

**In re Zimmer Nexgen Knee Implant Prods. Liab. Litig. (Batty v. Zimmer, Inc.), No. 2272, 2015 BL 273767 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 25, 2015) [2015 BL 273767]**

United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

---

IN RE: ZIMMER NEXGEN KNEE IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION; KATHY L. BATTY, Plaintiff, v. ZIMMER, INC., ZIMMER HOLDINGS, INC., and ZIMMER ORTHOPAEDIC SURGICAL PRODUCTS, INC., Defendants.

---

**MDL No. 2272 Master Docket No. 11 C 5468 No. 12 C 6279**

August 25, 2015, Filed August 25, 2015, Decided

For Zimmer Nexgen Knee Implant Products Liability Litigation, In Re: Tobias L Millrood, LEAD ATTORNEY, Pogust, Braslow, Millrood, Conshohocken, PA; Brian John Perkins, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Daniel Robert Lapinski, Wilentz Goldman & Spitzer, Woodbridge, NJ; Marc David Grossman, Sanders Viener Grossman, Llp, Mineola, NY; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Seth Sharrock Webb, Brown and Crouppen PC, St. Louis, MO.

For Steven Genslinger, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Debra K. Teague, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Joseph Campbell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Daniel Christopher Burke, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Parker Waichman Alonso LLP, Port Washington, NY; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Richard Cleveland, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Norma Coy, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Kay Elam, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Doris Hayes, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Melonie Holden, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Georgia Osterman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Gaston Robertson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Sharen Schaefer, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Ron Singaas, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Kim Sizemore, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Karl Woods, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Mary Wahlman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald S. Goldser, LEAD ATTORNEY, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Cynthia M. Mees, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Alberta K. Sloan Perry, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Richard E. Barlow, Sr., Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Sharon Barrett, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Doug Grubbs, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Jeri Strocchia, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Doug Grubbs, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers,

LLC, St. Charles, IL; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For William Korell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Doug Grubbs, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For William Genader, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Doug Grubbs, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Robert Fitzpatrick, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Doug Grubbs, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Joe L. Marks, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Laura L. Singletary, PRO HAC VICE, Neblett, Beard and Arsenault, Alexandria, LA; Richard J Arsenault, Neblett Beard & Arsenault, Alexandria, LA; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Florida Arabie, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Laura L. Singletary, PRO HAC VICE, Neblett, Beard and Arsenault, Alexandria, LA; Richard J Arsenault, Neblett Beard & Arsenault, Alexandria, LA; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Mary Williams, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Laura L. Singletary, PRO HAC VICE, Neblett, Beard and Arsenault, Alexandria, LA; Richard J Arsenault, Neblett Beard & Arsenault, Alexandria, LA; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Lori A. Wood, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

For Mary Alexander, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Frances Beaman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Vicki Burke, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Angela Coleman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Cheryl Gul, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Paula McClanahan, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Phyllis Morgan, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For David Sibley, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Gerald Waterston, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Morris Rodrigue, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, PRO HAC VICE, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Ronald Rolen, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, PRO HAC VICE, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Brenda Goad, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, PRO HAC VICE, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Dorothy Byram, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, PRO HAC VICE, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Cheryl Gustafson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Holly Dolejsi, PRO HAC VICE, Robins Kaplan LLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Cory Gustafson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Holly Dolejsi, PRO HAC VICE, Robins Kaplan LLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Zula DiSanti, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Willie Bradley, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For Sue Ellen Hughes, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): James Kent Emison, PRO HAC VICE, Langdon & Emison,

Lexington, MO; Phyllis A. Norman, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO.

For Patricia Taylor, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Sharron Davis, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Dennis G Parle, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Catherine Pollow-Daniels, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Scott Capel, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Dorothy Scott, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Alyson L. Oliver, PRO HAC VICE, Oliver Law Group P.C., Troy, MI; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For LeAnn K Anderson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Frederick H Busch, Jr, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Paul Lee Warren, LEAD ATTORNEY, Warren & Associates PLC, Norfolk, VA; Melissa Warner Scoggins, Warren & Associates PLC, Norfolk, VA.

For Robert Carr, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

For Douglas C Almon, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Steven Banberger, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Linda Karadsheh, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For Ali Elbaneh, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Subhia Elbaneh, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Sally Stachowski, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For John Hall, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Albert Marshall, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For Paul Joyce, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Erma Thompson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For Karen Polanecki, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For Paulette Wornum, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For Donald Little, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For John Rettig, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For Margaret Loveday, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For William Loveday, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Ann Robinson Lewis, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For Victoria Messina, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Salvatore Messina, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For David Foust, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI.

For Todd Thompson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Melody Thompson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Bruce Bottini, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Joseph Anthony Osborne, LEAD ATTORNEY, Babbitt Johnson Osborne & LeClainche, West Palm Beach, FL.

For Douglas Root, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Joseph Anthony Osborne, LEAD ATTORNEY, Babbitt Johnson Osborne & LeClainche, West Palm Beach, FL.

For Susan Werling, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Joseph Anthony Osborne, LEAD ATTORNEY, Babbitt Johnson Osborne & LeClainche, West Palm Beach, FL.

For Mary A. Crouse, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Carol Williams, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Mary Madden, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Joseph Anthony Osborne, LEAD ATTORNEY, Babbitt Johnson Osborne & LeClainche, West Palm Beach, FL.

For Linda Wallace, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): James H Cook, LEAD ATTORNEY, Dutton, Braun, Staack & Hellman, P.L.C., WATERLOO, IA.

For Willa J. Crawford, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

For Patricia Taylor, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Dorothy Byram, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Brenda Goad, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Carol Williams, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Constance A Swymeler, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Benjamin Creedy, PRO HAC VICE, Murphy Taylor Siemens & Elliott Pc, Saint Joseph, MO.



For Richard M Fogel, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Don K. Ledgard, Capretz & Associates, Newport Beach, CA.

For Sue Taylor, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Susan E Hamm, Law Office of Susan E Hamm, Shreveport, LA.

For Jerry S Hanson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Anthony J Nemo, Meshbeshesher & Spence, Ltd, Minneapolis, MN.

For Zimmer, Inc., Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Debbie Jamerson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Phyllis A. Norman, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO.

For Caleena Sisk, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Phyllis A. Norman, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO.

For Steve Parker, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Phyllis A. Norman, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO.

For Darlene Newman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Phyllis A. Norman, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO.

For Charles Kemp, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

For Nancy Reichel, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Phyllis A. Norman, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO.

For Sharon Cowart, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert W. Hallack, PRO HAC VICE, Baton Rouge, LA.

For Raymond Peltier, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, LEAD ATTORNEY, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX.

For Larry Giddings, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Russell S. Briggs, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson Llp, Houston, TX.

For Harvey J Barrett, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For James Berry, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Jane E Esslinger, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Mary L Knox, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Paula G Ponamsky, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Thomas Rose, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Judith L Nurse, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Sharon K Stotler, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Theresa Blaylock, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Derrick Hansen, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Sandy Flores, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Judith Wimberley, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Jerry Wesley, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Steven Clines, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Steven Logsdon, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Raymond Joyner, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Robin Joyner, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Ed Shacklock, Jr., Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Martha Becton, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Margaret Castle, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Stephen Cobb, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Patricia Henry, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Dorothy Jones, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Sheila Loop, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Mary Mason, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS; Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Angela Moore, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Cynthia Newton, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Joann Post, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Jessie Pryor, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Deborah Sheppard, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Debra Jones, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Charlotte Strickfaden, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Norman Jenkins, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Russell S. Briggs, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson Llp, Houston, TX.

For Carol J Connors, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Daniel Jay King, PRO HAC VICE, Law Offices of Daniel King, Woodland Hills, CA.

For Corda B Gaddy, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Wilfred K Wright, Jr, PRO HAC VICE, Wright Law PLC, Claremore, OK.

For Gary D. Evans, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Holly Dolejsi, PRO HAC VICE, Robins Kaplan LLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Kristy K. Evans, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Holly Dolejsi, PRO HAC VICE, Robins Kaplan LLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Deborah Leahy, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Radice, HORAS, RADICE & ASSOCIATES, LLC, St. Louis, MO.

For Mr. Hugh Goldston, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Douglas E Griffith, LEAD ATTORNEY, Kesler & Rust, Salt Lake City, UT; Adam Lee Grundvig, Kesler & Rust, Salt Lake City, UT.

For Barbara Campbell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Basil Jones, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Brenda Tate, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For James Savina, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, LEAD ATTORNEY, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX.

For Patricia A Murray, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, LEAD ATTORNEY, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX.

For Phyllis A Bush, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Sandy McConnell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Michael R. Stevenson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Mohammed Querishi, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): David E Pitcher, LEAD ATTORNEY, Heygood, Orr & Pearson, Dallas, TX.

For Angel Currier, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Navan Ward, Jr, LEAD ATTORNEY, Beasley, Allen, Crow, Methvin, Portis & Miles, P.c., Montgomery, AL.

For Pamela Magruder, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Russell S. Briggs, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson Llp, Houston, TX.

For Warren Behrens, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter Kristopher Janczyk, Edelstein Martin & Nelson, Philadelphia, PA.

For Ronnie Davis, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS; John Hunt Morgan, John Hunt Morgan, P.S.C., Harlan, KY.

For Ronald D Gafford, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Sylvia A. Hunter, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Deloris D. Johnson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Magdelene E. Thompson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Sandra Hurtado, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen Beyea-Schroeder, LEAD ATTORNEY, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX.

For Oscar Bruno, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Edward C Lawhead, Schreiner Malloy & Etzler PC, Highland, IN.

For Thomas Barnes, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Russell S. Briggs, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson Llp, Houston, TX.

For Douglas Duerr, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Russell S. Briggs, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson Llp, Houston, TX.

For Jack L Perry, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Blake Armstrong Shuart, Hutton & Hutton Law Firm, L.L.C., Wichita, KS.

For Pauline Coleman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Steven M. Johnson, PRO HAC VICE, The Johnson Law Firm, Fort Worth, TX.

For Sari McNamee, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Craig M Murphy, Murphy & Murphy Law Offices, Las Vegas, NV.

For William Shalhoob, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Anthony J Nemo, Meshbesh & Spence, Ltd, Minneapolis, MN.

For Carole Plenge, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Anthony J Nemo, Meshbesh & Spence, Ltd, Minneapolis, MN.

For Theodore Lorbiecki, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Anthony J Nemo, Meshbesh & Spence, Ltd, Minneapolis, MN.

For Karen M Ercoli, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Alton C. Haynes, LEAD ATTORNEY, Haynes, Studnicka, Kaham, O'Neill, Miller, LLC, Chicago, IL; Seth Letterman Ellis, Haynes Studnicka Kahan O'Neill & Poulakidas LLC, Chicago, IL.

For George Carro, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Cynthia Walker, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Robert Riley, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Priscilla Fielty, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Charlene Decino, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Eallen Collins, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Gloria Ann Bemby, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For James T Johnson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Edward Kennedy, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For John A Kennedy, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Cheryl R. Carnes, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Robert A. Burton, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Don P Schwartz, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Stephen M Sullivan Jr, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For William T Casper, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Maxy Payne, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Patricia A Pardee, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Michael R. Kunkel, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Scott E. Larson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Ellen Paulson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Richard Pappas, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Randy L. Pudwill, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Jeffrey Chapell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Diane L Urban, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Stacy K. Hauer, Johnson Becker, PLLC, Minneapolis, MN; Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For William Wadsworth, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For James A. Bondi, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Mitchell O. Nilles, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Yvonne Stovall, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Adrienne Ruck, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Jeanette Knapp, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Russell S. Briggs, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson Llp, Houston, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

For Mary E. Harvey, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Charles B. Scott, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Michael Chung, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Isabel C. Herrera, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Donna L. Hoyt, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Sharon R Joyner-Clarke, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Mr. Elmer Craig Bush, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Richard J Gage, Cheyenne, WY.

For Ruth F. Reinhart, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Lawrence J. Scanlon, Scanlon & Elliott, Akron, OH.

For David Chaves, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Ronald D. Rodman, LEAD ATTORNEY, Friedman, Rodman & Frank, PA, Miami, FL.



For Christopher L. Parker, PRO HAC VICE, Roderick Linton Belfance, Akron, OH; Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): David S. Nichol, Roderick Linton, Akron, OH.

For Alma Martin, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Joseph Hill, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Vickie LaRue, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For William Burk, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Sarah Jessup, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): JOSEPH G. SIGMON, LEAD ATTORNEY, BENSON, BROWN & FAUCHER, PLLC, GREENSBORO, NC; James R. Faucher, PRO HAC VICE, Benson Brown & Faucher, Pllc, Greensboro, NC.

For James Woodard, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Russell Wickholm, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Michael Cozzolino, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Duane Poser, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Marvin Harness, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Cassandra Madison, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Cindy Bartlette, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Donald Hamblin, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Tina Slavik, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Linda Tedrahn, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Joyce Holt, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Thomas Yates, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Angela Stalling, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Daniel Lewallen, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Julie Robertson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Pamela Allen, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Michael Ellis, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For David Durand, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Beverly Mulson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Ester Mason, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Tobias L Millrood, LEAD ATTORNEY, Pogust, Braslow, Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Susan R Wilson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'Brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Jacqueline Chadwick, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'Brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For John Ivey, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'Brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Debra Conner, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'Brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Ruth Ouzounian, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Rhome D. Zabriskie, LEAD ATTORNEY, ZABRISKIE LAW FIRM LLC, PROVO, UT; Kevin O'Brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Stephen Balcerzak, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Russell S. Briggs, PRO HAC VICE, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson Llp, Houston, TX.

For Delbert Hicks, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kara L. Rakers, LEAD ATTORNEY, Tapella & Eberspacher, LLC, Mattoon, IL.

For George H Burns, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher M Ellis, Bolen Robinson & Ellis, LLP, Decatur, IL; Eric D. Holland, Holland, Groves & Schneller, LLC, St. Louis, MO; Gerard B. Schneller, Holland, Groves & Schneller, St. Louis, MO; Shane M Mendenhall, Bolen, Robinson & Ellis, Decatur, IL.

For James Rossan, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert T Dassow, LEAD ATTORNEY, Hovde Dassow & Deets LLC, Indianapolis, IN.

For Renee Millington, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Donald John Lambiase, LEAD ATTORNEY, Murphy & Lambiase, Goshen, NY.

For Victory Lee Malon, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): David M Langevin, LEAD ATTORNEY, Langevin/McSweeney LLC, Minneapolis, MN; Rhett A McSweeney, Langevin/McSweeney LLC, Minneapolis, MN.

For Bobby Suber, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Karen J. Barnet-Backer, LEAD ATTORNEY, Ruiz Law Centre, Miami, FL.

For Peter DiDonato, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Richard L. Grant, LEAD ATTORNEY, Piazza & Simmons, Stamford, CT.

For Martha Wharton, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jesse Bernheim, LEAD ATTORNEY, Kelly, Bernheim and Dolinsky, LLC, Plantation, FL.

For Rosalind Martinez, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Shezad Malik, LEAD ATTORNEY, Dr Shezad Malik Law Office PC, Dallas, TX.

For Cindy Russell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Donna M. MacKenzie, LEAD ATTORNEY, Olsman, Mueller, Berkley, MI.

For Michael Russell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Donna M. MacKenzie, LEAD ATTORNEY, Olsman, Mueller, Berkley, MI.

For Gretchen Charon, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Nicole L. Kreklau, Pearson, Randall & Schumacher, P.A., Minneapolis, MN.

For James Charon, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Nicole L. Kreklau, Pearson, Randall & Schumacher, P.A., Minneapolis, MN.

For Jimmy Torres, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Dawn Marie Coulson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Epps and Coulson, LLP, Los Angeles, CA.

For Michael Murchie, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): J. Paul Janes, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Gruel Mills Nims & Pylman LLP, Grand Rapids, MI.

Bertha Copeland, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Russell Weise, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Russell Weise, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se, Buffalo, NY.

