| 1 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | EASTERN DISTRICT | OF NEW YORK (BROOKLYN) |
| 3 | | Case No. 1:22-md-03044-NGG-MMH |
| 4 | IN RE: EXACTECH POLYETHYLENE | |
| 5 | ORTHOPEDIC PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION, et al, | Brooklyn, New York |
| 6 | | June 1, 2023 2:40 p.m. |
| 7 | | via video |
| 8 | EDANGODIDE OF OER | THE CONTRACT HEADING |
| 9 | TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARCIA M. HENRY | |
| 10 | | S MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 11 | APPEARANCES: For the Plaintiffs: | N. Kirkland Pope, Esq. |
| 12 | | Pope McGlamry, P.C. 3391 Peachtree Road, NE |
| 13 | | Suite 300 Atlanta, GA 30326 |
| 14 | For the Plaintiffs: | Ellen Relkin, Esq. |
| 15 | | Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C. 700 Broadway |
| 16 | | New York, NY 10003 |
| 17 | For the Plaintiffs: | Rayna Kessler, Esq. Robins, Kaplan, LLP |
| 18 | | 1325 Avenue of the Americas Ste 2601 |
| 19 | | New York, NY 10019 |
| 20 | For the Plaintiffs: | Joseph H. Saunders, Esq. Saunders & Walker, PA |
| 21 | | 3491 Gandy Blvd North Suite 200 |
| 22 | | Pinellas Park, FL 33781 |
| 23 | For the Plaintiffs: | John Nazzaro, Esq. The Reardon Law Firm, P.C. |
| 24 | | 160 Hempstead Street P.O. Drawer 1430 |
| 25 | | New London, CT 06320 |

| | | · |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | APPEARANCES (continued): | |
| 2 | For the Plaintiffs: | Michael Cutler, Esq. Wagstaff & Cartmell |
| 3 | | 4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300 Kansas City, MO 64112 |
| 4 | For the Plaintiffs: | Jerry Wilke, Esq. |
| 5 | FOI CHE FIAINCIIIS. | Redmond Law, PLLC 80 Broad Street |
| 6 | | Ste 1202 New York, NY 10004 |
| 7 | Dan the District | |
| 8 | For the Plaintiff: (MSP Recovery Claims Series LLC) | Amanda L Fernandez, Esq. Rivero Mestre, LLP 2525 Ponce de Leon Blvd. |
| 9 | | Suite 1000 Miami, FL 33134 |
| 10 | For the Plaintiffs: | Carasusana B. Wallis, Esq. |
| 11 | Liaison | Zolls & Kranz 6620 Central Avenue, Suite 100 |
| 12 | | Toledo, OH 43617 |
| 13 | For the Defendants: (Exactech, Inc. and | Susan M. Sharko, Esq. Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath, |
| 14 | Exactech US, Inc. | LLP 25 Oak Ridge Avenue |
| 15 | | Summit, NJ 07901 |
| 16 | | Ruben I. Gonzalez, Esq. Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP |
| 17 | | 320 S. Canal St. Ste 3300 |
| 18 | | Chicago, IL 60606 |
| 19 | For the Defendants: (TPG Capital, a foreign | Christa C. Cottrell, Esq. Mark W. Premo-Hopkins, Esq. |
| 20 | Corporation, TPG Partners, VII, LP, TPG Genpar, VII | Kirkland & Ellis, LLP 300 North LaSalle |
| 21 | Advisors, LLC) | Chicago, IL 60654 |
| 22 | Clerk: | R.C. |
| 23 | Court Recorder: | Electronic Sound Recording |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

| 1 | Managarintian Commission | Chaig Herana | - |
|----|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| | . A | Chris Hwang Abba Reporting | |
| 2 | | PO Box 223282 Chantilly, Virginia | 20153 |
| 3 | | (518) 302-6772 | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | Proceedings recorded by electro | | <i>;</i> |
| 25 | transcript produced by transcri | iption service. | |

1 (Call to order at 2:40 p.m.)

2.2

THE CLERK: Good afternoon. This is civil cause for a status conference in this multi district litigation matter, 22-md-3044, In Re: Exactech Polyethylene Orthopedic Product Liability Litigation.

As a reminder, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 1.8, the parties may not independently record any court proceedings. A transcript of this proceeding may be ordered from the Clerk's Office.

