | 7/6 7/10 8/7 | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { walk [2] } & 20 / 24 & 50 / 23 \\ \text { wall } & \text { [1] } & 56 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| today [10] $3 / 23$ 7/2 8/15 | 38/18 55/8 58/7 | walls [3] 55/17 58/13 58 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} 10 / 7 & 37 / 1 & 38 / 13 & 50 / 3 & 58 / 8 \\ 59 / 18 & 59 / 24 \end{array}$ | unduly [1] 33/18 | want [32] 5/9 20/24 25/15 |
| told [3] 31/12 41/15 | unilateral [1] 45/25 | 30/4 30/11 33/23 40/10 40/20 |
| too [1] 4/12 | unique [1] 6/24 | 41/4 42/8 42/10 42/22 43/14 |
| took [3] 38/23 45/3 46/10 | UNITED [2] 1/1 1/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}44 / 17 & 46 / 11 & 46 / 13 & 46 / 16\end{array}$ |
| tool [1] 39/5 | unjust [1] 15/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll}46 / 22 & 46 / 23 & 47 / 2 & 47 / 4 & 50 / 4\end{array}$ |
| tools [5] 39/14 39/14 49/13 | unless [2] 28/14 43/9 | 52/19 52/23 53/7 55/12 56/12 |
| 59/4 59/4 | unlike [1] 34/24 | 56/20 56/23 57/12 57/24 |
| top [2] 32/20 44/17 | unlikely [1] | 59/20 [5] |
| topic [2] 11/6 50/6 | unpack [1] 32/15 | wanted [5] 24/21 33/6 40/24 |
| topics [7] 6/4 7/15 8/2 43/8 | unrelated [1] 23/23 | /10 |
| 43/22 43/24 53/22 | til [2] 38/10 41/23 | wanting [1] 7/25 |
| toto [1] 48/1 | up [10] 20/24 24/8 27/10 | wnts [1] |
| traditional [4] 20/19 27/16 | 31/1 38/10 39/23 47/3 51/10 | warning [1] 18/4 |
| 39/17 44/24 | 52/3 52/6 | warnings [1] 16/25 |
| transcript [1] 60 | up of [1] 31 | warrants [2] 42/4 42/ |
| transparency [3] 6/19 22/15 | update [2] 22/21 41/14 upon [6] 13/16 30/4 45/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { warranty } & {[1]} & 15 / 13 \\ \text { was [38] } & 8 / 1 & 8 / 25 & 13 / 11 & 16 / 7 \end{array}$ |
|  | 46/2 52/24 55/5 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 8 & 16 / 18 & 17 / 23 & 18 / 25 & 19 / 2\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ransparent } \left.\begin{array}{l} \text { [2] } \\ \text { cash } \\ 44 / 6 \\ 44 \end{array}\right) \end{aligned}$ | us [13] 11/13 11/15 26/11 | 19/3 19/15 19/20 19/24 20/2 |
| ating [2] | 28/5 30/12 33/3 34/6 41/15 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 20 / 14 & 20 / 14 & 20 / 15 & 21 / 5 & 29 / 13\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { eating }[2] \\ & \text { ial } 32 / 732 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | 41/24 51/22 57/9 57/12 58/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 15 & 30 / 19 & 31 / 17 & 34 / 4 & 34 / 8\end{array}$ |
|  | USB [2] 22/2 24/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 19 & 36 / 16 & 36 / 16 & 36 / 22\end{array}$ |
|  | use [27] 12/2 13/11 15/20 | 38/23 39/8 42/18 45/20 47/6 |
| true [4] 22/23 37/17 37 | 16/23 25/3 25/5 27/15 28/25 | 51/20 51/20 55/6 58/24 60/7 |
| $42 / 25$ (4] $22 / 23$ 3/117 | 29/10 34/17 34/19 39/9 39/24 | Washington [2] 2/2 2/6 |
| truly [1] 44/ | $39 / 24$ 40/1 40/2 40/3 40/19 | wasn't [6] 8/10 19/17 20/1 |
|  | 40/24 40/25 41/1 41/2 41/7 | 30/23 38/10 41/22 |
| 60/2 trying [2] 10/7 $45 / 19$ | 41/8 44/17 45/6 45/21 <br> used [15] 18/20 19/5 21/17 | ```watched [1] 29/16 way [17] 7/22 12/2 26/22``` |
| trying [2] 10/7 45/19 $\text { tunes [1] } 26 / 8$ | 22/7 22/11 22/20 23/16 25/23 | 27/4 27/16 28/9 30/21 33/3 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { s [1] } & 26 \\ {[5]} & 8 / 5 \end{array}$ | 33/3 39/2 39/25 40/23 44/21 | 39/9 48/9 50/20 50/21 53/8 |
| 19/18 $40 / 16$ | $44 / 21 \quad 45 / 20$ <br> useless [1] 26 | 55/2 57/10 57/11 57/13 <br> ways [4] 15/5 39/18 57/1 |