For Marjorie C Medlin, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Linda M. Hall, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Jay W. Ouellette, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Joyce M. Hay, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Robert W Stedman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Tammy Stetz-Field, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Clovis D. Bass, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Relda Georgann Frietchen, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For James Lewis, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Margaret Lewis, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Dianne R Laniel, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For RANDY PURSER, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Peggy Dahl, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Randy L Jones, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Marie A. Roberts, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

John Jardin, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

For Karen R Walker, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Dickison Mark John, LEAD ATTORNEY, Lawson & Weitzen, Llp, Boston, MA; Ryan Ciporkin, LEAD ATTORNEY, Lawson & Weitzen, Llp, Boston, MA.

For William Walker, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Dickison Mark John, LEAD ATTORNEY, Lawson & Weitzen, Llp, Boston, MA.

For Stacey Nash, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Brent William Bailey, LEAD ATTORNEY, Kish Manktelow & Bailey, PC, Richardson, TX.

For Marilyn Mosley, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Brent William Bailey, LEAD ATTORNEY, Kish Manktelow & Bailey, PC, Richardson, TX.

Lead Counsel, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

For Mertha J. Shoat, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles Harley Johnson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Law Office, St. Paul, MN; Reed A Flathmann, LEAD ATTORNEY, Law Offices of Charles H Johnson, PA, New Brighton, MN.

For Christina Barrows, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

For James Barrows, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

Raymond Rugeiro, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Cindy Rugeiro, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Richard Evans, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Lois E Evans, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Floyd W Ridley, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Margie Roberts, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Gloria Thomas-Malcolm, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Jeannette M Whittaker, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

William Stephenson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Bonnie W Wilson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Mary Cozart, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Dale Keltz, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Marilyn J. McAfee, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Patricia M Milewski, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Richard Myers, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Vincent Pause, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Margaret Gondalfo, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Peggy J. Keeler, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

William Fisher, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

DALE R. MIKLOS, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

For Kay Mayo, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Russell S. Briggs, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson LLP, Houston, TX.

Gregory Wuhs, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Julie Threadgill, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

For Lawrence Gilpatric, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christine M. Craig, Shaheen & Gordon (Dover), Dover, NH.

For Bonnie Gilpatric, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christine M. Craig, Shaheen & Gordon (Dover), Dover, NH.

For Phyllis Kirkman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For Kenneth James, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Elizabeth L. Dudley, LEAD ATTORNEY, The Dudley Law Firm, Llc, Douglass, KS.

For Ruth Basile, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Eric William Gruenwald, The Mulligan Law Firm, Dallas, TX.

For Samuel Harris, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Eric William Gruenwald, The Mulligan Law Firm, Dallas, TX.

For Brenda Long, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Eric William Gruenwald, The Mulligan Law Firm, Dallas, TX.

For Phillip Castro, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): David Paul Crandall, David P Crandall Law Offices, Laguna Hills, CA.

Joseph Jackson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Nanette Lockhart, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Patricia Reed, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Robert Gibson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Emma Torres, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Carol Gaston-Lyons, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Rodney Tweedy, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Mary Sue Peterman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Betty Skidmore, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se, Betty Skidmore, MO.

Alejandra Flores, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se, Alejandra Flores, TX.

Ellen Garrison, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se, Ellen Garrison, NC.

Tony M Villegas, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se, Nipomo, CA.

Donald C Didrickson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Beverly Jemma Goldin, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se, Beverly Jemma Goldin, NY.

For RANDY PURSER, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Paul E Kindle, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Bob Abell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For John Luss, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For Betty Wilson, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For Martha Sheets, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For Helen Nichols, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For Russell Downing, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For Jayneth Barnes, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For Nancy Scott, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX.

For Margaret L. Hall, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kenneth L Sales, LEAD ATTORNEY, Bubalo Goode Sales & Bliss PLC, Louisville, KY.

Juliana Smith, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

For Richard Parker, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Michael Elliot Holden, LEAD ATTORNEY, Romanucci & Blandin, LLC, Chicago, IL.

Richard E. Senecal, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

KIMBERLY J. LESKO, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

Wendy Besonen, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

PATRICIA P. MICHAEL, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

For Nilsa Madera-Rivera, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Anthony J. Voci, Jr., LEAD ATTORNEY, Borum Burke Didonato & Voci LLC, Philadelphia, PA.

For Sherry Wiesman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Darcy L. Proctor, Ancel, Glink, Diamond, Bush, DiCianni & Rolek, P.C., Chicago, IL.

For Benny Sabastiano, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter J. Flowers, LEAD ATTORNEY, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

For Diane Harrington-Bowers, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

Michael Tilghman, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se, Hagerstown, MD.

For Madis Lacy, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Michael C. Moody, O'Rourke, & Moody, Chicago, IL.

For Gayle Cavada, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Jeffrey J. Lowe, LEAD ATTORNEY, Jeffrey J. Lowe, P.C., St. Louis, MO; Doug Grubbs, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law

Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Javier Saucedo, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Doug Grubbs, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Jacqueline Gangloff, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Doug Grubbs, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Beverly Goldberg, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter Kristopher Janczyk, Edelstein Martin & Nelson, Philadelphia, PA.

For Yayati Patel, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, PRO HAC VICE, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Margaret L. Maiers, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Daniel Pancotto, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL.

For Sabrina Black, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Susan Coulston, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Nancy Joyce, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Margo Kell, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Lois Zaremba, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Stephanie Garrison, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Don K. Ledgard, Capretz & Associates, Newport Beach, CA.



For Elissa Smargiassi, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Christopher Paulos, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL.

For Albert Gaydos, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Joanne Gaydos, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Matilda Breig, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Sheila M. Bossier, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS.

For John Pekar, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY.

For Donna Rubenstein, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN.

For Cristy Craig, Plaintiff (1:11-cv-05468): Kevin O'Brien, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, Conshohocken, PA.

For Zimmer, Inc., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; William B Allen, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez, LLP, Houston, TX; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; James A O'Neal, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN; Marissa Lei Lin Owens, Goodsill Anderson Quinn & Stifel LLLP, Honolulu, HI.

For Zimmer Holdings, Inc., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker

Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; James A O'Neal, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN.

For Zimmer Orthopaedic Surgical Products, Inc., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; James A O'Neal, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN.

For Zimmer Orthobiologics, Inc., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; James A O'Neal, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN.

For Zimmer Surgical, Inc., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; William B Allen, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez, LLP, Houston, TX; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; James A O'Neal, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN.

For Zimmer US, Inc., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; William B Allen, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez, LLP, Houston, TX; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels

Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; James A O'Neal, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN.

For Orthopaedic Technologies, LLC, Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN.

For Zimmer Melia Associates, Inc., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; James A O'Neal, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN.

For Wilson/Phillips Holdings, Inc., also known as Zimmer Wilson Phillips, Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN.

For Zimmer Production, Inc., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Amy Rae Fiterman, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Bruce Gregory Jones, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Christin Jaye Garcia, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels Llp, Minneapolis, MN; James Stephen Bennett, Faegre Baker

Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; James A O'Neal, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN.

For Mary Jane Lamanto, Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): David Bagley Rheingold, LEAD ATTORNEY, Rheingold, Valet, Rheingold, Shkolnik & McCartney, LLP, New York, NY.

Dora Dice, Defendant (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

For Dora Dice, Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Robert A. Young, PRO HAC VICE, English, Lucas, Priest & Owsley, Llp, Bowling Green, KY.

Allen Dice, Defendant (1:11-cv-05468), Pro se.

For Dorothy Tretina, Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Randi Alyson Kassin, Sanders Viener Grossman, Llp, Mineola, NY.

For MD Arnold J Herbstman, M.D., Defendant (1:11-cv-05468): Adam D Smith, LEAD ATTORNEY, Glen J. Lerner & Associates, Las Vegas, NV; Allan Berger, LEAD ATTORNEY, Allan Berger & Associates, PLC, New Orleans, LA; Alyson L. Oliver, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Oliver Law Group P.C., Troy, MI; Amy Collignon Gunn, LEAD ATTORNEY, The Simon Law Firm, P.C., St. Louis, MO; Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Andrew J. Geiger, LEAD ATTORNEY, Allan Berger & Associates, PLC, New Orleans, LA; Andrew Charles Schwartz, LEAD ATTORNEY, Casper Meadows Schwartz & Cook, Walnut Creek, CA; Anthony J. Voci, Jr., LEAD ATTORNEY, Borum Burke Didonato & Voci LLC, Philadelphia, PA; Bradley Reeves, LEAD ATTORNEY, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, Llp, Houston, TX; Brian P Galligan, LEAD ATTORNEY, GALLIGAN & REID PC, DES MOINES, IA; Brian David Nettles, LEAD ATTORNEY, Law Offices of Brian D. Nettles, Ltd., Henderson, NV; Carl N. Frankovitch, LEAD ATTORNEY, Frankovitch Anetakis Colantonio & Simon, Weirton, WV; Charles E. Buchanan, LEAD ATTORNEY, Buchanan, Williams & Stilley PC, Joplin, MO; Charles Richard Mullins, LEAD ATTORNEY, COXWELL & ASSOCIATES, Jackson, MS; Christine M. Craig, LEAD ATTORNEY, Shaheen & Gordon (Dover), Dover, NH; Corey M Eschweiler, LEAD ATTORNEY, Glen J. lerner & Associates, Las Vegas, NV; Craig L. Kelley, LEAD ATTORNEY, Inserra, Kelley Law Firm, Omaha, NE; Crystal Gayle Foley, LEAD ATTORNEY, Simmons Hanly Conroy LLC, El Segundo, CA; Daniel Christopher Burke, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Parker Waichman Alonso LLP, Port Washington, NY; Daniel N. Gallucci, LEAD ATTORNEY, Nastlaw LLC, Philadelphia, PA; Daniel Jay King, PRO HAC VICE, Law Offices of Daniel King, Woodland Hills, CA; David S. Johnson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP, Tampa, FL;

David M Peterson, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Peterson & Associates, Pc, Kansas City, MO; David Randolph Smith, LEAD ATTORNEY, Law Offices of David Randolph Smith & Associates, Nashville, TN; Dawn M. Chmielewski, LEAD ATTORNEY, Climaco, Wilcox, Peca, Tarantino & Garofoli, LPA, Cleveland, OH; Deborah Shea Baukman, LEAD ATTORNEY, Mayer Smith & Roberts, Shreveport, LA; Douglass A. Kreis, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Aylstock, Witkin, Kreis & Overholtz, Pllc, Pensacola, FL; Edward John Walsh, Jr., LEAD ATTORNEY, Walsh, Knippen, Pollock & Cetina, Chartered, Wheaton, IL; Eustace de Saint Phalle, LEAD ATTORNEY, The Veen Firm, P.C., San Francisco, CA; Fredric A Bremseth, LEAD ATTORNEY, Bremseth Law Firm, PC, Minnetonka, MN; Garrett W. Wilson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Gary Paul Falkowitz, LEAD ATTORNEY, Parker Waichman Alonso, Port Washington, NY; George William Ellard, LEAD ATTORNEY, The Dolan Law Firm, San Francisco, CA; Glen J. Lerner, LEAD ATTORNEY, Glen J. Lerner & Associates, Las Vegas, NV; Greg McEwen, LEAD ATTORNEY, The McEwen Law Firm P.L.L.C., Inver Grove Heights, MN; Gregory X. Gorman, LEAD ATTORNEY, Gorman & Gorman, Chicago, IL; HEZEKIAH SISTRUNK, JR, LEAD ATTORNEY, Atlanta, GA; Harry F. Bell, Jr., LEAD ATTORNEY, The Bell Law Firm, Charleston, WV; Holly Dolejsi, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Robins Kaplan LLP, Minneapolis, MN; Jaclyn M. Setili, LEAD ATTORNEY, Reed Smith LLP, San Francisco, CA; James Kristopher Jackson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Mayer Smith & Roberts, Shreveport, LA; James M Kelley, III, Mayfield Heights, OH, LEAD ATTORNEY; James Mark Neudecker, LEAD ATTORNEY, Reed Smith LLP, San Francisco, CA; James A Piatt, LEAD ATTORNEY, Price Waicukauski & Riley LLC, Indianapolis, IN; Jamie R. Kendall, LEAD ATTORNEY, Price Waicukauski & Riley, LLC, Indianapolis, IN; Jeff S. Gibson, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Cohen and Malad LLP, Indianapolis, IN; Jennifer L Ashley, LEAD ATTORNEY, Salvi, Schostok & Pritchard, PC, Waukegan, IL; John R. Climaco, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Climaco, Wilcox, Peca, Tarantino & Garofoli Co., Lpa, Cleveland, OH; John P. Inserra, LEAD ATTORNEY, INSERRA, KELLEY LAW FIRM, Omaha, NE; John Hunt Morgan, LEAD ATTORNEY, John Hunt Morgan, P.S.C., Harlan, KY; John H Robinson, LEAD ATTORNEY, JAMIESON & ROBINSON, Casper, WY; Joseph J. Leghorn, LEAD ATTORNEY, Nixon Peabody, LLP, Boston, MA; Kenneth G Gilman, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Gilman Law LLP, Bonita Springs, FL; Kenneth A. Norsworthy, LEAD ATTORNEY, Law Office of Kenneth A. Norsworthy, LLC, Anchorage, AK; Kevin M. Fitzgerald, LEAD ATTORNEY, Lewis Saul & Associates, Portland, ME; Kristine K. Kraft, LEAD ATTORNEY, Schlichter, Bogard & Denton, St. Louis, MO; L Pahl Zinn, LEAD ATTORNEY, Dickinson Wright PLLC, Detroit, MI; Lawrence Bertram Goldhirsch, LEAD

ATTORNEY, Weitz and Luxenburg, P.C., New York, NY; Lee Adam Cirsch, LEAD ATTORNEY, The Lanier Law Firm; Lee J Hollis, LEAD ATTORNEY, Hollis Law Firm, Prairie Village, KS; Margaret M. Metzinger, LEAD ATTORNEY, Climaco, Wilcox, Peca, Tarantino & Garofoli Co., LPA, Cleveland, OH; Mark C. Choate, LEAD ATTORNEY, Choate Law Firm LLC, Juneau, AK; Mark F. Miller, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Denardis & Miller Pc, Mount Clemens, MI; Mark R Ruppert, LEAD ATTORNEY, HOLLAND & HART, Cheyenne, WY; Martin G. Rubenstein, LEAD ATTORNEY, Levy, Baldante, Finney, Rubenstein, Cohen & Chizmar, PC, Philadelphia, PA; Matthew J. McCauley, LEAD ATTORNEY, Parker Waichman Alonso LLP, Port Washington, NY; Matthew W. Perkins, LEAD ATTORNEY, Lecomte, Emanuelson & Doyle, Quincy, MA; Maureen Allison Bickley, LEAD ATTORNEY, Frost Brown Todd - Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH; Melanie H. Muhlstock, LEAD ATTORNEY, PARKER WAICHMAN LLP, Port Washington, NY; Michael Lewis Dallaire, LEAD ATTORNEY, Dickinson Wright PLLC, Detroit, MI; Michael John Kanute, LEAD ATTORNEY, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Chicago, IL; Michael W Kerensky, LEAD ATTORNEY, Williamson & Rusnak, Houston, TX; Michelle Lynnea Mello, LEAD ATTORNEY, Fulbrigh and Jaworski LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Mike J Miller, LEAD ATTORNEY, Solberg Stewart Miller & Tjon LTD, Fargo, ND; Patrick G. Warner, LEAD ATTORNEY, Climaco Wilcox, Peca, Tarantino & Garofoli Co., Arena District Office, Cleveland, OH; Paul Raymond Cordella, LEAD ATTORNEY, The Lanier Law Firm, New York, NY; RANDALL E. SMITH, LEAD ATTORNEY, SHAHEEN & GORDON, P.A., SACO, ME; Renee Marie Anckner, LEAD ATTORNEY, McCarter & English, LLP (NYC), New York, NY; Richard J Gage, LEAD ATTORNEY, Cheyenne, WY; Richard R Jamieson, LEAD ATTORNEY, JAMIESON & ROBINSON, Casper, WY; Richard L. Kellner, LEAD ATTORNEY, Kabateck Brown Kellner LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Robert W. Hallack, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baton Rouge, LA; Russell S. Briggs, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fibich, Hampton, Leebron, Briggs & Josephson Llp, Houston, TX; Russell O. Stewart, LEAD ATTORNEY, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP-Denver, Denver, CO; Ryan C. Edwards, LEAD ATTORNEY, Taft Stettinius & Hollister - Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH; Samuel W. Lanham, Jr., LEAD ATTORNEY, Lanham Blackwell, P.A., Bangor, ME; Samuel R. Mirkovich, LEAD ATTORNEY, Nettles Law Firm, Henderson, NV; Scott L. Owens, LEAD ATTORNEY, Owens Law Group, Richmond, KY; Stacy K. Hauer, LEAD ATTORNEY, Johnson Becker, PLLC, Minneapolis, MN; Susan E Hamm, LEAD ATTORNEY, Law Office of Susan E Hamm, Shreveport, LA; Suzanne Catherine Skolnick, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Skolnick Law Group, Carlsbad, CA; TaKeena M Thompson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Cohen & Malad LLP, Indianapolis, IN; Terence J. Sweeney, LEAD ATTORNEY, New York, NY;



