APR 2 7 2005

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

CHAMBERS OF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE 3 BLOOMES FALLOW ******

4 Docket No. MDL 1355 IN RE: PROPULSID PRODUCTS 5 LIABILITY LITIGATION New Orleans, Louisiana Tuesday, April 26, 2005 7 8 TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS 9 HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 10 11 APPEARANCES: 12 FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: HERMAN, MATHIS, CASEY, KITCHENS & 13 GEREL BY: RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQ. 14 LEONARD A. DAVIS, ESQ. 820 O'Keefe Avenue, Suite 100 15 New Orleans, LA 70113 16 17 BARRIOS, KINGSDORF & CASTEIX BY: DAWN BARRIOS, ESQ. 18 701 Poydras Street, Suite 3650 New Orleans, LA 70119 19 20 NEBLETT, BEARD & ARSENAULT 21 BY: RICHARD J. ARSENAULT, ESQ. 2220 Bonaventure Court 22 Newport Beach, CA 92660 23 HARTLEY, O'BRIEN, PARSONS, 24 THOMPSON & HILL BY: BARRY HILL, ESQ. 25 1325 National Road Wheeling, WV 26003

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:	
2		CAUMUTED DOUNTING LABARRE
3		GAUTHIER, DOWNING, LaBARRE, DEAN & SULZER, L.L.P.
4		BY: JAMES R. DUGAN, ESQ. 3500 N. Hullen Street
5		Metairie, LA 70002
6		
7		CAPRETZ & ASSOCIATES BY: JAMES CAPRETZ, ESQ.
8		5000 Birch Street, Suite 2500 Newport Beach, CA 92660
9		
10		LEVIN, FISHBEIN, DEDRAN & BERMAN
11		BY: ARNOLD LEVIN, ESQ. 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500
12		Philadelphia, PA 19106-3697
13		TOWN DEPLUTIONS SHOWED WITHOUT
14		LEVIN, PAPANTONIO, THOMAS, MITCHELL, ECHSNER & PROCTOR
15		BY: TROY RAFFERTY, ESQ. 316 S. Baylen Street, Suite 600
16		Pensacola, FL 32501
17		
18		BECNEL, LANDRY & BECNEL BY: DANIEL BECNEL, ESQ.
19		106 West Seventh Street Reserve, LA 70084-0508
20		
21		INGRAM & ASSOCIATES
22		BY: CARROLL H. INGRAM, ESQ. P.O. Box 15039
23		Hattiesburg, MS 39404
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:	
2		DOMENCE ALLS INDICUS MODOLLY & DOV
3		DOMENGEAUZ, WRIGHT, MOROUX & ROY BY: BOB F. WRIGHT, ESQ. 556 Jefferson Street, Suite 500
4		Lafayette, LA 70502-3668
5		
6		SEEGER WEISS, L.L.P. BY: CHRISTOPHER A. SEEGER, ESQ.
7		One William Street New York, NY
8		NOW TOTAL INT
9		MURRAY LAW FIRM
10		BY: STEPHEN MURRAY, ESQ. JULIE JACOBS, ESQ.
11		909 Poydras Street, Suite 2250 New Orleans, LA 70112
12		
13		WEITZ & LUXENBERG
14		BY: PAUL PENNOCK, ESQ. 180 Maiden Lane, 17th Floor
15		New York, NY 10038-4925
16		
17		
18	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	IRWIN, FRITCHIE, URQUHART & MOORE BY: JAMES B. IRWIN, ESQ.
19		MONIQUE GARSAUD, ESQ. 400 Poydras Street, Suite 2700
20		New Orleans, LA 70130
21		
22		DRINKER, BIDDLE & SHANLEY BY: THOMAS F. CAMPION, ESQ.
23		500 Campus Drive Florham Park, NJ 07932-1047
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:	
2		
3	SPECIAL MASTER:	PREUSS, SHANAGHER, ZVOLEFF & ZIMMER BY: CHARLES F. PREUSS, ESQ. 225 Bush Street, 15th Floor
4		San Francisco, CA 94104-4207
5		
6		JUNEAU LAW FIRM
7		BY: PATRICK A. JUNEAU, ESQ. 1018 Harding Street, Suite 202 Lafayette, LA 70503
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	Official Court Reporter:	Karen A. Ibos, CCR, RPR
14		500 Poydras Street, Room HB-406 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
15		(504) 589-7776
16		
17	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produc	
18	by computer.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

please.