| W | why [12] 17/9 17/11 20/22 | yet [1] 52/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ways... [1] 57/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 21 / 12 & 21 / 24 & 24 / 10 & 24 / 14 & 33 / 3 \\ 43 / 3 & 43 / 16 & 50 / 25 & 59 / 3 \end{array}$ | ```you [234] you respond [1] 38/20``` |
| we [238] $\text { we'd [1] } 11 / 24$ | wide [1] 18/17 | you'd [1] 25/16 |
| $\text { we'll [1] } 25 / 2$ | wife [1] 41/2 | you're [1] 56/19 |
| we're [1] $51 / 7$ | will [57] $1 / 21$ 3/23 4/8 6/3 | YOUNG [2] 2/10 4/4 |
| weaker [1] 17/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 7 & 9 / 24 & 10 / 4 & 10 / 6 & 10 / 12 \\ 13 / 16 & 15 / 3 & 15 / 14 & 15 / 20 & 16 / 23\end{array}$ | your [118] |
| wearing [1] 56/19 | $\begin{array}{llll} 13 / 16 & 15 / 3 & 15 / 14 & 15 / 20 \\ 16 / 23 \end{array}$ | yourselves [2] 51/10 52/23 |
| week [1] 22/22 | $23 / 13 \text { 25/7 28/13 28/16 29/11 }$ | Z |
| weekend [1] 60/6 | 33/23 34/24 35/9 35/10 38/18 | ZANTAC [10] $1 / 4 \mathrm{3} / 2 \mathrm{l}$ 10/3 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { weeks [1] } & 60 / 5 \\ \text { weight [1] } & 14 / 20\end{array}$ | 40/16 46/12 47/9 50/5 51/3 | 12/11 13/11 17/19 $23 / 11$ |
| weight [1] 14/20 Weiselberg [1] 1/15 | 51/4 52/4 52/11 52/13 52/13 | 23/16 23/19 45/3 |
| Weiselberg [1] 1/15 <br> well [9] 4/16 5/15 8/21 14/3 | $52 / 1452 / 1752 / 18 \quad 52 / 20$ | Zoom [1] 1/8 |
| 27/25 42/9 $44 / 6$ 57/18 60/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll}52 / 25 & 53 / 6 & 53 / 14 & 54 / 1 & 54 / 3\end{array}$ |  |
| went [6] 16/7 21/7 21/7 40/4 | $55 / 13 \text { 55/23 58/5 58/5 58/16 }$ $58 / 17 \quad 59 / 25 \quad 60 / 2 \quad 60 / 4$ |  |
| 48/6 48/6 | will direct [1] 58/16 |  |
| were [24] 4/14 4/22 5/17 | Williams [1] 2/1 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 14 & 16 / 21 & 19 / 1 & 19 / 20 & 21 / 11 \\ 23 / 16 & 24 / 5 & 24 / 7 & 24 / 9 & 25 / 24\end{array}$ | window [1] 15/25 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 16 & 24 / 5 & 24 / 7 & 24 / 9 & 25 / 24 \\ 29 / 8 & 29 / 16 & 30 / 17 & 34 / 4 & 36 / 18\end{array}$ | within [2] 14/9 20/2 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 8 & 29 / 16 & 30 / 17 & 34 / 4 & 36 / 18 \\ 38 / 25 & 43 / 10 & 44 / 9 & 44 / 10 & 50 / 21\end{array}$ | without [1] 36/3 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 25 & 43 / 10 & 44 / 9 & 44 / 10 & 50 / 21\end{array}$ | witnesses [1] 30/18 |  |
| 50/25 weren't [2] 19/25 25/9 | won't [3] 29/24 35/17 53/5 |  |
| WEST [3] 1/2 1/5 2/16 | Wonderful [1] 32/19 |  |
| WestLaw [1] 15/22 | word [2] 20/9 33/17 |  |
| what [82] | work [18] 21/22 22/10 22/11 |  |
| whatever [7] 6/18 11/22 | 23/7 23/7 $24 / 5$ 24/15 $24 / 17$ |  |
| 27/23 51/2 56/19 58/4 59/19 | 39/1 |  |
| whatevering [1] 30/8 |  |  |
| WhatsApp [3] $22 / 22$ 22/19 $22 / 19$ | work-related [3] 22/10 22/11 |  |
| when [23] 16/7 17/25 18/3 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 14 & 18 / 15 & 24 / 3 & 25 / 3 & 33 / 3\end{array}$ | working [2] 39/22 57/14 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}34 / 1 & 39 / 16 & 40 / 17 & 41 / 4 & 43 / 25\end{array}$ | works [5] 26/5 26/7 26/22 |  |
| 44/9 $44 / 12$ 50/15 50/16 50/21 | $\begin{array}{rl} \text { works } & \text { 131 } \\ 32 / 1 & 48 / 10 \end{array}$ |  |
| 52/8 52/18 53/5 56/12 56/24 | worth [1] 38/9 |  |