Thomas A. Virgulto, LEAD ATTORNEY, Hill & Hill, LLC, Madison, CT; Tim K. Goss, LEAD ATTORNEY, Freese & Goss PLLC, Dallas, TX; Tim J. Helfrich, LEAD ATTORNEY, Yturri Rose LLP, Fruitland, ID; Tobias L Millrood, LEAD ATTORNEY, Pogust, Braslow, Millrood, Conshohocken, PA; Todd Michael Miller, LEAD ATTORNEY, SOLBERG STEWART MILLER & TJON, FARGO, ND; Tracy H. Fowler, LEAD ATTORNEY, Snell & Wilmer LLP, Salt Lake City, UT; Troy A. Bozarth, LEAD ATTORNEY, Hepler Broom LLC, Edwardsville, IL; Vaughn A. Crawford, LEAD ATTORNEY, Snell & Wilmer, LLP, Phoenix, AZ; William B Allen, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez, LLP, Houston, TX; William Gene Horton, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Nolan Caddell & Reynolds, Rogers, AR; William Louis Veen, LEAD ATTORNEY, The Veen Firm, P.C., San Francisco, CA; Abby Jane Resnick-Parigian, Wilentz Goldman & Spitzer, Woodbridge, NJ; Abigail M Butler, FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Adam Shea Gober, Fairhope, AL; Adam Lee Grundvig, Kesler & Rust; Adam Christopher Kruse, Walsh, Knippen, Pollock & Cetina, Chartered, Wheaton, IL; Adria Conklin, Mitchell Williams Selig Gates Woodyard P.L.L.C., Little Rock, AR; Aimee Hall Wagstaff, Andrus Hood & Wagstaff, PC, Denver, CO; Alan Daniel Mathis, Johnston Barton Proctor & Rose LLP, Birmingham, AL; Alan Joseph Robertson, Sloan, Bagley, Hatcher & Perry Law Firm, Longview, TX; Albert G. Marquis, Marquis & Aurbach, Las Vegas, NV; Alex J Brown, The Lanier Law Firm, Houston, TX; Alex Cameron Walker, Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A., Albuquerque, NM; Alyson L. Oliver, PRO HAC VICE, Oliver Law Group P.C., Troy, MI; Amy Eskin, Hersh & Hersh, San Francisco, CA; Anapol Schwartz, Philadelphia, PA; Andres W. Lopez, Andres W. Lopez Law Office, San Juan, PR; Andrew T. Citrin, Citrin Law Firm, PC, Daphne, AL; Andrew L Davick, Meshbesh & Spence, Ltd, Rochester, MN; Andrew W. Knox, Lopez McHugh LLP, Philadelphia, PA; Andrew J Sciolla, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, LLC, Conshohocken, PA; Anne Langdon Hamilton, Standly & Hamilton, LLP, Dallas, TX; Anthony R. Martoccia, McMahan, Kublick Law Firm, Syracuse, NY; Anthony J Nemo, Meshbesh & Spence, Ltd, Minneapolis, MN; Antonio D. Pyle, Esq., PRO HAC VICE, Antonio D. Pyle, P.C., Stowe, VT; April E Sellers, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP - Ind/IN/Mer, Indianapolis, IN; Ari Kresch, Southfield, MI; Ari Kresch, Kresch Legal Services, New York, NY; Ashley Hennings Nader, BUTLER, SNOW, O'MARA, STEVENS & CANNADA - Jackson, Ridgeland, MS; Ashley L. Oliker, Frost Brown Todd - Columbus, Columbus, OH; B Kristian W. Rasmussen, CORY WATSON CROWDER & DEGARIS, Birmingham, AL; Barry R. Eichen, Eichen Crutchlow Zaslow & McElroy, LLP, Edison, NJ; Benjamin H. Anderson, Anderson Law Office, Cleveland, OH; Benjamin Creedy, PRO HAC VICE, Murphy Taylor Siemens & Elliott Pc, Saint Joseph, MO; Benjamin Warren

Gordon, Jr., Levin, Papantonio, Thomas, Mitchell, Rafferty & Proctor, PA, Pensacola, FL; Benton Gaines Ross, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Bernard F. Gaffney, Rome McGuigan, P.C., Hartford, CT; Bertram L. Marks, Litigation Associates, Farmington Hills, MI; Bharati O. Sharma, Pogust Braslow & Millrood LLC, Conshohocken, PA; Billie-Marie Morrison, White Meany & Wetherall, LLP, Las Vegas, NV; Bobby Jewell Bell, Jr., Hollis, Wright, Clay & Vail, P.C., Birmingham, AL; Booth G. Samuels, PRO HAC VICE, Pittman, Dutton & Hellums, P.c., Birmingham, AL; Brenda S. Fulmer, Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley, P.A., West Palm Beach, FL; Brent William Bailey, Kish Manktelow & Bailey, PC, Richardson, TX; Bret Chancellor Merkle, Merkle Law Firm Prof. LLC, Sioux Falls, SD; Brett A. Emison, PRO HAC VICE, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO; Brett Goodson, Goodson & Company, Ltd., Cincinnati, OH; Brian D Chase, PRO HAC VICE, Bisnar Chase, Llp, Newport Beach, CA; Brian Douglas Fowler, Troutman Sanders LLP, Richmond, VA; Brian S Franciskato, Nash & Franciskato Law Firm, Kansas City, MO; Brian Alan Goldstein, Cellino & Barnes, P.c., Buffalo, NY; Brian T. Guthrie, Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP, Tampa, FL; Brian P. Marcelle, Huber, Slack, Houghtaling, Pandit & Thomas, LLP, New Orleans, LA; Brian J. Panish, PRO HAC VICE, Panish, Shea & Boyle, Llp, Los Angeles, CA; Bryan August Pfleeger, Michael Hingle & Associates, Inc. (Slidell), Slidell, LA; Byron B Conway, Habush Habush & Rottier SC, Green Bay, WI; Caleb L H Marker, PRO HAC VICE, Ridout & Lyon, LLP, Long Beach, CA; Calvin S. Tregre, Jr., Burg Simpson Eldredge Hersh Jardine - Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH; Camala E Capodice, Irwin Fritchie et al, New Orleans, LA; Carla De La Barra Helstrom, Frost Brown Todd LLC - Louisville, Louisville, KY; Carol P. Smith, Frost Brown Todd, Charleston, WV; Carolyn Batz McGee, Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC, Pittsburgh, PA; Carrie R. Capouellez, Lopez McHugh LLP, Philadelphia, PA; Charles Andrew Childers, Childers, Schlueter & Smith, LLC, Atlanta, GA; Charles R. Houssiere, III, Houssiere, Durant & Houssiere, LLP, Houston, TX; Charles H Johnson, Law Offices of Charles H Johnson, PA, New Brighton, MN; Charles Harley Johnson, Johnson Law Office, St. Paul, MN; Charles Marshall Thomas, Huber, Slack, Houghtaling, Pandit & Thomas, LLP, New Orleans, LA; Charles Hiram Williams, II, Williams and Williams, Orangeburg, SC; Christopher M. Burke, PRO HAC VICE, ScottScott LLP, San Diego, CA; Christopher Dean, Dell Little Trovato & Vecere, LLP, Bohemia, NY; Christopher M Ellis, Bolen Robinson & Ellis, LLP, Decatur, IL; Christopher S. Hamilton, Standly & Hamilton, LLP, Dallas, TX; Christopher R. LoPalo, Napoli Bern Ripka Shkolnik & Associates, LLP, New York, NY; Christopher T Nace, Paulson and Nace PLLC, Washington, DC; Christopher Nidel, NIDEL LAW, PLLC, Washington, DC; Christopher L. Parker, PRO HAC VICE, Roderick Linton Belfance, Akron, OH; Christopher Paulos, PRO

HAC VICE, Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.a., Pensacola, FL; Christopher P Ridout, Ridout & Lyon LLP, Long Beach, CA; Christopher A Seeger, Seeger Weiss LLP, Newark, NJ; Christopher Alain Viadro, Burnham Brown, Oakland, CA; Clell Calvin Warriner, III, Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley, West Palm Beach, FL; Corlis J. Chang, Goodwill Anderson Quinn & Stifel LLLP, Honolulu, HI; Craig E. Hilborn, Hilborn & Hilborn, Birmingham, MI; Craig A. Stanfield, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP, Houston, TX; Cullen W. Guilmartin, McCarter & English, LLP, Hartford, Ct; Curtis C. Osborne, Osborne Law Firm, P.C., Charlotte, NC; DAVID R. BUCHANAN, SEEGER WEISS, LLP, NEWARK, NJ; Dale Ernest Akins, Akins Law Firm, Bluffton, SC; Daniel E. Becnel, Jr., Becnel Law Firm, LLC (Reserve), Reserve, LA; Daniel Christopher Burke, Parker Waichman Alonso LLP, Port Washington, NY; Daniel P Goetz, Cleveland, OH; Daniel Z. Herbst, REED SMITH, LLP, Washington, DC; Daniel Robert Lapinski, Wilentz Goldman & Spitzer, Woodbridge, NJ; Daniel Wesley McDonald, McDonald Law Firm, P.C., Fort Worth, TX; Daniel Arthur Nigh, PRO HAC VICE, Levin, Papantonio, Thomas, Mitchell, Rafferty & Proctor P.a, Pensacola, FL; Daniel Vincent Parish, Dunn, MacDonald & Reynolds, PC, Knoxville, TN; Daniel S Wittenberg, Snell & Wilmer LLP - Denver, CO, Denver, CO; David W. Alexander, Law Office of David W. Alexander, League City, TX; David W Brooks, Shook, Hardy & Bacon, Kansas City, MO; David L. Cleary, Cleary Shahi & Aicher, P.C., Rutland, VT; David Paul Crandall, David P Crandall Law Offices, Laguna Hills, CA; David Mitchell Garrett, Jr, Tulsa, OK; David S. Johnson, Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP, Tampa, FL; David M Langevin, Langevin/McSweeney LLC, Minneapolis, MN; David Andrew List, Clark, Perdue & list, Columbus, OH; David H Martinez, Law Office of David Martinez, Lubbock, TX; David Paul Matthews, Matthews & Associates, Houston, TX; David A. Miller, Frackville, PA; David S. Nichol, Roderick Linton, Akron, OH; David B. Pittman, Pittman Law Firm, P.L., Bonita Springs, Fl; David Bagley Rheingold, Rheingold, Valet, Rheingold, Shkolnik & McCartney, LLP, New York, NY; David L. Rosenband, Weitz & Luxenburg, PC, New York, NY; David T. Schaefer, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP - Louisville, Louisville, KY; Deborah Ellen Lavender, Cochran Firm Disability Lawyers PC (Metairie), Metairie, LA; Delia M. Druley, Johnson, Abdallah, Bollweg & Parsons LLP, Sioux Falls, SD; Dennis J. Canty, Kaiser Gornick LLP, Walnut Creek, CA; Derek T Braslow, PRO HAC VICE, Pogust Braslow & Millrood, LLC, Conshohocken, PA; Devon Marie Lyon, Ridout & Lyon LLP, Long Beach, CA; Dino S. Sangiamo, Venable LLP, Baltimore, MD; Don K. Ledgard, Capretz & Associates, Newport Beach, CA; Donald Hamilton Kidd, Perdue & Kidd, LLP, Houston, TX; Donald A. Migliori, Motley Rice LLC, Providence, RI; Douglas B Cannon, Fabian and Clendenin, Salt Lake City, UT; Douglas E Griffith, Kesler & Rust, Salt Lake City,

UT; Douglas C Monsour, PRO HAC VICE, The Monsour Law Firm, Longview, TX; Douglas Robert Plymale, The Dugan Law Firm, New Orleans, LA; Douglas H. Sanders, Sanders Law, PLLC, Garden City, NY; Edward J. Fanning, JR., McCarter & English, LLPC, Newark, NJ; Elisha Nicole Hawk, Janet Jenner and Suggs LLC, Baltimore, MD; Elizabeth Middleton Burke, Richardson Patrick Westbrook and Brickman, Mt Pleasant, SC; Elizabeth A Peterson, Lockridge Grindal Nauen, Minneapolis, MN; Elizabeth C. Ward, Motley Rice LLC, Mt. Pleasant, SC; Ellen Relkin, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY; Eric J Buhr, Reed Smith LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Eric T. Chaffin, Chaffin Luhana LLP, New York, NY; Eric William Gruenwald, The Mulligan Law Firm, Dallas, TX; Eric K. Schwarz, Sullivan Papin Block McGrath & Cannavo P.C., New York, NY; Erika Reynolds, Fox Galvin, LLC, St. Louis, MO; Erika J Schoenberger, Frost Brown Todd LLC, Columbus, OH; Frank V. Balderrama, WILL FERGUSON & ASSOCIATES, Albuquerque, NM; Frank Jacob D'Amico, Jr., Law Offices of Frank J. D'Amico, Jr. (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA; Frank A Silvestri, Silvestri & Massicot, New Orleans, LA; Gary Paul Falkowitz, Parker Waichman Alonso, Port Washington, NY; Gary Francis Franke, Cincinnati, OH; Gary S Grynkewich, Showard Law Firm PC, Tucson, AZ; Gary C Johnson, Gary C. Johnson, Pikeville, KY; Gary J. Spahn, Troutman Sanders LLP, Richmond, VA; Genevieve Mary Zimmerman, Zimmerman Reed, Minneapolis, MN; George G Eck, Dorsey & Whitney LLP, Mpls, MN; George M. Fleming, Fletcher & Sippel, Chicago, IL; Glenn A Dorfman, Glenn A Dorfman Law Offices, Santa Barbara, cA; Gregg J. Borri, Borri Law Offices, New York, NY; Gregory J. Bubalo, Bubalo Goode Sales & Bliss PLC, Louisville, KY; Gregory L. Laker, PRO HAC VICE, Cohen & Malad, LLP, Indianapolis, IN; Gregory Scott Malush, PRO HAC VICE, Milavetz, Gallop & Milavetz; Gregory T. Mueller, Mueller Law Practice, LLC, St. Louis, MO; Gregory Steven Spizer, PRO HAC VICE, Anapol Schwartz, Philadelphia, PA; Gregory W. Wix, Bowman and Brooke LLP, East Bloomfield Hills, MI; H. Forest Horne, Jr., Jones, Martin, Parris & Tessener, Raleigh, NC; Haroon Anwar, PRO HAC VICE, Baker & Daniels LLP, Indianapolis, IN; Hildy M. Sastre, Shook Hardy & Bacon, Miami, FL; Hunter Jay Shkolnik, Napoli Bern Ripka Shkolnik LLP, New York, NY; Iain Leslie Cooper Kennedy, Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P., Miami, FL; J Antonio Tramontana, Monroe, LA; J. Stephen Bennett, Baker & Daniels - Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, IN; J. Thomas Henretta, Akron, OH; J. Michael Riley, Axley Brynelson, LLP, Madison, WI; J. Paul Sizemore, Sizemore Taylor, LLP, Manhattan Beach, CA; J. Paul Sizemore, Sizemore Law Firm, El Segundo, CA; JOSEPH G. SIGMON, BENSON, BROWN & FAUCHER, PLLC, GREENSBORO, NC; Jacqueline C. Gorbey, Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP, Philadelphia, PA; Jacqueline A Olson, Zimmerman Reed PLLP - Minneapolis, MN, Minneapolis, MN; Jamenda A