That being said, starting with counsels for Plaintiff, please unmute your line and each state your appearances for the record?

 $\mbox{MS. RELKIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Ellen Relkin} \\ \mbox{from Weitz & Luxenberg for the Plaintiffs.} \\$

MR. POPE: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Kirk Pope for counsel for Plaintiffs.

MS. KESSLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Rayna Kessler on behalf of Plaintiffs MDL liaison counsel.

MR. SAUNDERS: Joseph H. Saunders, counsel for the Plaintiff and Florida liaison.

MS. WALL: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Cara Wall for Plaintiffs, executive committee, and ESI liaison in the MDL.

MR. NAZZARO: Good afternoon, Your Honor, John
Nazzaro on behalf of Joe Barnes and myself with the Reardon law
firm in Connecticut.

1 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Nazzaro. 2 MR. CUTLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Michael 3 Cutler for the Plaintiffs. 4 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Is that everyone? Is 5 that everyone on the Plaintiffs' executive? 6 MR. WILKE: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Jerry Wilke 7 (phonetic) on behalf of Redmond law firm. 8 THE COURT: Hang on. I need to hear from the 9 specially designated Plaintiff's leadership counsel who were 10 appointed by the Court's order. So I just want to make sure 11 that the counsel who have announced themselves are included in 12 that list. 13 MR. WILKE: Yes, ma'am, I'm --14 MR. NAZZARO: Point of correction, Your Honor, I'm 15 John Nazzaro. I'm not on that committee just to be clear. 16 THE COURT: Okay. If you're not on the committee, I 17 only need to hear committee attorneys. Thank you. 18 THE CLERK: For Defendant Exactech, counsels, please 19 state your appearances? 20 MS. SHARKO: Susan Sharko from Faegre Drinker for the 21 Exactech Defendants. 22 MR. GONZALEZ: Ruben Gonzalez from Faegre Drinker for 23 the Exactech Defendants. And I'll just note for the Court that 24 I have a couple of summer associates sitting with me. 25 THE CLERK: Then for TP -- Defendant TPP (sic),

1 | counsel, please state your appearance?

2.2

MS. COTTRELL: Christa Cottrell with Kirkland & Ellis for TPG.

MR. PREMO-HOPKINS: And Mark Premo-Hopkins from Kirkland & Ellis also for TPG.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE CLERK: And for TPP counsel, please state your appearance?

MS. FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Amanda Fernandez on behalf of the TPP Plaintiff.

THE COURT: Okay, that is everyone that I should be hearing from. Good afternoon to each of you, assuming we're all in the same time zone.

Okay, so there's been a lot that's happened since our last status conference in March. Let me just first remind everyone to please keep your lines muted if you're not speaking.

And as a reminder, the only people who should be speaking for Plaintiffs are people on the Plaintiff's executive committee and its subcommittees. Counsel for the Defense have already announced themselves.

Otherwise, your line should be mute. I'm not going to repeat this. You're just going to be removed from the conference if you can't abide by that direction. Thank you very much.

Okay, so there have been a number of orders entered since the last conference, including an amended fact sheet implementation order at Document 166, an amended case management order regarding Plaintiff's preliminary disclosure forms at Document 168, several practice and procedure orders regarding direct filing, electronic service. Those are at Documents 194 and 195.

2.2

There was an order governing the adoption of the master, excuse me, amended master personal injury complaint, et cetera, at Document 196.

There was an order for Science Day at 197, a second amended fact sheet implementation at 198. And then, more recently in the past few days, there has been a couple of case management orders, specifically orders numbers 3 and 4, regarding pathology in medical device preservation protocol at Document 268 and the amended leadership counsel for Plaintiff at Document 269.

Just this week, I entered two text orders regarding specific requests around discovery, one, relating to MSP Recovery claims and third-party payer claims, overruling any objections and denying their request to defer ruling on the proposed discovery order.

I also granted the motion to stay discovery for the TPG Defendants. And each of those orders are essentially implementing stays of discovery as to those respective parties

pending the motions to dismiss filed by Exactech regarding the third-party payer Plaintiffs and as to TP -- yes, TPG as to their motion to dismiss.

2.2

Those motions are either fully briefed or are in the process of briefing, but the stays of discovery apply to those parties.