PROCEEDINGS

(APRIL 26, 2005)

(MONTHLY STATUS CONFERENCE)

24

25

THE COURT: Be seated, please, ladies and gentlemen.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL 1355, in re: Propulsid.

THE COURT: Counsel, make their appearance for the record,

MR. IRWIN: Good morning, your Honor, Jim Irwin for defendants.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the court, good morning, your Honor, Russ Herman for the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: We are here today for our monthly status conference. I've received the joint report from liaison counsel. The first item has to do with the state matters. Last time I talked with the State Liaison Counsel and also the defendant's counsel and suggested that they begin getting together and seeing if they could put together some program for the state claimants benefit. Anything on that?

MR. ARSENAULT: We do have several things to report, your First of all, we've continued to engage in dialogue with all Honor. of the state attorneys that we're aware of. We think we've made some at least preliminary contact with all of those, and we've identified about 357 claimants in that universe. The defendants

have been doing the same thing and they've identified approximately 557 plaintiffs, state plaintiffs that might be eligible for Propulsid MDL 2.

The total universe as far as the defendants are aware of right now would be something just shy of 9,000. That would be just shy of 2,000 federal plaintiffs, about 6,300 that were subject to tolling agreements, and about 557 state plaintiffs. But we've shared with them our list and our matrix of who we have been in touch with and as much of the demographics associated with that as we have. They have shared with us their list. So we are moving to try to get an accurate and comprehensive census of what's out there.

Additionally, your Honor, there has been the remand issue associated with Mr. Pennock's cases, he is here today, we met with him this morning and he is going to engage I understand in a dialogue with Mr. Campion following this conference with regard to some of the issues associated with the remand.

MR. HILL: We just got this list from the defendants and that 9,000 figure is, I can see right away that it's way, way less than that because I see 1,500 in here from me, all of which are gone and we've taken care of them. I see other lawyers in here who I know personally who I know don't have these cases anymore. So I think in a fairly short amount of time we can get this 9,000 number way, way down. I don't think it's anything close to that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MS. BARRIOS: Excuse me, your Honor, Dawn Barrios. In

addition to the information that Mr. Arsenault provided to the court, we've also been in touch with state attorneys who have cases set for trial. Mr. Campion and I have been able to intervene in at least one of those cases and the plaintiffs counsel have agreed to a stay order pending Propulsid 2. So we've been able to put the brakes on some state court trials because of Propulsid 2.

THE COURT: I think we need to now close in on it a little bit. I am going to ask Mr. Arsenault and Ms. Barrios to speak for the state claimants, and I want Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Levin to be the interface with the Plaintiff Liaison Counsel and with the defendants. And I would like to meet with you all after this meeting, and let's see if we can get some program together, meeting program so that you can get down to the nitty-gritty.

It's taken a longer time with the primary case and we've got to be able to utilize the process, what has gone before to streamline your program so that we ought to be able to do yours in less than 5 percent of the time that it took the other ones. I'll meet with you and give you some thoughts on that.

Service list of attorneys.

MR. IRWIN: Your Honor, we have two lists today, we have the traditional service list, we also have the pro se list. I don't think the service list at this point requires much explanation. But I will try to give a little explanation with respect to the pro se list.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. IRWIN: Our best count is, Judge, that we have 477 pro ses, but there are a couple of permutations here. Our office doesn't quite agree with Mr. Preuss' office, and his data are probably better than ours, maybe, but we are trying to work it out. The list that we have here actually totals 558. That is because some names are duplicated because they're represented by multiple plaintiff counsel in Achord, that is the explanation. But this is going to take some further refinement, but it's going to be in the 400 to 500 range.

THE COURT: Now, the pro se cases it seems to me fall into two categories: First, the pro ses that nobody has heard from, attorneys haven't received any response from, or either can't contact them because they've moved, or they've lost interest in the litigation, those individuals; Second, another group may be pro ses who are interested in pursuing their case but want to do it by themselves.

Do we have any breakdown, does the 477 or 500 include both of those numbers?

MR. IRWIN: It does, your Honor. I think it's close to 50-50. Mr. Preuss may have a better handle on that.

MR. PREUSS: Your Honor, I think most of the pro se plaintiffs have come as a result of the MDL settlement program, but there are I'd say a dozen to 25 that have been pro ses for a period of time during the course of the litigation. We've had occasional communications from time to time, but nobody on a steady basis.

THE COURT: I am going to need to eventually make certain we cull those out because what I think needs to be done, I have to give notice to all of the pro ses to show cause why their case should not be dismissed. I would like to put that notice on a web site, I would like to notify them at the last known address. I intend to direct the liaison counsel to post my order to show cause in various newspapers where they live.