McCoy, Chicago, IL; James Douglas Barger, Aulstock Witkin Kreis & Overholtz PLLC, Pensacola, FL; James C. Barton, Jr., Johnston Barton Proctor & Rose, LLP, Birmingham, AL; James T. Capretz, Capretz & Associates, Newport Beach, CA; James H Cook, Dutton, Braun, Staack & Hellman, P.L.C., WATERLOO, IA; James R. Dugan, II, Dugan Law Firm, New Orleans, LA; James Kent Emison, PRO HAC VICE, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO; James B Irwin, Irwin Fritchie et al, New Orleans, LA; James P. Lemonds, Brown & Crouppen, P.C., St. Louis, MO; James P. Leonard, Devereaux and Stokes, St. Louis, MO; James A. Lowe, Lowe Eklund Wakefield & Mulvihill Co., LPA, Cleveland, OH; James A McKowen, James F. Humphreys & Associates, L.C., Charleston, WV; James M. Mucklewee, Brown Chiari LLP, Lancaster, NY; James Gaughan O'callahan, Girardi And Keese, Los Angeles, CA; James R. Ronca, PRO HAC VICE, Anapol Schwartz, Philadelphia, PA; James D Sill, Sill & Medley, EDMOND, OK; James F. Swindoll, Law Offices of James F. Swindoll, Little Rock, AR; Jami S. Oliver, Attorney At Law, Columbus, OH; Jan E. Dodd, Fulbright & Jaworski LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Jane Thompson Davis, Nelson Mullins Riley and Scarborough (Ch), Charleston, SC; Janet Ruth Davis, Meckler, Bulger & Tilson, Chicago, IL; Jason P Johnston, PRO HAC VICE, Meshbesh & Spence, LTD, Minneapolis, MN; Jason R. Katz, Law Offices of Jason Ray Katz, Farmington Hills, MI; Jason J. Thompson, Sommers Schwartz, P.C., Southfield, MI; Jay Joseph Schuttert, Snell & Wilmer L.L.P., Las Vegas, NV; Jean S. Martin, Law Office of Jean Sutton Martin PLLC, Wilmington, NC; Jeffrey Charles Bogert, Law Office of Jeffrey C. Bogert, Santa Monica, CA; Jeffrey A. Bowersox, Bowersox Law Firm, P.C., Lake Oswego, OR; Jeffrey S. Brenner, Nixon Peabody LLP, Providence, RI; Jeffrey Todd Embry, Hossley & Embry LLP, Tyler, TX; Jeffrey Royal Johnson, Williams Kastner & Gibbs (SEA), Seattle, WA; Jeffrey S. Jordan, O'Connor & Nakos, Chicago, IL; Jeffrey J. Lowe, Jeffrey J. Lowe, P.C., St. Louis, MO; Jeffrey Allen Mitchell, Cochran Firm Disability Lawyers PC (Metairie), Metairie, LA; Jennifer L. Crose, Becnel Law Firm, LLC (Reserve), Reserve, LA; Jerald D. Pearson, The Pearson Law Firm, Snoqualmie, WA; Jerry A. Soper, Soper Law Firm, P.c., Davenport, IA; Jessalyn H. Zeigler, Bass, Berry & Sims (Nashville), Nashville, TN; Jesse Nisan Bernheim, Bernhiem & Dolinsky, LLC, Fort Lauderdale, FL; Jesse Huntsman Rigsby, IV, Twiggs, Strickland & Rabenau, P.A., Durham, NC; John T. Boundas, Williams Kherkher Hart Boundas Llp, Houston, TX; John Mark Dickison, Lawson & Weitzen LLP, Boston, MA; John C. Dorame, Feldman Graf, P.C., Las Vegas, NV; John P. Freedenberg, Goldberg Segalla LLP, Buffalo, NY; John C Gray, Fulbright & Jaworski LLP, Los Angeles, CA; John E Kerley, Kerley & Associates, P.C., Springfield, IL; John P. Lavelle, Jr., Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP, Philadelphia, PA; John Joseph Love, Robert H Alexander Jr pc, OKLAHOMA

CITY, OK; John Jeremy Mahoney, Mahoney & Mahoney; John T Schlafer, PRO HAC VICE, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN; John C. Whitfield, Whitfield Bryson & Mason, LLP, Madisonville, KY; John A Zick, Attorney at Law, Farmington Hills, MI; Jon Collins Conlin, CORY WATSON CROWDER & DEGARIS PC, Birmingham, AL; Jon C. Peeler, Nashville, TN; Jonathan H. Garside, Fox Galvin, LLC, St. Louis, MO; Jonathan Shub, Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C., Philadelphia, PA; Jordan L Chaikin, Parker Waichman LLP, Bonita Springs, FL; Joseph W. Elliott, PRO HAC VICE, Murphy Taylor Siemens & Elliott Pc, St. Joseph, MO; Joseph Anthony Osborne, Babbitt Johnson Osborne & LeClainche, West Palm Beach, FL; Joseph J. Rhoades, Law Office of Joseph Rhoades, Esq., Wilmington, DE; Joseph N. Williams, Price Waicukauski & Riley, LLC, Indianapolis, IN; Joshua L Benson, Marquis Aurbach Coffing, Las Vegas, NV; Joshua D Cools, Snell & Wilmer LLP, Las Vegas, NV; Joshua S. Kincannon, Keefe Bartels, Red Bank, NJ; Jules Bernard Olsman, PRO HAC VICE, Olsman Mueller Wallace & Mackenzie, P.c, Berkley, MI; Justin G. Witkin, AYLSTOCK AND WITKIN, Pensacola, FL; Karen Beyea-Schroeder, PRO HAC VICE, Fleming, Nolen & Jez L.L.P., Houston, TX; Karen Barth Menzies, Robinson Calcagnie Robinson Shapiro Davis, Inc., Newport Beach, CA; Katharine Elizabeth Heitman, Baker & Hostetler LLP, Chicago, IL; Katherine P Lett, Fulbright & Jaworski, Dallas, TX; Kathryn Johnson, Dorsey & Whitney LLP, Mpls, MN; Kay L. Van Wey, Van Wey Law PLLC, Dallas, TX; Keith T Belt, Jr, Belt Law Firm PC, Birmingham, AL; Ken Nunn, Nunn Law Office, Bloomington, IN; Kenneth Warren Smith, Law Offices of Kenneth W. Smith, Alexandria, Va; Kenneth S. Soh, The Lanier Law Firm, Houston, TX; Kenneth M Suggs, Janet, Jenner & Suggs, LLC, Columbia, SC; Kim M. Schmid, Bowman & Brooke LLP, Minneapolis, MN; Kinika Lanay Young, Bass, Berry & Sims, PLC (Nashville), Nashville, TN; Kira Dale Pfisterer, Hepworth Janis and Kluksdal, Boise, ID; Kristine M. Larsen, Ray Quinney & Nebeker, Salt Lake City, UT; Kyle Osting, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; L Leonard Lundy, Philadelphia, PA; Larry M. Amoni, Amoni Law Offices, P.C., Auora, IL; Larry L. Boschee, PEARCE & DURICK, BISMARCK, ND; Larry E Coben, Anapol Schwartz Law Firm, Scottsdale, AZ; Lawrence C. Mann, Bowman and Brooke, Troy, MI; Lawrence J. Myers, Smith Moore Leatherwood, LLP-GA, Atlanta, GA; Lawrence J. Scanlon, Scanlon & Elliott, Akron, OH; Lemuel E. Montgomery, BUTLER, SNOW, O'MARA, STEVENS & CANNADA, Ridgeland, MS; Lesley Ellen Swanson, Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Leslie M. Cronen, Bubalo Rotman PLC, Louisville, KY; Leslie C. Nixon, Nixon Vogelmann Barry Slawsky & Simoneau PA, Manchester, NH; Lina B. Melidonian, Kabateck Brown Kellner LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Linda Susan Svitak, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; Lisa Ann Gorshe, Johnson Becker

PLLC, Minneapolis, MN; Louis Cappelli, Jr., Florio Perrucci Steinhardt & Fader, LLC, Cherry Hill, NJ; Lowell Wayne Finson, Phillips Webster PC, Los Angeles, CA; Lyn Peebles Pruitt, Mitchell Williams Law Firm - LR, Little Rock, AR; M Joseph Winebrenner, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Mpls, MN; Marc Jay Bern, PRO HAC VICE, Napoli Bern Ripka Shkolnik And Associates, New York, NY; Marc David Grossman, Sanders Viener Grossman, Llp, Mineola, NY; Marcus W. Viles, Viles & Beckman, LLC, Ft Myers, FL; Maria K. Tougas, Scott & Scott LLP - CT, Colchester, CT; Mario Biaggi, Jr., Law Offices of Mario Biaggi Jr., New York, NY; Mark Etheredge Burton, Hersh & Hersh, SAN FRANCISCO, CA; Mark Gebauer, Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott LLC, Harrisburg, PA; Mark P. Robinson, Jr., Robinson Calcagnie Robinson Shapiro Davis, Inc., Newport Beach, CA; Mark Charles Tanenbaum, Mark C Tanenbaum Law Office, Charleston, SC; Mark S. Thetford, Edwards Law Firm, Tulsa, OK; Martin A Little, Jolley Urga Wirth Woodbury & Standish, Las Vegas, NV; Martin J. Lucas, O'Connor & Nakos, Chicago, IL; Marvin B. Berke, Berke Berke & Berke, Chattanooga, TN; Mary Anne S. Rayburn, Martin Bischoff Templeton Langslet & Hoffman, Portland, OR; Matthew R Hale, BERNARD LAW GROUP PLLC, SEATTLE, WA; Matthew J Schumacher, Pearson, Randall, & Schumacher, P.A., Minneapolis, MN; Matthew J. Sill, Sill Law Group, PLLC, Edmond, OK; Mauricio O. Muniz-Luciano, O'Neill & Borges, San Juan, PR; Mekel Smith Alvarez, Morris Bart, LLC (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA; Melissa Fry Hague, Anapol Schwartz, Philadelphia, PA; Melissa Ann Marcus, Snell & Wilmer LLP - Tucson, AZ, Tucson, AZ; Melissa Ann Prickett, Beasley Allen Crow Methvin Portis & Miles, PC, Montgomery, AL; Melissa Richards Smith, Gillam & Smith, LLP, Marshall, TX; Merritt Elizabeth Cunningham, Smith Stag, New Orleans, LA; Mia Lauren Maness, Mark C Tanenbaum Law Office, Charleston, SC; Michael S. Appel, Sugarman, Rogers, Barshak & Cohen, P.C., Boston, MA; Michael A. Bottar, Bottar, Leone Law Firm, Syracuse, NY; Michael M Cushing, Law Offices of F. John Cushing III, P.C., Chicago, IL; Michael J Fay, McSweeney & Fay, PLLP, Mpls, MN; Michael E. Gallant, Kelley, Bernheim & Dolinsky, LLC, Washington, DC; Michael Edmund Gatto, PRO HAC VICE, The Veen Firm, P.C., San Francisco, CA; Michael E. Heygood, Heygood, Orr & Pearson, Dallas, TX; Michael Elliot Holden, Romanucci & Blandin, LLC, Chicago, IL; Michael K Johnson, Johnson Becker PLLC, Minneapolis, MN; Michael S Kruse, Niemeyer, Grebel, & Kruse, LLC, St. Louis, MO; Michael R Lipscomb, Michael R. Lipscomb, Hot Springs, AR; Michael Eugene Liska, Gary C. Johnson, P.S.C. - LEXINGTON, Lexington, KY; Michael A London, Douglas & London, New York, NY; Michael C. Loos, Clayborne, Loos & Sabers, Rapid City, SD; Michael J. Modl, Axley Brynelson, LLP, Madison, WI; Michael R Rhames, Michael R Rhames and Associates PC, Culver City, CA; Michael Brandon Smith, Childers, Schlueter &

Smith, LLC, Atlanta, GA; Michael F. Villeck, Sanders, Viener Law Firm - Mineola Office, Mineola, NY; Michael J. Wiggins, McDonald Toole Wiggins, PA, Orlando, FL; Michael Karl Yarbrough, Frost Brown Todd LLC, Columbus, OH; Mike M Arias, Arias Ozzello and Gignac LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Miles Baker Cooper, PRO HAC VICE, Rouda, Feder, Tietjen & Mcguinn, San Francisco, CA; Mindy Anne Finnigan, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Chicago, IL; Molly J. Miller, Amoni Law Offices, P.C., Aurora, IL; Morris Bart, III, Morris Bart, LLC (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA; Moyahoena N. Ogilvie, McCarter & English, Hartford, CT; Nancy A. Mismash, Robert J. Derby & Associates, Salt Lake City, UT; Nathan J. Marcusen, PRO HAC VICE, Bowman And Brooke Llp, Minneapolis, MN; Nathaniel Cade, Jr., Cade Law LLC, Milwaukee, WI; Navan Ward, Jr, PRO HAC VICE, Beasley, Allen, Crow, Methvin, Portis & Miles, P.c., Montgomery, AL; Neal Lewis Moskow, Ury & Moskow, Fairfield, CT; Neil Overholtz, PRO HAC VICE, Aylstock, Witkin, Kreis & Overholtz, PLLC, Pensacola, FL; Nicholas S. Clevenger, Peterson & Associates, P.C., Kansas City, MO; Nicole L. Kreklau, Pearson, Randall & Schumacher, P.A., Minneapolis, MN; Patrick C. Booth, Chaffin Luhana - New York, New York, NY; Patrick C. Booth, Chaffin Luhana, Weirton, WV; Patrick K.A. Elkins, Morgan, Lewis, & Bockius, Houston, TX; Patrick Thomas Fennell, Crandall & Katt, Roanoke, VA; Paul J Fina, Fina & Hunter, Downers Grove, IL; Paul J. Hill, Ft. Mitchell, KY; Paul J. Schachter, PRO HAC VICE, Schachter, Hendy & Johnson, Psc, Ft. Wright, KY; Paul D Stevense, Milstein Adelman & Kreger LLP, Santa Monica, CA; Pedro de la Cerda, Edwards and de la Cerda PLLC, Dallas, TX; Penny U. Hendy, PRO HAC VICE, Schachter, Hendy & Johnson, Psc, Ft. Wright, KY; Perry Allan Craft, Craft & Sheppard, P.L.C., Brentwood, TN; Peter J. Flowers, Meyers & Flowers, LLC, St. Charles, IL; Peter Kristopher Janczyk, PRO HAC VICE, Edelstein Martin & Nelson, Philadelphia, PA; Peter L. Kaufman, PRO HAC VICE, Panish, Shea & Boyle, Llp, Los Angeles, CA; Peter A. Meyer, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Fort Wayne, IN; Peter J Polos, Panish Shea and Boyle LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Peter Samberg, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY; Peter C Wetherall, White & Wetherall, Las Vegas, NV; Peyton P Murphy, Murphy Law Firm, Baton Rouge, LA; Phoebe Anne Wilkinson, Hogan Lovells US LLP, New York, NY; Phyllis A. Norman, Langdon & Emison, Lexington, MO; Preston J. Dugas, III, McDonald Law Firm, P.C., Fort Worth, TX; R. Eric Kennedy, Weisman, Kennedy & Berris Co., L.P.A., Cleveland, OH; ROBERT M. SILVERMAN, Weitz & Luxenberg, Cherry Hill, NJ; Ramon Rossi Lopez, Lopez McHugh, LLP, Newport Beach, CA; Randal Alan Kauffman, Attorney at Law, Tomball, TX; Randi Alyson Kassan, Sanders Viener Grossman, Llp, Mineola, NY; Randi McGinn, MCML, PA, Albuquerque, NM; Raquel Lao, Friedman, Rodman & Frank, P.A., Miami, FL; Rebecca Cameron Blount, The Blount Law

Firm, PC, Greenville, NC; Rebecca J. Hillyer, PRO HAC VICE, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, Philadelphia, PA; Rebecca G. Newman, Douglas and London, New York, NY; Rebecca Jane Roe, Shroeter Goldmark & Bender, Seattle, WA; Reed Gillmor Bowman, Morris Bart, LLC (New Orleans), New Orleans, LA; Reed A Flathmann, Law Offices of Charles H Johnson, PA, New Brighton, MN; Reginald C. Allen, Unit F-12, Philadelphia, PA; Renee A. Gallagher, McCarter & English, LLP, New York, NY; Rhett A McSweeney, Langevin/McSweeney LLC, Minneapolis, MN; Rhonda Jennings Blackburn, Gary C. Johnson, P.S.C. - PIKEVILLE, Pikeville, KY; Richard J Arsenault, Neblett Beard & Arsenault, Alexandria, LA; Richard A Freese, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Birmingham, AL; Richard L. Kellner, Kabateck Brown Kellner LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Richard A Mincer, SHUCK KUKER LLC, Cheyenne, WY; Richard W. Schulte, Wright & Schulte, LLC, Vandalia, OH; Rick L. Rose, Ray Quinney & Nebeker, Salt Lake City, UT; Ritchie E. Berger, Esq., Dinse, Knapp & McAndrew, P.C., Burlington, VT; Robert Bruce Abel, Jr., PRO HAC VICE, Law Offices Of Robert B. Abel, Jr., San Francisco, CA; Robert H Alexander, Jr, Robert H Alexander Jr pc, OKLAHOMA CITY, OK; Robert K Beck, ROBERT K BECK & ASSOCIATES, Idaho Falls, ID; Robert T Dassow, Hovde Dassow & Deets LLC, Indianapolis, IN; Robert Loren Davis, Law Office Of Robert L. Davis, Chico, CA; Robert J. Gordon, PRO HAC VICE, Weitz & Luxenberg, P.C., New York, NY; Robert L Hanley, Jr, Nolan Plumhoff and Williams Chtd, Towson, MD; Robert K Jenner, PRO HAC VICE, Janet, Jenner & Suggs, LLC, Baltimore, MD; Robert B Newkirk, III, Newkirk Law Office, Cornelius, NC; Robert J. Radice, HORAS, RADICE & ASSOCIATES, LLC, St. Louis, MO; Robert D. Rowland, Goldenberg Heller et al., Edwardsville, IL; Robert Benjamin Sherrer, Ben Sherrer Law Office PC, PRYOR, OK; Robert B. Sickels, Sommers, Schwartz, Southfield, MI; Robert A. Young, PRO HAC VICE, English, Lucas, Priest & Owsley, Llp, Bowling Green, KY; Roger C. Denton, Schlichter, Bogard & Denton, St. Louis, MO; Ronald S. Goldser, Zimmerman Reed, P.I.I.p., Minneapolis, MN; Ronald E. Johnson, Jr., PRO HAC VICE, Schachter, Hendy & Johnson, Psc, Ft. Wright, KY; Ronald D. Rodman, Friedman, Rodman & Frank, PA, Miami, FL; Roopal P. Luhana, Chaffin Luhana LLP, New York, NY; Rusty Graf, Feldman Graf, P.C., Las Vegas, Ne; Ryan A. Keane, THE SIMON LAW FIRM, P.C., St. Louis, MO; Ryan T. McCoy, Fulbright & Jaworski LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Ryan A. Prochaska, Prochaska, Giroux & Howell LLC, Wichita, KS; Samuel L Felker, PRO HAC VICE, Bass, Berry & Sims, Nashville, TN; Samuel Preston McClurkin, IV, Daphne, AL; Sara Marie Athen, Snell & Wilmer LLP, Phoenix, AZ; Sarah Mikowski, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP - Louisville, Louisville, KY; Sarah J Showard, Showard Law Firm PC, Tucson, AZ; Sarah Nicole Smith, Schachter, Hendy & Johnson PSC, Ft. Wright, KY; Scott William

Anderson, Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP, Tampa, FL; Scott Crissman Harris, Whitfield, Bryson & Mason, LLP, Raleigh, NC; Sean Olsen McCrary, Andrus Hood & Wagstaff, PC, Denver, CO; Seth Alan Katz, Burg, Simpson, Eldredge, Hersh & Jardine, PC-Englewood, Englewood, CO; Seth Sharrock Webb, Brown and Crouppen PC, St. Louis, MO; Shannon Falon, Johnson, Abdallah, Bollweg & Parsons LLP, Sioux Falls, SD; Shawn Boyd Deery, McGowan Hood and Felder, Columbia, SC; Sheila M. Bossier, PRO HAC VICE, Freese & Goss, PLLC, Jackson, MS; Sonja S Weissman, Reed Smith LLP, San Francisco, CA; Spencer C. Shields, Law Office of Spencer C. Shields, L.L.C., Olathe, KS; Stephanie L. Arndt, Olsman Mueller Wallace & MacKenzie PC, Berkley, MI; Stephen M. Brooks, Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP, Atlanta, GA; Stephen E. Chappellear, Frost Brown Todd - Columbus, Columbus, OH; Stephen M. Huber, Huber, Slack, Houghtaling, Pandit & Thomas, LLP, New Orleans, LA; Stephen Irving Leshner, Stephen I. Leshner, P.c., Phoenix, AZ; Stephen D. Martin, Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP, Raleigh, NC; Stephen T. Morrow, Law Office of Joseph Rhoades, Esq., Wilmington, DE; Stephen Hensleigh Thomas, Gerling Law Offices, Evansville, IN; Steven Goodstadt, Napoli Bern Ripka Shkolnik, Great River, NY; Steven M. Johnson, PRO HAC VICE, The Johnson Law Firm, Fort Worth, TX; Steven M. Johnson, Johnson, Abdallah, Bollweg & Parsons LLP, Sioux Falls, SD; Steven J. Kherkher, Williams & Bailey Law Firm, Houston, TX; Steven R. Maher, The Maher Law Firm, P.A., Winter Park, FL; Steven F Schossberger, HAWLEY TROXELL ENNIS & HAWLEY, Boise, ID; Steven L Shaw, Pearson Law Firm, Snoqualmie, WA; Stuart T. Feeley, Stuart T Feeley ALC, Honolulu, HI; Stuart C. Talley, Kershaw Cutter & Ratinoff, LLP, Sacramento, CA; Susan C. Minkin, Ashcraft & Gerel LLP (DC), Washington, DC; Tad Thomas, Thomas Law Office, PLLC, Louisville, KY; Tarifa Belle Laddon, Fulbright and Jaworski LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Taylor C Bartlett, HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, Birmingham, AL; Terrence Smith, Davis, Saperstein & Salomon, PC, Teaneck, NJ; Thomas R. Anapol, Anapol, Schwartz, Weiss, Cohan, Feldman & Smalley, PC, Cherry Hill, NJ; Thomas R. Anapol, Anapol Schwartz, Attorneys at Law, Philadelphia, PA; Thomas P. Cleere, PRO HAC VICE, Napoli Bern Ripka Shkolnik Llp, Great River, NY; Thomas J. Sherrer, Esq., Thomas Sherrer, PLLC, Burlington, VT; Timothy J. Becker, Johnson Becker PLLP, Minneapolis, MN; Timothy W. Van Ronzelen, Cook, Vetter, Doerhoff & Landwehr, P.C., Jefferson City, MO; Tony Edwards, The Edwards Law Firm, Tulsa, OK; Tonya L. Melnichenko, Franklin D. Azar & Associates, PC-Aurora, Aurora, CO; Trevor B Rockstad PHV, PRO HAC VICE, Davis & Crump PC, Gulfport, MS; Tricia Wisenbaker Macaluso, Fulbright & Jaworski, Dallas, TX; Troy Alexander Brenes, Lopez McHugh LLP, Newport Beach, CA; Trudy E. Fehlinger, Eckert Seamans, Harrisburg, PA; Vance Robert Andrus,



PRO HAC VICE, Andrus Wagstaff, Pc, Lakewood, CO; WARREN N SAMS, III, Atlanta, GA; Waldon Michael Hingle, Michael Hingle & Associates, Slidell, LA; Walter Kelley, Kelley Bernheim Dolinskiy, LLC, Plymouth, MA; Wayne D. Parsons, Wayne Parsons Law Offices, Honolulu, HI; Wendy M Behan, Casey Gerry Schenk Francavilla Blatt & Penfield LLP, San Diego, CA; Wilfred K Wright, Jr, Wright Law, Claremore, OK; Willard J. Moody, Jr., The Moody Law Firm, Inc., Portsmouth, VA; Willard P Techmeier, The Cochran Firm - Wisconsin LLP, Milwaukee, WI; William E Applegate, IV, Yarborough Applegate, Mt Pleasant, SC; William Justin Blakemore, Lewis & Roberts, PLLC, Raleigh, NC; William Morris Bristol, Gary F. Franke Co., L.P.A., Cincinnati, OH; William L. Bross, IV, Heninger Garrison Davis, LLC, Birmingham, AL; William J Maniatis, PRO HAC VICE, Schlemmer & Maniatis Llp, New York, NY; William F. Northrip, Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP - KC/Grand, Kansas City, MO; William T. Polaski, Eckert Seamans Cherin Mellott, Pittsburgh, PA; William N. Riley, Price Waicukauski & Riley, LLC, Indianapolis, IN; Yolanda Alvarez-Cruz, Ferraiuoli-Torres, Marchand & Rovira PSC, San Juan, PR; Zachary P. Lowe, Lowe Law Group, Ogden, UT; Zane Christian Riester, McCarter & English LLP, Four Gateway LLP, Newark, NJ; Zlatina Georgieva, Bowman and Brooke LLP (MI), Troy, MI.

For Kathy L. Batty, Thomas Batty, Plaintiffs (1:12-cv-06279): Melissa Fry Hague, LEAD ATTORNEY, Anapol Schwartz, Philadelphia, PA.

For Zimmer, Inc., Defendant (1:12-cv-06279): Andrea R. Pierson, LEAD ATTORNEY, Baker & Daniels Llp, Indianapolis, IN; Charles Frederick Webber, LEAD ATTORNEY, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP, Minneapolis, MN; James A O'Neal, LEAD ATTORNEY, Faegre & Benson, Minneapolis, MN; Mark Gebauer, LEAD ATTORNEY, Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott LLC, Harrisburg, PA.

Rebecca R. Pallmeyer, United States District Judge.

Rebecca R. Pallmeyer

## MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Kathy Batty is one of hundreds of Plaintiffs to sue Defendants, Zimmer, Inc. and its affiliates (collectively, "Defendant" or "Zimmer"), manufacturers of the Zimmer NexGen Flex knee system. Plaintiffs, who have had the NexGen Flex system implanted, allege that the femoral and tibial components of the system are prone to premature aseptic loosening (that is, loosening which occurs in the absence of infection), resulting in pain and loss of movement. Ms. Batty's case has been chosen for a "bellwether" trial. Both parties have identified several expert

witnesses. The court has already addressed challenges to a number of these experts in earlier rulings.<sup>1</sup> In this opinion, the court considers Plaintiff's objections to expert testimony from one of Zimmer's proposed experts, Dr. Michael G. Vitale [1337]. For the reasons set forth below, the court overrules Plaintiff's objections.

## BACKGROUND

In April 2009, Plaintiff Kathy Batty's treating physician, Dr. Alan Klein, performed total knee replacements ("TKRs," also known as "total knee arthroplasties" or "TKAs") on both of Ms. Batty's knees. He implanted a NexGen LPS-Flex Gender Solutions femoral component (the "NexGen Flex") and a NexGen Stemmed Tibial Component Option in each of her knees. These components are among the Zimmer "high-flex" components at issue in these lawsuits and are designed to enhance a patient's knee flexion capacity to as much as 155 degrees, significantly more than the flexion afforded by earlier implants, including Zimmer's own original knee implant model (the "NexGen Standard"). Just over a year after her surgeries, in July 2010, Ms. Batty began to experience pain in both knees. Another orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Lawrence Crossett, performed revision surgeries to replace the Zimmer implants in April and May of 2011. Ms. Batty alleges in this litigation that the Zimmer high-flex design caused the premature loosening in her knees that required revision surgeries.

According to Plaintiff, a number of clinical research studies support the theory that Zimmer high-flex implants fail at an "artificially high rate when compared to their non-flex equivalents." (Pls.' Master Long Form Complaint [211] ¶ 125.) Zimmer's proposed expert, Dr. Michael G. Vitale, concedes that some peer-reviewed studies suggest that Zimmer NexGen Flex knee systems are associated with higher rates of revision. (Expert Report of Dr. Michael G. Vitale, Ex. A to Mem. in Supp. of Pls.' Steering Committee's Mot. to Excl. Test. of Michael Vitale [1339-1], hereinafter "Vitale Rep.," 8); see H.S Han et al., *High Incidence of Loosening of the Femoral Component in Legacy Posterior Stabilized-Flex Total Knee Replacement*, 89-B J. Bone Joint Surg. 1457, 1461 (2007) (hereinafter "*Han-1*"); H.S. Han et al., *Brief Follow-up Report: Does High-Flexion Total Knee Arthroplasty Allow Deep Flexion Safely in Asian Patients?* 471 Clin. Orthop. & Rel. Res. 1492, 1497 (2013) (hereinafter "*Han-2*"); and S.-D. Cho et al., *Three- to Six-Year Follow-up Results After High-Flexion Total Knee Arthroplasty: Can We Allow Passive Deep Knee Bending?* 19 Knee Surg. Sports Tramatol. Arthrosc. 899, 903 (2011) (hereinafter "*Cho*"). Dr. Vitale responds to those studies with a review of data from an Australian joint replacement data registry and a literature review that he believes demonstrates that the unfavorable findings are outliers. Dr. Vitale asserts that most

clinical studies report high success rates for Zimmer high flex devices. Plaintiff objects to Dr. Vitale's testimony on the grounds that, as a pediatric spine surgeon, he lacks the necessary qualifications to offer an opinion in this case and that the methodology of his literature review is biased and unreliable. In advance of bellwether trials, Plaintiff urges the court to exercise its "gatekeeper function" and exclude the testimony of Dr. Vitale from Plaintiff's trial on the basis that it fails to meet *Daubert's* strictures. (Mem. in Supp. of Pls.' Steering Committee's Mot. to Excl. Test. of Michael Vitale [1338], hereinafter "Pl.'s Mem.," 1.) Though the court shares some of Plaintiff's concerns, it ultimately concludes that Dr. Vitale's testimony would assist the jury and will be sufficiently reliable. The motion to bar his testimony will be denied.

## DISCUSSION

### I. *Daubert* Standards

**Rule 702 of the Federal Rules of Evidence**, which governs the admissibility of expert testimony, states:

A witness who is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify in the form of an opinion or otherwise if:

- (a) the expert's scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue;
- (b) the testimony is based on sufficient facts or data;
- (c) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and
- (d) the expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

In *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*, **509 U.S. 579** (1993), the Supreme Court held that the Federal Rules of Evidence "assign to the trial judge the task of ensuring that an expert's testimony both rests on a reliable foundation and is relevant to the task at hand." **Id. at 597**. This inquiry involves a "three-step analysis," which asks "whether the witness is qualified; whether the expert's methodology is scientifically reliable; and whether the testimony will 'assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue.'" *Myers v. Illinois Central R. Co.*, **629 F.3d 639**, **644** (7th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Ervin v. Johnson & Johnson*, **492 F.3d 901**, **904** (7th Cir. 2007)); see also *Lapsley v. Xtek, Inc.*, **689 F.3d 802**, **809** (7th Cir. 2012) ("**Rule 702** requires that expert testimony be relevant, reliable, and have a factual basis—requirements that must be met before the jury is allowed to hear and perhaps be persuaded by the expert testimony.").