And then, finally, the most recent discovery order is at Document 291, which is the overall discovery case management order.

Now typically in this status conference, I look to your status report or your most recent status report as to any issues that need to be discussed.

And based on my review of that report, including other submissions for the discovery case management order, it appears that many of the issues that were raised in the status report at Document 289 have been resolved by the discovery orders.

So why don't I start with counsel for Plaintiffs, whomever is taking the lead today, to discuss what if any additional issues they believe remain outstanding from the status report.

MR. POPE: Thank you, Your Honor. It's Kirk Pope for Plaintiffs. Your Honor, it's our position I believe your discovery order that was entered at Document 291 addressed at least all of the issues that we need to discuss today.

There are some issues that Plaintiffs and Defendant Exactech are continuing to work through that were mentioned in the joint status conference, but we don't believe today is an appropriate time to take up any of those issues.

THE COURT: Okay, all right, that's fine. Anyone else from Plaintiff's counsel before I turn to counsel for Exactech?

MS. KESSLER: Your Honor, this is Rayna Kessler on behalf of Plaintiff liaison counsel. I had a few things with counsel on the line that are mostly reminders to counsel.

THE COURT: Okay, yes.

2.2

MS. KESSLER: I can say that again.

THE COURT: Yes, please. I will always allow you,

Ms. Kessler, at the end of these conferences to handle any

administrative or other announcements, but I need to deal with

kind of the meat of the issues first.

Ms. Relkin, I think you were starting to speak.

MS. RELKIN: One minor thing and, you know, we're scheduling a Rule 26 conference with Defendants for next week, but I know it had been debated before and it hasn't been addressed before Your Honor, the number of interrogatories with regard to Rule 33.

Plaintiffs believe that in light of this being an MDL involving three different joints with multiple products, that the 25 cap of interrogatories should not be applicable. I hope

we'll be able to work it out with Defendants, but I'd hate to not work it out and then have to come back.

So whether you want to have briefing scheduled in case we can't work it out, I'm just flagging that issue because it wasn't addressed in our papers.

THE COURT: Right, I think that -- and I won't speak for counsel for Exactech. I believe that there was mention of the number of interrogatories that had already been served and it was something like 34, but why don't I hear from counsel from Exactech, whomever's speaking today?

MS. SHARKO: Mr. Gonzalez will address that for us.

MR. GONZALEZ: Your Honor, we did suggest in our proposed case discovery plan that we would limit the requests for production.

And then, what we propose is that we would actually -- that the more common trend in MDL litigation is to move away from written interrogatories.

But I do think that perhaps the more appropriate thing to do would be to confer with -- to confer with the Plaintiffs on this and see if we can come to some sort of agreement and raise it separately before the Court.

THE COURT: Okay, well, I already included in here that there should be interrogatories, sir. So I don't think this is a discussion about whether or not there will be interrogatories. I think what Ms. Relkin is pointing out is

the number of interrogatories.

2.2

MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah, I think that's right, Your

Honor. It wasn't my -- it wasn't our intention to bring up

what we had initially proposed, but I think that what we can do

is work with the Plaintiffs, and if we can't come to an

agreement, then we'll bring that back.

THE COURT: Am I correct when I said that there were something like 34 interrogatories served already?

MR. GONZALEZ: I believe it's 34 interrogatories and then the requests for production I think were close to 90.

THE COURT: Okay. And so, is the current dispute between the 34 and the 25 that is capped in the federal rules? You really want to brief that?

MS. SHARKO: No, no, it could be that we will have some additional ones now that, you know, we're learning some more information. So that the 34 would not be our universe of interrogatories. We just need to know what we're working with.

THE COURT: Okay, I will say that it was my intention with the discovery order if it wasn't made clear. And I adopted the phrasing that both parties submitted around the request being consistent with the federal rules and the local rules of this Court. So that would mean a 25 interrogatory cap, unless you're able to show cause as to why there should be more.

The fact that there is an MDL by itself may not be

sufficient because there are a number of other related cases in which discovery has been exchanged.

And so, it may be that the interrogatories themselves can be sufficiently narrowed or frankly the answers may be in documents that are going to be provided in response to the document requests, but I will leave it to you all to confer on that issue before addressing it more directly.

Okay, all right, so besides those, Ms. Relkin, anything else from the status report that you think needs to be addressed today?