| where [37] $6 / 8$ 7/7 $7 / 21$ <br> $10 / 10 \quad 12 / 18$ <br> $19 / 20 \quad 25 / 1 \quad 25 / 8$ | would [52] 6/2 7/3 7/15 8/ |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}10 / 10 & 12 / 18 & 19 / 20 & 25 / 1 & 25 / 8 \\ 25 / 9 & 25 / 23 & 28 / 6 & 29 / 8 & 30 / 2\end{array}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 9 & 25 / 23 & 28 / 6 & 29 / 8 & 30 / 2 \\ 30 / 15 & 34 / 16 & 34 / 22 & 35 / 22\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 12 & 14 / 15 & 16 / 13 & 17 / 11\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 15 & 34 / 16 & 34 / 22 & 35 / 22 \\ 36 / 16 & 37 / 11 & 37 / 19 & 38 / 13 & 40 / 7\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 19 & 17 / 24 & 18 / 6 & 18 / 8 & 20 / 20\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 16 & 37 / 11 & 37 / 19 & 38 / 13 & 40 / 7 \\ 41 / 9 & 41 / 10 & 41 / 25 & 42 / 6 & 42 / 11\end{array}$ | 22/4 23/7 23/11 25/8 25/22 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}41 / 9 & 41 / 10 & 41 / 25 & 42 / 6 & 42 / 11 \\ 42 / 13 & 42 / 19 & 45 / 12 & 45 / 18 & 46 / 3\end{array}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 13 & 42 / 19 & 45 / 12 & 45 / 18 & 46 / 3 \\ 46 / 25 & 47 / 6 & 47 / 23 & 48 / 20 & 54 / 18\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 9 & 29 / 18 & 29 / 20 & 30 / 11 & 30 / 14\end{array}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 31 / 6 & 31 / 14 & 33 / 18 & 36 / 20 & 37 / 8\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered}\text { whether [19] } \\ \begin{array}{c}14 / 21 \\ 14 / 21\end{array} 14 / 13 \\ 14 / 22\end{gathered} 14 / 20$ 15/3 $16 / 20$ | 39/22 $41 / 22 \quad 45 / 8 \quad 46 / 16$ 48/11 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 21 & 14 / 21 & 14 / 22 & 15 / 3 & 16 / 20 \\ 16 / 21 & 18 / 10 & 18 / 25 & 19 / 4 & 19 / 6\end{array}$ | $51 / 8 \quad 51 / 2253 / 16 \quad 56 / 5 \quad 56 / 17$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 21 & 18 / 10 & 18 / 25 & 19 / 4 & 19 / 6\end{array}$ | 57/18 58/19 59/14 59/21 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 23 & 43 / 6 & 53 / 24 & 55 / 19 & 55 / 21 \\ 55 / 23 & 56 / 15\end{array}$ | $\text { wouldn't [5] } 17 / 6 \text { 17/7 24/10 }$ |  |
| 55/23 56/15 | $45 / 12 \quad 48 / 13$ |  |
|  | written [2] 6/21 50/5 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}13 / 18 & 15 / 15 & 15 / 18 & 15 / 19 & 16 / 8 \\ 16 / 8 & 17 / 20 & 19 / 2 & 23 / 2 & 23 / 12\end{array}$ | wrong [1] 47/19 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 8 & 17 / 20 & 19 / 2 & 23 / 2 & 23 / 12 \\ 23 / 19 & 30 / 8 & 31 / 17 & 33 / 18 & 36 / 5\end{array}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}23 / 19 & 30 / 8 & 31 / 17 & 33 / 18 & 36 / 5\end{array}$ | X |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 6 & 38 / 6 & 39 / 1 & 40 / 25 & 44 / 12 \\ 51 / 24 & 52 / 12 & 52 / 15 & 52 / 19 & 54 / 6\end{array}$ | X1 [2] 58/16 59/4 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}51 / 24 & 52 / 12 & 52 / 15 & 52 / 19 & 54 / 6\end{array}$ $55 / 6 \quad 55 / 19 \quad 57 / 12$ | Y |  |
| while [2] 17/23 38/23 | yeah [1] 30/7 |  |
| white [1] 29/17 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { WHITELEY [4] } 1 / 18 \text { 1/18 } 3 / 19 \\ & 3 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | years [8] 11/22 12/10 12/10 |  |
| who [6] 9/2 $16 / 15$ 17/15 $21 / 3$ |  |  |
| 39/15 43/19 | yes [21] 5/8 5/24 8/10 8/13 |  |
| whole [4] 23/22 26/20 30/7 | 9/6 14/6 34/7 39/7 41/10 |  |
| 31/18 <br> wholesales [1] 46/17 | $\begin{array}{llllllll} & 46 / 8 & 47 / 8 & 49 / 19 & 53 / 18 & 55 / 2\end{array}$ |  |
| wholesales [1] 46/17 <br> wholly [1] 38/14 | 56/1 56/2 57/23 58/9 58/22 |  |