*Daubert* teaches that the reliability of an expert's methodology may be assessed by considering factors such as "(1) whether the scientific theory or technique can be (and has been) tested; (2) whether the theory or technique has been subjected to peer review and publication; (3) whether a particular technique has a known potential rate of error; and (4) whether the theory or technique is generally accepted in the relevant scientific community." *Schultz v. Akzo Nobel Paints, LLC*, **721 F.3d 426**, **431** (7th Cir. 2013) (citing *Daubert*, **509 U.S. at 593-94**). Cf. *Stollings v. Ryobi Technologies, Inc.*, **725 F.3d 753**, **766** (7th Cir. 2013) ("**Rule 702**'s reliability elements require the district judge to determine only that the expert is providing testimony that is based on a correct application of a reliable methodology and that the expert considered sufficient data to employ the methodology."). Once an expert has identified a reliable methodology, the expert still must "faithfully apply the method to the facts at hand," and "rely on 'facts or data,' as opposed to subjective impressions." *Brown v. Burlington N. Santa Fe Ry. Co.*, **765 F.3d 765**, **772** (7th Cir. 2014). The test for reliability is a flexible one, however, *Lapsley*, **689 F.3d at 810**, and the trial judge may, but need not, consider the specific factors identified in *Daubert*. The *Daubert* factors are important "where they are reasonable measures of the reliability of expert testimony," *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael*, **526 U.S. 137**, **152**, **119 S. Ct. 1167**, **143 L. Ed. 2d 238** (1999), but those factors do not apply "to all experts or in every case." **Id. at 141**. Further, in fulfilling its "gatekeeping" role, the trial court retains discretion in choosing *how* to assess the reliability of the testimony. **Id. at 152**.

An expert's testimony is relevant under **Rule 702** if "it assists the jury in determining any fact at issue in the case." *Stuhlmacher v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.*, **774 F.3d 405**, **409** (7th Cir. 2014). "Whether an issue is relevant in a case is a question of substantive state law; whether the specific evidence offered is relevant to resolving the issue is a procedural question governed by the Federal Rules of Evidence." *Stollings*, **725 F.3d at 767**. Testimony may be relevant even where it involves "hypothetical explanation[s] of the possible or probable causes of an event." **Id.** (quoting *Smith v. Ford Motor Co.*, **215 F.3d 713**, **718-19** (7th Cir. 2000)). Ultimately, whether an explanation is credible in light of the facts of the case is left to the trier of fact. **Id. at 719**.

Finally, "**Rule 702**'s requirement that the district judge determine that the expert used reliable methods does not ordinarily extend to the reliability of the conclusions those methods produce—that is, whether the conclusions are unimpeachable." *Stollings*, **725 F.3d at 765-66** (citing *Daubert*, **509 U.S. at 595**). An expert may provide expert testimony based on valid and properly applied methodologies and still present a "conclusion that is subject



to doubt. It is the role of the jury to weigh these sources of doubt." *Id.* "[T]he accuracy of the actual evidence is to be tested before the jury with the familiar tools of 'vigorous cross-examination, presentation of contrary evidence, and careful instruction on the burden of proof.'" *Lapsley*, 689 F.3d at 805 (quoting *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 596 ).

## II. Report of Dr. Vitale

In his expert report, Dr. Vitale reviews data from two separate "references" to determine "whether there is some defect in the design of the [Zimmer high-flex] device[s] leading to consistent and replicable failure leading to higher rates of revision." (Vitale Rep. at 6.) Based on his "integrated review" of the two references—(1) data from the Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry and (2) his own "formal systematic review of the literature"—Dr. Vitale concludes that "there is no evidence that [the Zimmer] design is associated with higher rates of revision." ( *Id.*) The Australian Joint Replacement Registry, Dr. Vitale explains, is a patient registry, or an "organized system" that collects uniform data to evaluate specified outcomes for a particular patient population. ( *Id.* at 3.) Because of the size, representativeness, and heterogeneity of the data collected in a patient registry, clinical research on that data enables researchers to detect rare adverse events. ( *Id.*) In Australia, all hospitals undertaking joint replacement procedures submit data to the Australian Registry, an entity established by the Australian Orthopaedic Association and funded by the Australian government. Australian Orthopaedic Assoc. Nat'l Joint Replacement Registry, *Annual Report 3* (2013), available at <https://aoanjrr.dmac.adelaide.edu.au/documents/10180/127202/Annual%20Report%202013?version=1.2&t=1385685288617> (last visited Aug. 24, 2015). As of 2013, 304 Australian hospitals were participating in the Registry, and the Registry reported on 351,875 primary total knee procedures. *Id.* at 3, 122. The Registry's principal outcome measure for all joint replacements is "time to first revision surgery." *Id.* at 4. The 2013 Australian Registry Annual Report, upon which Dr. Vitale relies, provides records of cumulative revision rates following total knee replacements for many knee devices, including Zimmer NexGen Flex devices. (Vitale Rep. at 5.)

Dr. Vitale's other "reference" is his systematic literature review. Such a review is not limited to any particular data registry and is, instead, an attempt to "synthesize and integrate the available relevant literature within a field" to answer some clinical question posed at the outset. ( *Id.* at 4.) The review begins with a "formal, transparent, and reproducible" search for studies that address a proposed research question. ( *Id.*) Once a list of appropriate articles is selected, the articles are reviewed and scored based on their methodological and evidentiary quality, and the review often concludes with summary statistics and qualitative findings. ( *Id.*) Essentially, a systematic literature review uses formal search methods to allow a researcher to obtain a neutral "snapshot" of the existing research on a particular question.

Plaintiff's motion to exclude Dr. Vitale's testimony does not mention his review of the Australian Registry Data, focusing instead on Dr. Vitale's qualifications to offer an opinion in this case and on the reliability of his literature review and its subsequent update. Dr. Vitale intended his literature review to examine the "current understanding regarding reported revision rates for NexGen Flex knee implants" and began with a search of relevant medical databases using a set of search terms related to his research question (such as "knee," "flex," and "NexGen"). ( *Id.* at 8-9.) Dr. Vitale's initial search retrieved 3,437 studies. ( *Id.* at 9.) Duplicate studies and irrelevant studies—such as those related to "ligamentous surgeries," "revision surgical technique," or "infections"—were ultimately excluded, leaving only 100 relevant studies to be analyzed. ( *Id.*) Dr. Vitale divided the 100 studies into three groups: Group 1 reported outcomes for NexGen Flex knees, Group 2A reported outcomes for NexGen Standard knees, and Group 2B reported outcomes for other brands' high-flex knee implants. ( *Id.*) Dr. Vitale's report omitted the results of 21 studies (eight from Group 1, ten from Group 2A, three from Group 2B) from his quantitative analysis for various reasons ( *id.* at 9-11), namely that they had "some methodological or statistical or other inconsistencies that deserve some pause." (Dep. of Michael Vitale, Ex. B to Pl.'s Mem. [1339-2], hereinafter "Vitale Dep.," 179:10-22.) But Dr. Vitale does discuss the excluded studies in the report and testified that the omitted studies were still "very much considered" in his qualitative analysis. ( *Id.* at 179:3-22.) After discussing the reasons for omitting the excluded articles in each group, Dr. Vitale's report categorizes the remaining studies by their evidence level<sup>2</sup> and lists the "survival rates" (i.e., the percentage of TKAs that did not require revision) and average postoperative follow-up period (i.e., the period between operation and most recent follow-up) of subjects from the various studies. (Vitale Rep. at 9-12.) Dr. Vitale's review showed that most of the studies in Group 1 reported

high survival rates and that reported rates for patients in Group 1 were similar to those in Groups 2A and 2B. He concluded that certain Group 1 studies with higher revision rates should be considered "outliers." ( *Id.* at 13-14.) He thus concludes in the systematic review section of his report that "[i]f anything, NexGen Flex products appear to be as safe if not safer than other products of similar design." ( *Id.* at 14.)

In his rebuttal to Dr. Vitale's report, Plaintiff's expert, Dr. Mininder S. Kocher, argues that Dr. Vitale failed to offer any analysis of whether patients who actually achieved high flexion were more likely to have revisions than those who did not. (Rebuttal Letter of Dr. Mininder S. Kocher, Ex. D to Pl.'s Mem. [1339-4], hereinafter "Kocher Rebuttal Rep.," 5.) As Dr. Kocher explained, and as Plaintiff contends in this case, patients with high flexion implants who do not actually achieve higher flexion may be no more likely to suffer from aseptic loosening than patients who have standard implants; it may be that only those patients in Group 1 who actually achieved higher flexion are more likely to suffer from such loosening and ultimately require revision surgery. ( *Id.*) In response to the criticism that his analysis did not consider this possibility, Dr. Vitale reexamined the Group 1 studies already included in his review and provided an update to his report, this time including information about the range of motion achieved by patients in the studies. (Ex. Q to Pl.'s Mem. [1339-17].)

Plaintiff is not satisfied by this additional analysis. She contends that Dr. Vitale's lack of experience and knowledge about knees and knee replacement surgery disqualifies him from offering an expert opinion in this case. She urges, further, that his failure to follow established guidelines or to otherwise use proper methods in conducting his systematic literature review renders unreliable any opinion based on that review or its later update. Plaintiff also seeks to exclude Dr. Vitale's subsequent "range of motion" analysis as unreliable. The court addresses these arguments in turn.

### A. Qualifications

Dr. Vitale is an orthopedic surgeon who specializes in pediatric spine surgery at Morgan Stanley Children's Hospital of New York-Presbyterian / Columbia University Medical Center, where he has been an attending orthopedic surgeon since 2001. (Vitale Rep. at 1.) He received his medical degree from Columbia in 1995. ( *Id.*) After medical school, he completed a residency in orthopedic surgery at Columbia / New York Presbyterian Hospital in 2000 and a fellowship in pediatric orthopedic surgery at Children's Hospital of Los Angeles in 2001. ( *Id.*) In addition to his experience as an orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Vitale also has a "special interest and expertise in the area of clinical research." ( *Id.*) He received a master's degree in public

health, with an emphasis on clinical outcomes research, from Columbia University in 1995, and he is the author of many peer-reviewed articles that "utilize techniques in health services research including large database review and systematic review of [medical] literature . . ." ( *Id.*) He has served on the Evidence-Based Medicine Committee of the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons ( *id.*), and he estimates that he devotes 20 to 25% of his workweek on clinical research. (Vitale Dep. at 10:23-11:2.)

Plaintiff emphasizes that Dr. Vitale is a pediatric spine surgeon. As she sees things, his lack of experience with, prior knowledge of, and prior interest in knees and knee replacement surgery renders him unqualified to offer his opinion in this case. (Mem. by Pls.' Steering Committee in Supp. of Mot. for Misc. Relief [1338], hereinafter "Pl.'s Mem.," 4-7.) Dr. Vitale admits that he has never published a clinical research study on adult knees or on TKAs, and that he has not conducted a TKA himself since he was a medical resident in 2001. (Vitale Dep. at 20:12-18; 36:7-10.) In addition to this purported general lack of experience and knowledge of knees and TKAs, Plaintiff notes Dr. Vitale's lack of familiarity with Zimmer's or its competitors' devices and argues that this, too, precludes his offering an opinion about the safety of Zimmer's high-flex devices relative to other products. (Pl.'s Mem. at 6.) For example, Plaintiff notes that Dr. Vitale could not say whether Zimmer's gender-specific device was available in cruciate-retaining ("CR") form or in legacy knee posterior stabilized ("LPS") form; he did not know how long the LPS-Flex and CR-Flex devices have been on the market; he explicitly admitted that he "would not hold [himself] out as an expert" on the knee designs of Zimmer's competitors; and he confused the anterior and the posterior cruciate ligaments during his deposition. ( *Id.* at 6-7.)

Despite these shortcomings, the court is satisfied that Dr. Vitale possesses "scientific or specialized knowledge that will assist the trier of fact" in this case. **Fed. R. Evid. 702** . As Plaintiff's own expert conceded, Dr. Vitale is "qualified as an epidemiologist." (Dep. of Mininder Kocher, Ex. C to Zimmer's Resp. to Pls.' Steering Committee's Mot. to Excl. Test. of Michael Vitale [1444-3], hereinafter "Kocher Dep.," 298:18-23.) In determining whether his testimony is admissible, the court compares "the area in which [he] has superior knowledge, skill, experience, or education with the subject matter of [his] testimony." *Carroll v. Otis Elevator Co.*, **896 F.2d 210** , **212** (7th Cir. 1990). The testimony Dr. Vitale intends to offer is not based on specialized knowledge of knee mechanics, surgical procedures, or the engineering design of Zimmer's products and those of its competitors. His testimony instead focuses on his review of clinical research—a discipline in which he has significant interest, knowledge, and expertise. The examples of Dr.

Vitale's ignorance or misstatements cited by Plaintiff are not relevant to the clinical research reviews he conducted in this case. His conclusions are based on his epidemiological and general clinical research expertise, and the fact that his past clinical research did not specialize in the subjects of knees or TKAs does not disqualify him from offering his conclusions. *Cf. Gayton v. McCoy*, **593 F.3d 610**, **617** (7th Cir. 2010) (holding doctor did not need specific cardiac training to testify as expert in case involving heart-related death).<sup>3</sup>

## B. Reliability of Dr. Vitale's Opinion

In addition to challenging Dr. Vitale's qualifications, Plaintiff argues that Dr. Vitale employed unreliable methods to reach his conclusions. Though she does not question his analysis of the Australian Registry data, Plaintiff asserts that Dr. Vitale's self-described "formal systematic literature review" did not adhere to widely accepted guidelines for such reviews and was conducted in a biased and unreliable way. (Pl.'s Mem. at 7-20.)

The court ultimately agrees with Zimmer that the issues Plaintiff raises miss the big picture. (Zimmer's Resp. to Pls.' Steering Committee's Mot. to Excl. Test. of Michael Vitale [1444], hereinafter "Def.'s Resp.," 13.) Even cumulatively, though the issues Plaintiff raises may undermine Dr. Vitale's ultimate conclusions, they do not show that the methods he used were so unreliable that his testimony should be kept from the jury. On the contrary, as discussed below, the data Dr. Vitale collected will provide important context for the jury in deciding key issues in the case, and Plaintiff will have the opportunity through cross-examination and the production of contrary evidence to challenge his opinions.

In determining whether Dr. Vitale's testimony is sufficiently reliable, the court focuses on the "validity of the methodology employed . . . not the quality of the data used in applying the methodology or the conclusions produced." *Manpower, Inc. v. Ins. Co. of Pennsylvania*, **732 F.3d 796**, **806** (7th Cir. 2013). Notably, Plaintiff does not contend that a formal systematic literature review is itself an unreliable or invalid methodology. Rather, she argues primarily that the literature review Dr. Vitale conducted for purposes of this litigation did not comply with internationally recognized guidelines outlined in Alesandro Liberati et al., *The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis of Studies That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration*, PLOS MED. 1 (July 2009) (hereinafter "PRISMA" or "PRISMA guidelines"). In addition to the PRISMA-specific defects Plaintiff asserts, Plaintiff claims that Dr. Vitale's literature review impermissibly "commingled" heterogeneous studies, failed to established a fixed definition of a knee device's

"survivability," and used inconsistent criteria in determining which studies to include in his review; each of these alleged flaws, according to Plaintiff, shows that Dr. Vitale's methods were unreliable. Finally, Plaintiff urges that Dr. Vitale's analysis of study patients' range of motion was unreliably "tacked on" to his initial systematic review, again without adhering to systematic review guidelines. The court first discusses Dr. Vitale's purported failure to abide by the PRISMA guidelines before turning to the other methodological defects Plaintiff identifies.

## 1. Guidelines for Systematic Literature Reviews

Plaintiff and Zimmer disagree about the significance of the PRISMA guidelines. According to Plaintiff, PRISMA is the "international recognized guideline for systematic reviews" (Pl.'s Mem. at 8), and Dr. Vitale's deviation from PRISMA's 27-item checklist—by, for example, failing to explicitly state his study question, failing to acknowledge the limitations of his review, failing to present his findings graphically, and failing to reproduce his search results—demonstrates that he has not applied the "same level of intellectual rigor" as would someone in his field, making his review unreliable. ( *Id.* at 9 (citing *Lapsley*, **689 F.3d at 805** ).) Zimmer and Dr. Vitale respond that the PRISMA guidelines on which Plaintiff relies relate primarily to the *presentation or reporting* of systematic literature reviews, not to the process for conducting such a review. (Def.'s Resp. at 5; Vitale Dep. 238:23-240:7.) As Dr. Vitale was not disseminating his findings to a wider audience, but was merely conducting his review as part of an integrated report for this litigation, Zimmer argues, the PRISMA reporting guidelines have less applicability. (Def.'s Resp. at 5.) Furthermore, Zimmer disputes that Plaintiff has established that the PRISMA guidelines are as widely recognized as her attorneys claim. ( *Id.* at 5-6.)

The court sides with Zimmer on the issue of PRISMA's relevance to Dr. Vitale's review. In discussing the appropriate methodology for a systematic literature review, Plaintiff's own expert, Dr. Kocher, neglected to cite PRISMA, which casts some doubt on Plaintiff's claim of widespread acceptance. (See *generally* Kocher Rebuttal Rep.) In addition, the authors of the PRISMA Statement themselves caution that "PRISMA is not intended to be a quality assessment tool and it should not be used as such." PRISMA at 22. They also state quite explicitly that, as Dr. Vitale observed, PRISMA is intended to guide the *reporting* of systematic reviews and "does not address directly or in a detailed manner the *conduct* of systematic reviews." *Id.* at 4 (emphasis added).

The court's concern in this case is whether Dr. Vitale used reliable methods in conducting his review. Guidelines

for *reporting* on such a review in a published academic journal may be of less concern in this context. PRISMA's requirement, for example, to include an abstract that will help readers to decide "whether to read the full report" is obviously not relevant here. More importantly, as discussed below, many of Dr. Vitale's alleged deviations from PRISMA relate to his reporting, rather than the conduct, of his literature review. The purpose for certain of the PRISMA checklist items is to reduce the potential for bias. See, e.g., PRISMA at 7 (discussing how selection of review question might facilitate detection of bias). Reliability analysis under *Daubert* calls for the court to determine whether the expert's testimony is based on reliable methods rather than "his own subjective experience or bias," *Brown*, 765 F.3d at 775, so the court will consider whether Dr. Vitale's alleged deviations from the PRISMA guidelines did indeed introduce an impermissible element of bias or otherwise undermine his reliability. But Dr. Vitale's failure to abide by a particular checklist item suggested by PRISMA will not, by itself, render his literature method unreliable.

Plaintiff asserts that one of the most problematic deviations from the PRISMA guidelines in Dr. Vitale's report was his failure to include an explicit statement of the research question his review intended to answer. (Pl.'s Mem. at 9-11.) PRISMA guidelines explain that "precisely stated review objectives are critical as they help define other components of the review process" such as the study eligibility criteria and the search for relevant literature. PRISMA at 7. Dr. Vitale himself states that a systematic review's formal search strategy is "based on the research question." (Vitale Rep. at 4.) A primary reason for an explicit statement of the research question is that it enables subsequent researchers to determine whether the review is applicable to their interests. PRISMA at 7. That is not a concern for this litigation. One could imagine that the failure to state the research question driving a literature review might make it difficult for an observer to assess whether the proper studies were included or excluded. Here, however, though Dr. Vitale's report lacks a single, succinct statement of his research question, that question is readily discernible, and an external observer would be able to assess whether his review was properly tailored to answering that question. As Dr. Vitale stated in his deposition, his review sought to answer whether patients whose knees are replaced by Zimmer high-flex devices have higher rates of revision caused by aseptic loosening than do patients whose knees are replaced by other devices. (Vitale Dep. at 144:5-10.) Though this precise question is not clearly stated in his report, it is clear from the studies he includes and excludes and from his analysis of those studies that this is the question Dr. Vitale investigated. For example, Dr. Vitale omits from his quantitative analysis studies that excluded revised patients from their population or that included

patients who needed revision but for whom the cause of that revision was unclear. (Vitale Rep. at 9-12.) And Dr. Vitale's analysis of the studies he deems relevant address the rate of revisions, attributable to aseptic loosening, for Zimmer high-flex devices and others. (Id. at 9-14.) Because the question that drove his review is easily identifiable, the court is comfortable concluding that Dr. Vitale's failure to include an explicit and succinct statement of that question in his report does not render his entire method unreliable.

Plaintiff also faults Dr. Vitale for neglecting to acknowledge the limitations of his review. PRISMA guidelines provide that systematic reviews should discuss "limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias)." PRISMA at 21. According to PRISMA, "[r]eaders may find [such a discussion] helpful . . . ." (Id.) In his deposition, Dr. Vitale noted that "systematic literature reviews, by design, have some limitations as [do] all research methodologies" (Vitale Dep. at 199:10-17), but he did not explicitly acknowledge any such limitations in his expert report. Plaintiff will have ample opportunity to press Dr. Vitale on the limitations of his report during cross-examination, however. Cf. *Buie v. McAdory*, 341 F.3d 623, 625 (7th Cir. 2003) (whether a given expert witness overstated her conclusion can be explored on cross-examination). Dr. Vitale is clearly aware that systematic literature reviews have limitations, as he stated in his deposition, and Plaintiff has provided no reason why the court should conclude that his failure to state this fact in his expert report, as well, has any impact on the reliability of his underlying methods.

In addition to Dr. Vitale's purported failure to report his research question and to acknowledge his review's limitations, Plaintiff cites two more allegedly problematic deviations from the PRISMA guidelines: (1) the report's lack of graphic data explaining Dr. Vitale's findings and (2) Dr. Vitale's failure to reproduce his search results. The court concludes that neither issue renders Dr. Vitale's underlying method unreliable. Dr. Vitale's failure to include graphic data—specifically, box plots, forest plots or funnel plots—is, again, an issue of the presentation, rather than the conduct, of his review. Furthermore, Dr. Vitale had a reason to omit graphical presentation of the data—namely, his reluctance to present data graphically when there is heterogeneity or variability among the studies included in his review.<sup>5</sup> (Vitale Dep. at 312:7-18.) Plaintiff's own expert criticized Dr. Vitale's report on this basis, but admitted that the results of a systematic literature review could be analyzed or interpreted in both quantitative *and* qualitative ways. (Kocher Dep. at 92:5-12.) Dr. Vitale's choice to present his data in a qualitative, non-graphical form, therefore, does not undermine confidence in his methodology.<sup>6</sup> Nor is the



court moved by the contention that Dr. Vitale's failure to reproduce his search results discredits his entire review. Plaintiff urges that ensuring that the results are "transparent and reproducible" is "[a]xiomatic to a reliable systematic literature review," and that Dr. Vitale's failure to make a list of studies he retrieved originally deprives the court of the ability to determine that his search and study selection were unbiased. (Pl.'s Mem. at 14.) Dr. Vitale's report does, however, clearly explain his search method, identifies the number of studies he initially retrieved and the ones he excluded, and describes his process for excluding certain studies (albeit without explaining the reasons for excluding or including any individual study). (Vitale Rep. at 8-9.) In addition, Dr. Vitale did produce his work product and search strategy document, which identified the dates on which the searches were run, the lists of articles selected for export from the databases searched, and the selected group of 331 "potentially relevant studies." (Def.'s Resp. at 11; Garcia Email, Ex. G. to Def.'s Resp. [1444-7].) As Zimmer points out, "If Plaintiffs wish to challenge the validity of the reported search results or the choices to eliminate articles," they are free to repeat the searches on the databases Dr. Vitale used. (Def.'s Resp. at 11.) Notably, as discussed below, Plaintiff has not identified a single relevant study that Dr. Vitale completely omitted from his review. Given this fact and given Dr. Vitale's transparency about the way his search was conducted and the information about the search strategy provided to Plaintiff, the court is satisfied that Dr. Vitale's failure to produce his original search results should not discredit the entire review.

## 2. "Commingling" of Heterogeneous Studies

According to Plaintiff, one of the "deepest flaws" in Dr. Vitale's methodology is his "commingling" of studies that are highly variable, or heterogeneous, in terms of their "study length, follow-up, size, design, power, outcome, range of motion, component type" and other features. (Pl.'s Mem. at 12.) Dr. Kocher similarly opines that there is "significant variability" in the studies Dr. Vitale included in his review. (Kocher Rebuttal Rep. at 4.) He notes, for example, that the time between TKA and follow-up ranged among study patients from one month to 139.2 months, and points out that studies with one month follow-up are not useful for assessing revision rates. ( *Id.*) Dr. Vitale himself did not provide heterogeneity statistics for the studies he included in his review, and Dr. Kocher suspects there is "likely large heterogeneity in the studies." ( *Id.*) This is problematic, he continues, because "[h]igh levels of heterogeneity preclude combining study results and making conclusions based on combining studies." ( *Id.*) Zimmer is untroubled by the heterogeneity concern. The examples Plaintiff identifies of "broad brush conclusions" that Dr. Vitale has drawn from the "commingled" studies are actually

mere descriptions of the studies' findings, Zimmer contends. Those conclusions, Zimmer contends, do not rest on any impermissible inferences from combined data: Dr. Vitale simply states that "xx number of studies with xx months of follow-up reported xx% survival." (Def.'s Resp. at 13.) Dr. Vitale in fact acknowledges that "the variability among study cohorts precludes aggregate analysis . . . ." (Vitale Rep. at 4.) Thus, rather than attempting such analysis, he offers an examination of "crude survival rates" to provide "an important snapshot of the performance of NexGen Flex Products." ( *Id.*)

In light of Dr. Vitale's recognition of the heterogeneity in the studies, the court is not certain that, in grouping studies together and providing information about the number of studies within that group that reported a given survival rate, Dr. Vitale was drawing any impermissible conclusions. (Cf. Kocher Rebuttal Rep. at 4.) This is not to say, however, that the heterogeneity of the studies included in Dr. Vitale's review is unproblematic. Some of the studies included may, as Dr. Kocher suggests, have follow-up periods that are too short to draw conclusions about survival rates. And the studies may be too variable across a number of dimensions to support Dr. Vitale's ultimate conclusion—based on his literature review and the Australian registry data—that "there is no evidence that this design is associated with higher rates of revision." (Vitale Rep. at 6.) But it is not the court's role as gatekeeper to determine whether Dr. Vitale's ultimate conclusion is the right one: "the key to the gate is not the ultimate correctness of the expert's conclusions." *Schultz*, **721 F.3d at 431** . As discussed below, Plaintiff has not shown that Dr. Vitale used an improper method to select the studies for his review. In challenging the conclusions he draws from those studies, Plaintiff cannot rely on the court's assessment of the truth of those conclusions but may rely instead on "[v]igorous cross-examination [and] presentation of contrary evidence . . . ." *Daubert*, **509 U.S. at 596** .

## 3. Definition of "survivability"

Plaintiff contends, next, that in his examination of "survival rates among high flex knees," Dr. Vitale never defined "survivability" and thus was able to change his definition of patient survival from study to study, each time categorizing the data in a way that would favor Zimmer. (Pl.'s Mem. at 20-23.) This methodology, Plaintiff argues, is obviously not reliable. ( *Id.*) But the examples Plaintiff cites do not actually demonstrate that Dr. Vitale's criteria changed or that he was inconsistent. Plaintiff's examples may suggest that the conclusions Dr. Vitale draws from his "survival analysis" are shaky, but they do not render his underlying methods unreliable. The court's *Daubert* analysis must focus "solely on principles and methodology, not on the conclusions they generate." *Daubert*, **509 U.S. at 595** .

Dr. Vitale's "survival" criteria are consistent throughout his report. For each study, Dr. Vitale sought to determine "crude survival rates"—that is, the percentage of patients, at the time of the study's follow-up, who required revision following TKAs because of aseptic loosening. (Vitale Rep. at 4.) If the study reported no revisions at the given time of follow-up, or no revisions attributable to aseptic loosening, the survival rate was reported as 100%. ( *Id.* at 10-12.) If a study reported revisions attributable to aseptic loosening, Dr. Vitale discussed those studies separately from those reporting 100% survival, and then determined the survival rate by counting the number of patients within the study who required revision because of aseptic loosening at the time of follow-up. ( *Id.*) If a study reported revisions, but did not identify the percentage of revisions attributable to aseptic loosening, Dr. Vitale did not include that study in his quantitative analysis. ( *Id.*) This appears to the court to be a consistent application of Dr. Vitale's definition of "survival." Plaintiff contends that Dr. Vitale's survival criteria should have led him to report the *Radetzki* study as showing an 85% (17 out of 20) survival rate as opposed to his reported 90% (18 out of 20) survival rate. (Pl.'s Mem. at 21 (citing Florian Radetzki et al., *High Flex Total Knee Arthroplasty—A Prospective, Randomized Study with Results After 10 Years*, 79 ACTA ORTHOP. BELG. 536, 540 (2013)).) But Dr. Vitale explained at his deposition that while three of the 20 patients required revision, only two out of 20 patients were revised for "asymptomatic aseptic loosening," while one additional patient was revised for "painful mid-flexion instability." (Vitale Dep. at 301:5-11.) And as discussed above, Dr. Vitale's survival criteria required a showing that the patient underwent a revision for *aseptic loosening*.

Plaintiff also questions Dr. Vitale's inclusion of the *Ahmed* and *Nutton* studies in his survival analysis. She notes that Dr. Vitale made an assumption that the implants of those studies' patients survived despite any explicit statement about survival or revision rates from the authors. (Pl.'s Mem. at 21-22 (citing R.W. Nutton et al., *A Prospective Randomised Double-Blind Study of Functional Outcome and Range of Flexion Following Total Knee Replacement with the NexGen Standard and High Flexion Components*, 90-B J. Bone Joint Surg. (BR.) 37, 42 (2008) and Issaq Ahmed et al., *Range of Flexion After Primary TKA: The Effect of Soft Tissue Release and Implant Design*, 32 Orthopedics 811 (2009)).) Aseptic loosening, Plaintiff contends, was not a "primary or secondary endpoint" for either study—that is, the authors were not studying aseptic loosening, and their studies, therefore, should not have been included in the survival analysis. ( *Id.* at 22.) Dr. Vitale's assumption about survivability is not unreasonable, in the court's view. As he explained, the studies were considering patients' range of motion following TKAs. The

studies' authors reported follow-up data on patients with knee devices and did not make any mention of revisions; it was therefore reasonable to conclude that there were no revisions at all, whether as a result of aseptic loosening or for any other reason. (Vitale Dep. at 278:17-280:17.) Dr. Kocher questioned the strength of the conclusions one might draw from a study that did not mention revisions, but he acknowledged it was "fair to report" that such a study reported no revisions. (Kocher Dep. at 300:5-15.) At trial, Plaintiff is free to argue that one should give little weight to studies that require assumptions of this kind when making ultimate conclusions about survival rates. But the assumption Dr. Vitale made in including the studies within his analysis was at least a "fair" or reasonable one that does not make his methodology unreliable.

Plaintiff also faults Dr. Vitale for including the *Endres and Wilke* study among those listed as having 100% survivorship because that study's authors explicitly cautioned against drawing survivorship conclusions from their short-follow-up study. (Pl.'s Mem. at 23 (citing S. Endres & A. Wilke, *High Flexion Total Knee Arthroplasty—Mid-Term Follow Up of 5 Years*, 5 Open Orthopaedics J. 138, 142 (2011) (hereinafter *Endres and Wilke*)).) Dr. Vitale, however, did not draw grand "survivorship conclusions" on the basis of the *Endres and Wilke* study but was merely reporting that study's "crude survival rate" as part of his larger review. As Dr. Vitale said when discussing the *Endres and Wilke*, he "agree[s] completely in context that you cannot draw conclusions from any single study." (Vitale Dep. at 292:18-20.) Plaintiff can, on cross examination, question the wisdom of drawing larger survivorship conclusions from a review that includes such a study or of drawing conclusions from reports of "crude survival rates" generally. That said, though Plaintiff may have reason to believe that the ultimate conclusions Dr. Vitale draws from his literature review are "shaky," Plaintiff has not shown that the "survival" definition Dr. Vitale deployed in the conduct of his review was itself overly biased or unreliably inconsistent.

#### 4. Study Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Plaintiff next argues that Dr. Vitale's review is "fatally flawed" because he used inconsistent criteria to determine which studies should be included in his review and which should be excluded. (Pl.'s Mem. at 14.) This allowed Dr. Vitale to "cherry pick" studies to produce an artificially favorable snapshot of the literature for Zimmer. ( *Id.* at 16-20.) The court agrees with Plaintiff that testimony based on Dr. Vitale's literature review would have to be excluded if Dr. Vitale used biased inclusion or exclusion criteria to provide an inaccurate snapshot of the literature. Such a review would be unreliable and would mislead the jury. *Cf. In Re Zoloff*, 26 F. Supp. 3d 449, 460-61 (E.D. Pa. 2014)

(excluding epidemiologist's testimony where she selectively discussed studies most supportive of her conclusions and failed to account for contrary evidence, including her own published work). The court, however, does not believe that Dr. Vitale engaged in such biased "cherry picking" in conducting his review.

Plaintiff faults Dr. Vitale for dismissing four publications—*Han-1*, *Han-2*, *Cho*, and R.S. Namba et al., *Increased Risk for High Flexion Total Knee Replacement with Thicker Tibial Liners*, 96-B BONE JOINT J. 217, 223 (2014) (hereinafter "*Namba*")—with "alarmingly high" revision rates from his analysis. (Pl.'s Mem. at 16.) But Dr. Vitale did not "dismiss" those publications in the sense of excluding them from his review or pretending they did not exist. On the contrary, all four are cited and discussed within his report. Dr. Vitale excluded *Han-1* from his quantitative analysis of Group 1 (concerning Zimmer high-flex devices) because *Han-1* and *Han-2* used the same patient cohort, and in such cases, Dr. Vitale included only the study with the longer follow-up. (Vitale Rep. at 10.) Dr. Vitale excluded two other studies from the Group 1 quantitative analysis for this same reason. ( *Id.*) As for *Cho*, contrary to Plaintiff's claims, Dr. Vitale did include that study within the Group 1 analysis. ( *Id.*) *Namba*, on the other hand, was excluded from Dr. Vitale's quantitative analysis of Group 1. ( *Id.*) Dr. Vitale did not exclude *Namba* because the results were unfavorable, however; he excluded *Namba* because the study reported a survival rate only with respect to "aseptic revision." ( *Id.*) That is, it was not clear from *Namba* how many of the revisions were attributable to aseptic *loosening*, and he therefore concluded the study's results could not reliably be included in the quantitative analysis. Other studies were similarly omitted from the quantitative analysis because they did not provide serviceable data for quantitative review. For example, one study reporting a 100% survival rate was excluded because it discussed the misnomer "NexGen 'Full Flex' knees" and thus could not be accurately categorized. ( *Id.*) In any event, though he omitted the *Namba* results from the quantitative analysis, Dr. Vitale still considered the study, and it contributed to his opinion in the case. (Vitale Dep. 207:8-208:5.)

Dr. Vitale did label the three cohorts studied in the four publications at issue (one cohort for *Han-1* and *Han-2*, one cohort for *Cho*, and one cohort for *Namba*) as "outliers." (Vitale Rep. at 10.) But he discussed each study and explained why he thought it deserved that label. The results of *Han-1* and *Han-2* were simply too disparate from the results of other studies to be given much weight, especially for a single cohort whose devices were implanted by a single surgeon at a single institution. ( *Id.* at 13.) Though *Cho* reported high rates of loosening, it also reported high *survival* rates at a 51-month follow-up. ( *Id.*) And analysis of

the *Namba* results is confounded by the fact that the highest revision rates were found among patients given thicker tibial polyethylene liners—liners commonly used for patients with "instability and/or significant" deformity, which could have contributed to the high revision rates. ( *Id.* at 10, 13.) These three "outlier" cohorts, thus, were considered and not simply ignored or dismissed out of hand. Plaintiff is free to challenge Dr. Vitale's characterization of these studies as "outliers" during cross-examination, but his treatment of these studies does not appear to the court to reflect unacceptable "cherry picking."

Plaintiff does bring to the court's attention problematic aspects of certain studies that Dr. Vitale may have overlooked in his inclusion and exclusion process. These oversights, too, may provide additional material for cross-examination. For example, Dr. Vitale included two studies in his Group 1 quantitative analysis, stating that both reported 100% survival rates, despite the fact that both studies used the same cohort and that Dr. Vitale had excluded previous studies for studying a duplicate cohort. (Vitale Rep. at 10.) Dr. Vitale explained at his deposition, however, that the authors of each study reported different numbers for the cohort sizes at the beginning of the studies, and thus the use of the same cohort "got by the peer-review process and it got by my filter as well." (Vitale Dep. 284:3-12.) This appears to the court to be an inadvertent oversight, not an attempt to distort the data. It is also easily correctable by removing one of the studies from the Group 1 analysis so that instead of 28 out of 35 studies reporting 100% survival rates, only 27 out of 34 do so.

Plaintiff also points out that nine of the 42 studies included in Dr. Vitale's Group 1 quantitative analysis focus on NexGen Flex *mobile-bearing* knees, devices that are not at issue in this litigation, which deals with Flex fixed-bearing knees. (Pl.'s Mem. at 19.) It appears that when Dr. Vitale conducted his review, he was unaware whether the Plaintiffs were suing over both types of Flex knees and thus may have included unrelated and irrelevant studies in his review. (Vitale Dep. at 75:16-24.) In his deposition, Dr. Vitale admitted initially that the inclusion of these studies was a mistake; but he later corrected his testimony to say that many of the included mobile-bearing studies have "serviceable relevant data for fixed components." (Vitale Errata, Ex. I to Def.'s Resp. [1444-9].) Zimmer responds to Plaintiff's argument by noting that there are, in fact, cases in this litigation involving mobile-bearing knees and that the mobile-bearing knee's femoral component is identical to the femoral component of other Flex devices. (Tr. of Proceedings, *Daubert* Hearing, Apr. 20, 2015, at 217:14-24.) The court concludes that the inclusion of these nine studies in Dr. Vitale's review, some of which included fixed-bearing knee devices as well, does not

render Dr. Vitale's entire testimony unreliable. Dr. Vitale's conclusions, after all, are based on his review of both the Australian Registry data and the 100 relevant studies included in his review (50 studies specific to the NexGen Flex), and the court is unwilling to jettison testimony based on that extensive review on the basis that a handful of studies may not have been properly included. As with the duplicate cohort oversight, if Plaintiff believes these studies were improperly included, Plaintiff can easily remove the studies and perform her own quantitative analysis of the resulting data. The best way, therefore, to determine how the inclusion of these studies affects the ultimate conclusion to draw from Dr. Vitale's data is for Plaintiff to cross-examine Dr. Vitale and present evidence of the studies' purported irrelevance and allow the jury to weigh the competing arguments and draw its own conclusion.

Dr. Vitale excluded both favorable and non-favorable studies from his review, apparently for objective, scientific reasons. Significantly, Plaintiff has not identified any apparently relevant study that Dr. Vitale should have discussed but omitted completely. Dr. Vitale is not therefore, as Plaintiff contends, like the excluded epidemiologist in *Zoloff* who failed to account for or discuss contrary evidence in her expert report. **26 F. Supp. 3d at 460-61**. On the whole, Dr. Vitale appears to have used reliable methods in including and excluding studies, and Plaintiff will be free at trial to dispute the conclusions one ought to draw from the studies Dr. Vitale collected.

### 5. Dr. Vitale's Subsequent "Range of Motion" Analysis

As noted, after Dr. Kocher criticized Dr. Vitale's report for failing to consider the range of motion achieved by patients in the studies included in his review, Dr. Vitale prepared an additional analysis of patients' range of motion in the 50 studies chosen for Group 1 of his initial review. Plaintiff asks the court to exclude this analysis because it was performed post-hoc and did not follow "any methodology of a systematic review." (Pl.'s Mem. at 23.) As the court understands Plaintiff's position, she argues that Dr. Vitale conducted his initial review to answer a question (whether Zimmer's high-flex devices in general have higher rates of revision caused by aseptic loosening than other devices) that did not consider the degree of flexion (or "range of motion") actually achieved by study patients. Now that he is attempting to address that specific question (whether patients who achieve higher flexion have higher revision rates), she contends, he is required to conduct a completely new systematic review with a search driven by this new question. Zimmer responds by pointing out that Dr. Vitale's subsequent analysis was a response to Dr. Kocher's criticism of the initial review on this ground—that is, that it did not consider whether patients in the Group 1 studies

actually achieved high flexion. (Def.'s Resp. at 12.) It is thus "only fair" that the court would allow Dr. Vitale to go back and review those Group 1 studies to address Dr. Kocher's criticism. (*Id.*)

The court agrees with Zimmer. Dr. Vitale's subsequent analysis was not aimed at providing a definitive answer to the question of whether patients who achieve higher flexion with the Zimmer high-flex devices have higher revision rates because of aseptic loosening. Rather, Dr. Kocher suggested that the high survival rates Dr. Vitale reported for studies of Zimmer high-flex devices must be discounted because his report did not analyze the flexion achieved by patients in those studies, and Dr. Vitale simply revisited those studies to determine whether Dr. Kocher's attack had merit and updated his data accordingly. The court does not agree with Plaintiff that this "subsequent analysis" was invalid or unreliable.

### C. Relevance of Dr. Vitale's Opinion

The court also concludes that the testimony Dr. Vitale intends to offer is relevant under **Rule 702** because it will "assist the [jury] with its analysis of . . . issues involved in the case." *Smith*, **215 F.3d at 718**. Namely, Dr. Vitale's testimony will provide the jury with an opportunity to gain a picture, or "snapshot," of the existing medical literature related to the question of whether Zimmer's high-flex knee devices are more or less likely to lead to revision caused by aseptic loosening. Even if this picture does not allow the jury to answer what Plaintiff characterizes as the key question in this litigation—whether failure rates of Zimmer's high-flex devices are higher in those patients who actually achieve high flexion—this picture might inform their conclusions about whether Zimmer's design was indeed defective or whether Zimmer's design was a likely cause of Plaintiff's injury.

The picture of the literature that the jury develops may not be identical to the one Dr. Vitale seeks to paint. Dr. Vitale's version of that picture shows that a substantial majority of relevant studies found that Zimmer's high-flex devices do not lead to revisions caused by aseptic loosening. He concluded that the handful of studies suggesting the opposite can be dismissed as outliers. Following cross-examination, however, the jury may conclude that Dr. Vitale dismissed studies like *Han* too easily, that studies showing high survival rates for Zimmer's high-flex devices should be discounted because of short follow-up times or failure to consider patients' degree of achieved flexion, or that Dr. Vitale's conclusions do not follow from his data for some other reason. But the underlying data Dr. Vitale provides, and the debate about his conclusions that will inevitably occur at trial, will surely assist the jury in analyzing



key issues in the case. Dr. Vitale's testimony is therefore relevant under **Rule 702** and *Daubert*.

ENTER:

### CONCLUSION

/s/ Rebecca R. Pallmeyer

The court concludes that Dr. Vitale is qualified as an epidemiologist and clinical researcher to offer testimony in this case. The testimony he intends to offer is relevant, and the methods underlying that testimony appear to be sufficiently reliable. Plaintiff's motion to exclude his testimony [1337] is therefore denied.

United States District Judge

Dated: August 25, 2015

*fn*<sub>1</sub>

For purposes of this opinion, the court assumes familiarity with its detailed description of the facts of this case in earlier opinions. See *In re Zimmer NexGen Knee Implant Products Liab. Litig.*, No. 11-CV-5468, [2015 BL 187603], 2015 WL 3669933 (N.D. Ill. June 12, 2015); *In re Zimmer NexGen Knee Implant Products Liab. Litig.*, No. 11-CV-5468, [2015 BL 193304], 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79462, 2015 WL 3799534 (N.D. Ill. June 17, 2015).

*fn*<sub>2</sub>

Dr. Vitale's report includes a table from the "Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery Guidelines for Level of Evidence," which lists five levels of evidence (with Level I as the highest level and Level V as the lowest) and the categories of studies within different study types that warrant the label of a particular evidence level. (Vitale Rep. at 25.) For therapeutic studies that investigate the results of treatment, for example, studies categorized as randomized control trials would provide Level I evidence, while case-control studies would produce Level III evidence. ( *Id.* )

*fn*<sub>3</sub>

Plaintiff criticizes Dr. Vitale's reliance on help from a research assistant, Columbia medical student Evan Trupia, in the conduct of his review. It is unclear whether Plaintiff is arguing that Dr. Vitale's use of a research assistant warrants exclusion of his testimony because it is based in part on the work and opinions of an unqualified expert or because it simply shows his method to be unreliable. Whatever Plaintiff's theory on this point, the court does not believe that Dr. Vitale's employment of Trupia in his review was improper. "An expert witness is permitted to use assistants in formulating his expert opinion." *Dura Auto. Sys. of Indiana, Inc. v. CTS Corp.*, 285 F.3d 609, 612 (7th Cir. 2002). Dr. Vitale "designed, supervised the performance of, and conducted" the project. (Vitale Rep. at 8.) He stated that use of a research assistant in this fashion is common and that he has sought such assistance for other systematic literature reviews that have been subsequently published. (Vitale Dep. 145:9-17, 147:12-14.) Dr. Vitale closely supervised Mr. Trupia. ( *Id.* at 189:22-190:3.) The court concludes that Dr. Vitale, not Mr. Trupia, is the only expert whose qualifications it must assess here and that Mr. Trupia's assistance does not undermine the reliability of Dr. Vitale's testimony.

*fn*<sub>4</sub>

As Dr. Vitale explained, each of these plots is a way of "graphically representing data." A box plot "give[s] you an estimate of the effect size as well as the confidence intervals around those effect sizes." (Vitale Dep. at 248:6-10.) A forest plot depicts "the relationship between study size and effect size." ( *Id.* at 248:11-16.) A funnel plot "speaks to issues related to effect size, confidence intervals around those and sample size . . ." ( *Id.* at 248:20-24.)

*fn*<sub>5</sub>

Dr. Vitale does not explain precisely why the heterogeneity of studies would affect the decision to present data graphically. He does state, though, that "the question of how much summary statistics, how much pooled analysis, how much aggregate data to present . . . is one that should be driven by the heterogeneity of the study . . ." (Vitale Dep. at 250:17-20.) Dr. Kocher agreed with the statement that "variability among the different patient groups makes a pooled analysis . . . not appropriate from an epidemiologic perspective." (Kocher Dep. at 93:9-13.)

*fn*<sub>6</sub>

Though Dr. Vitale has himself published a paper that presented data in graphical form, he states that such presentation was not his own personal choice and that since the publication of that article, "there's been more of an emphasis on restricting aggregate data presentations, including things like forest plots to studies where there was more homogeneity." (Vitale Dep. at 250:6-251:1.)

## General Information

<b>Judge(s)</b>	Rebecca R. Pallmeyer
<b>Related Docket(s)</b>	2272 (U.S.J.P.M.L.); 1:11-cv-05468 (N.D. Ill.); 1:12-cv-06279 (N.D. Ill.);
<b>Topic(s)</b>	Products Liability; Class Actions
<b>Industries</b>	Health & Medical; Physicians
<b>Date Filed</b>	2015-08-25 00:00:00
<b>Court</b>	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois
<b>Parties</b>	IN RE: ZIMMER NEXGEN KNEE IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION;; KATHY L. BATTY, Plaintiff, v. ZIMMER, INC., ZIMMER HOLDINGS, INC., and ZIMMER ORTHOPAEDIC SURGICAL PRODUCTS, INC., Defendants.