MS. RELKIN: No, Your Honor, I think, you know, your order was very helpful in laying out the rules and we have our meeting with Defendants some time next week. So, hopefully, any other remaining issue, we can resolve.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

And for going back to Exactech, besides responding on the number of interrogatories, anything else that you think needs to be addressed that was raised in the status report?

MS. SHARKO: Susan Sharko for Exactech. No, Your Honor. We thought your order was very comprehensive.

THE COURT: Okay, I do appreciate all of you providing your respective perspectives on the way in which discovery should unfold.

And I realize that there are a number of issues to be teased out in this case. So thank you for assisting me in

coming to these decisions.

2.2

I also wanted to note that Science Day was very helpful, extremely comprehensive and very helpful, so thank you again for your experts' presentations.

Let me turn to others that I have not yet heard from. Does TPG have anything to chime in here on?

MS. COTTRELL: Christa Cottrell for TPG. We don't, Your Honor. I think our issue for now is settled, but thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. And Ms. Fernandez, I'm again realizing that you're here. You're part of the leadership counsel. You are representing the third-party payers, but there is a stay of discovery, so I don't know that there is anything else to be addressed unless you wanted to raise it with the Court?

MS. FERNANDEZ: There's nothing to raise, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. All right, typically, I ask for an update on the number of cases, but does anyone have the latest number as of today? Your status report was last week, but I feel like there are a number of changes by the same we get here.

MS. SHARKO: Yes, Susan Sharko, Your Honor, I do. As of today, there are 589 cases in the MDL and they make up 89 hips, 491 knees, 7 ankles, and 1 unknown, and 1 is the MSP

1 case.

In Florida, we have 192 cases, which are 46 hips, 143 knees, and 3 ankles.

In other states, we have 25 cases, which are 2 hips, 22 knees, and 1 unknown.

THE COURT: And the other states would be all the actions filed in other state courts combined?

MS. SHARKO: Correct, yes. New York state court, California, and Chicago or Illinois are the main ones. Those are listed in Appendix A or Exhibit A to the report.

THE COURT: All right, okay. Thank you.

All right, Mr. Saunders, can you provide a status on the Florida coordinated actions?

MR. SAUNDERS: Certainly. We have -- there are two motions to compel discovery pending in the independent Frees (phonetic) case, which is the only case in which depositions are going to forward.

We took a deposition last week of the designated 30(b)(6) rep for regulatory and quality, Michael Crater (phonetic). Next week, we have a deposition of a Mr. Katanzarai (phonetic), who is an engineer with the company.

We are in the process of scheduling the depositions of Plaintiffs' experts that have been disclosed. The Defense disclosure is due shortly, so we're in the process of finishing up the employee depositions of the company, as well as

scheduling the depositions within the next probably, you know, four, six, eight weeks of the Plaintiff's experts.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Okay, given that most of our issues appear to have been resolved in the most recent orders, Ms. Kessler, before I give you the floor, is there anything else that anyone else wanted to raise?

Hearing and seeing nothing -- or Mr. Pope?

MR. POPE: No, Your Honor, I was just going to speak up, say we didn't -- so you didn't have to sit there in silence. Nothing from Plaintiffs, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, certainly. No problem.

All right, Ms. Kessler? And I just wanted to raise one point, which is in one of the short text orders that I issued about the short form complaints. Is that something that you're going to address?

MS. KESSLER: Yes, Your Honor, that is one that I was going to address. And thank you for issuing that docket order as well.

So I had a few things to update the Court on to let Your Honor know that we are communicating with all counsel that had filed cases very regularly.

We've had two webinars since the last status conference with Your Honor. The first webinar was centered on working with all Plaintiffs' counsel to advise them of the case

specific discovery deadlines and orders that the Court has now entered, specifically on the Plaintiff fact sheet, deadlines, as well as the Plaintiff preliminary disclosure form deadlines that apply to every single case that's filed in this MDL.

2.2

A reminder to all counsel that 75 days from the date of that implementation order will be next week on June 6. So will be a major deadline for Plaintiffs to have filed a lot of Plaintiff fact sheets with the Defense fact sheets then due 15 days after that that are substantially complete. So there should be a lot of case-specific discovery happening within the next month.