I'll give enough time so that they will have an opportunity to read the notice and understand it or do something about it. If they don't show up to show cause why their case should not be dismissed, I'll dismiss the case. Then those cases in which I get some response that they're interested in pursuing it, that they're interested in dealing with their case, I'll give them an opportunity to handle their case.

I'll set those cases for status conferences, and we'll do a pretrial order, we'll do preparation for trial and we'll try the case. I don't know in my own mind yet the order of trial or whether I can group them and take a sample case for each group, but I need you to be thinking about a method and mechanism for dealing with those cases, give it some thought.

Another thought is to sever liability from quantum and try quantum first, let's see whether or not there's causation and quantum; and then if there is no causation or no quantum, then liability is moot. If there is causation and quantum, then perhaps we go into Phase 2 and try liability.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am not sure in my own mind how to do that, but those are some thoughts that are at least jumping around in my mind.

MR. IRWIN: We plan on engaging with the Plaintiffs
Steering Committee on that dialogue, your Honor, and exploring
solutions.

THE COURT: I give you those ideas so that you can at least think about them and give me your input.

Trial schedule, anything further on that? Any cases that are set for trial?

MR. IRWIN: Your Honor, there have been no changes on that since our last report to the court.

THE COURT: Anything on indemnity agreements?

MR. IRWIN: Likewise, your Honor, that has been static.

THE COURT: Mediation and resolution program. We have with us today Mr. Pat Juneau, the Special Master that the court has appointed. I'll hear from him.

MR. JUNEAU: Yes, your Honor. We have been receiving through the claims office a tremendous amount of paper and material. All of that is being inventoried now, that's been the progress. We've engaged in addition to and will serve as a conduit to some of the attorneys, I see Mr. Ingram is here, I talked to him earlier, about some of the problems having to do with disqualification, so we are going to see if we can facilitate those matters for him and set up a meeting.

Additionally, we're working with the counsel insofar as

facilitating the process about the reviews of these various materials. But the material level has picked up substantially here in the past month, and that'll continue over the next two months.

THE COURT: Do you see any particular roadblocks that you care to comment on?

MR. JUNEAU: No, sir. It's been rather smooth, it's just a process now. I don't see any particular problems.

THE COURT: I appreciate your work on it and the work of your staff, too. I know that you've got the ball now, so I am confident that you will be able to handle it.

What about the government's participation? I am interested in getting them involved.

MR. JUNEAU: I have engaged and talked to the appropriate people at the government. I think through the efforts of the court they understand that we don't want this matter to delay these proceedings, delay any payments to be made in this matter. They have committed to me that they will participate. There is obviously a wealth of information they need to make their analysis. I have a handle on what that is, but we are not at the stage to tell what those bulk of cases are.

I have committed once we have determined what those cases are to give them the information they need to analyze those cases, which they can do they have assured me rapidly. I have told them that once we reach that stage I thought it was appropriate that we engage in the court with the government in a status conference

1 before the court. So we are way ahead of schedule in dealing with 2 the government. And it's an obstacle which has been an obstacle in 3 other cases, I don't anticipate that being the case here. 4 THE COURT: Keep me in the loop and I would like to meet 5 with the government when you get the information that you feel that that's what they need, let me know, I'll set a status conference. I 6 7 would like to meet with you and the government. I'd like to share with both of you some thoughts that I have on how we can streamline 8 9 the process. 10 MR. JUNEAU: I will do that, your Honor. Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Anything on Daubert or summary judgments? 12 MR. HERMAN: No. The parties have the same positions that 13 they've stated previously, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Verilaw/Lexis Propulsid, anything there? 15 MR. HERMAN: Yes. We have one problem with the migration 16 from Verilaw to Lexis, and we will contact the Lexis people to meet 17 with your Honor at your Honor's convenience. 18 THE COURT: I'd like to meet with them, let's get them 19 down and I'll have a status conference with Lexis and liaison 20 committee. Remand motions, anything on remand? 21 MR. CAMPION: Mr. Pennock is here. 22

THE COURT: Good morning, you can come forward. I appreciate you being here, Mr. Pennock.

MR. PENNOCK: Good morning, your Honor.

23

24

25

MR. CAMPION: We have begun a discussion between us, we know each other from sometime and we may be able to come to some accommodations. But a discussion has started on a good note, I don't believe there is any formal business that has to be done today before your Honor, but we may be able to report something more satisfactory at the next conference.

THE COURT: Two things that I wanted to get your input on, both of you, is the oppositions have now been filed and there is an indication that you want to hear these next status conference; is that what your wish is?

MR. PENNOCK: I met with Mr. Arsenault and Ms. Barrios this morning at breakfast and discussed some issues, as I mentioned to Tom just before the conference. We may consider withdrawing the motions at this point in light of some of these discussions, and I was going to talk to Tom hopefully after this conference and try and hammer some things out.

THE COURT: How about the motions for summary judgment, too, are they on hold?

MR. PENNOCK: Your Honor, I only saw one of these motions. I came in Friday night, the others were apparently received last night after I had already flown down here and I can't speak to any of those in a substantive nature.

THE COURT: Take a look at it and if you can't deal with it, give me some input as to how much time you need and I'll set it in that regard.

MR. PENNOCK: Thank you, Judge.

MR. CAMPION: Thank you, Judge.

MR. HERMAN: May it please the court. Your Honor, although it's not calendared, I do have a report to make that I'd like to make to the court and I'd like it reflected in the minutes of this status conference, which are published on the web site.

\$72,300,000 has been deposited with Deutsche's Bank and invested in the Black Rock Fund. This is the settlement fund that will pay claims. I want to thank Mr. Campion's office, we've been in negotiations with Deutsche's Bank over an escrow agreement now for some months and were able to get it done on Friday so that the funds could be deposited Monday of this week.

I also want to thank all counsel because we exceeded the minimum needed by almost \$3 million, which indicates that many more people enrolled in this program than was originally envisioned. The \$15 million fund, administrative fund has been in escrow and invested for sometime now, and bills are being paid regularly from that fund subject to the Special Master and the court appointed distribution agents review or request.

There is one other fund under the terms of the settlement, it's 22,500,000 in common benefit, attorney's fees, costs. By a term sheet we're to discuss that issue first with the Special Master and we will, we intend to present a motion and a brief to the court within the next ten days, and would ask that that matter be calendared for the next hearing that your Honor selects.

I also want to report that there were three investment funds, these are basically AAA T-bill funds, the Evergreen Fund, the Fidelity Fund, the Black Rock Fund. J&J's financial advisors selected the Black Rock Fund based upon their appreciation of the flexibility of the fund, the investment of the fund, the costs and all of the other considerations, and we agreed to the investment of a settlement fund in the same Black Rock Fund that J&J's folks had designated.

In the event that any attorney or claimant wishes to review the Black Rock prospectus, they can contact either liaison counsel or the depository and we will find a way to put it on line so that we can review that.

That's the only other report that I had, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. It looks like that in this litigation we're coming to the point where everybody ought to be on the same page and pulling the same oar. In litigation, the adversary system serves us well to have each side take a position and out of that conflict comes an answer.

But that has been done and now we have an answer, and at this point seems to me that all counsel ought to be at the same point in wanting to complete this process. So everybody ought to be rowing in the same direction, if not with the same oar, and I would be remiss if I didn't take the opportunity to again thank counsel for their work in this process.

I've lived in these vineyards for nearly 40 years now and

most of my time over three decades was in the shoes that many of you all occupy; and I know the last ten years I've seen it from a different vantage point, but I know it's harder to handle a case as a lawyer than it is as a judge. You do the work. Occasionally the court may get the credit, but I know from having been there that it's your work and not the court's.

You've made it happen and the thing that is helpful in cases of this sort is a quality and professionalism of the attorneys, and I've seen it in this particular case and it is to your credit that this has been done.

Our next meeting will be, we have two possibilities with May 26 or 27th. What's a good date?

MR. CAMPION: Your Honor, the defense would suggest instead that the next meeting be held in the week of June 6 because of concerns with -- June 13th, I stand corrected.

THE COURT: The 16th or the 17th? What about the latter part of that week, 16th or 17th; is that a problem?

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I am going to be out of the country renewing my soul, needs some serious renewal, from the 14th to the 24th of June.

THE COURT: I will give you all an opportunity to think about it and give me some dates.

Anything further on this meeting? I will see the folks in the office in a minute. The court will stand in recess.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, if I might --

THE COURT: Yes. MR. HERMAN: We need a short plaintiffs meeting if we could use this room, the jury room. THE COURT: You can use the jury room. MR. HERMAN: Thank you, Judge. THE COURT: The court will stand in recess. (WHEREUPON, THE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.) REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I, Karen A. Ibos, CCR, Official Court Reporter, United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding, from the record of the proceedings in the above-entitled and numbered matter. Karen A. Ibos, CCR, RPR Official Court Reporter