In addition, we also covered the short form complaint filing process and implementation order that the Court entered. And the -- Your Honor, we appreciate the docket entry on May 19 to remind counsel that all of the short form complaints should only be filed in individual dockets as an amended complaint.

None of the individual pleadings should be on the master docket. We understand how busy the master docket is.

And we certainly do not want it cluttered out with any individual pleadings. And the orders were very clear on that as well.

In addition to filing the short form complaint and the individual dockets, they must also be submitted on MDL Centrality within 14 days of filing a short form complaint.

And that process has also been explained in emails from me as

liaison counsel to all counsel with filed cases and was also addressed in our webinars.

In addition to webinar that we did on case-specific discovery, we held a webinar yesterday again with all Plaintiff's counsel. We reviewed the case-specific discovery deadlines, but we also focused on the preservation order that Your Honor entered on May 19, which is Case Management Order Number 3.

That also applies to all file cases and lays out the preservation letter templates and attachments that all counsel need to use for filed cases with either future revision, surgeries, or if preservation letters have not been sent prior to the case being filed.

We also have now a Defense contact for all counsel to copy on those preservation letters that are sent pursuant to CML3.

That information has been provided to all counsel with filed cases as well, but I will state it here, too, that the Defense contact to copy on all preservation letter correspondence is Blake Lehr. That's B-L-A-K-E.L-E-H-R@faegredrinker.com.

We also provided counsel with a potential provider to use to store the devices. That is Steelgate, Incorporated and provided communication and that contact information as well for Steelgate to all counsel.

I wanted to also thank the Court for adding Brown

Greer to ECF notifications. That has allowed all Plaintiffs'

counsel to now automatically receive PDF versions of what's

filed on the master docket. And that is going very smoothly.

All counsel has the option of opting into that by using their

MDL Centrality accounts and that's offered with no cost to any

Plaintiffs' counsel to utilize that.

In addition, we have been updating our Plaintiff website, which can be found at ExactechMDLfilings.com. That's updated weekly. We include all the key core orders on there for counsel and also for Plaintiffs to have access to it. It's a publicly-available website.

We also include all the templates to use for the case-specific discovery and work closely with Brown Greer to make sure those are all fillable PDF formats as well that are easy for counsel to use.

In addition, I'm maintaining our master Plaintiff counsel list. We poll new counsel that are listed as counsel of record on Pacer. We poll that weekly, so it's a pretty upto-date list.

If anyone else on this court hearing is not receiving my emails, you can email me at our liaison email address. And that is ExactechMDLliaison@RobinsKaplan.com.

It's very important that all Plaintiffs' counsel utilize that email address and not my personal email address,

because that will go to a distribution list that can provide a quicker response than my personal email address.

So I think that's it for liaison counsel update. Thank you, Your Honor, for the time.

2.2

THE COURT: All right, thank you, Ms. Kessler.

If there is nothing else from anyone else, then I wanted to set a date for our next status conference. And this will be the long-awaited in-person status conference here in our courthouse in New York.

Because of the dates in the discovery plan, many of which appear to be coming up in June and July, I thought it would be helpful to have a date in August and specifically Tuesday, August 22nd at 2:00 p.m.

Any objections to that date? Hearing none, then the date will be August 22nd, 2023 at 2:00 p.m. That will be in our courthouse in the ceremonial courtroom, which is courtroom 2E as in Eric, north. The cases -- the MDL has grown a little bit too large for the courtroom that we were in before.

All right, if there is nothing else, of course, your status report would be due the usual 10 days before that. And of course, feel free to bring to my attention any issues that should arise after your meet and confer.

All right, thank you all very, very much. With that, we are adjourned. Everyone, enjoy the rest of your summer and see you on August 22nd.

| 1 | MR. POPE: Thank you, Your Honor. |
|----|--------------------------------------|
| 2 | MS. KESSLER: Your Honor. |
| 3 | (Proceedings concluded at 3:13 p.m.) |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| | 21 |
|----|--|
| 1 | CERTIFICATE |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, Chris Hwang, court approved transcriber, certify |
| 5 | that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official |
| 6 | electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above- |
| 7 | entitled matter. |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | a 14 |
| 12 | - 14 |
| 13 | June 23, 2023 |
| 14 | Chris Hwang Date |
| 15 | Court Reporter |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |