

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION

IN RE: BIOMET M2a MAGNUM) CAUSE NUMBER:
HIP IMPLANT PRODUCTS) 3:12-md-02391-RLM
LIABILITY LITIGATION)
(MDL 2391)) Wednesday
_____) October 7, 2015
)
This Document Relates to All Cases)
_____)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT L. MILLER, JR.

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs: MR. JUSTIN PRESNAL
Fisher, Boyd, Brown & Huguenard
2777 Allen Parkway, 14th Floor
Houston, Texas 77019

MR. NAVAN WARD
Beasley Allen Crow Methvin & Miles
Post Office Box 4160
Montgomery, Alabama 36103-4160

For Biomet: MR. JOHN LaDUE
MS. ERIN LINDER HANIG
LaDue Curran & Kuehn
200 First Bank Building
205 West Jefferson Boulevard
South Bend, Indiana 46601

MR. JOHN WINTER
Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-6710

Joanne M. Hoffman
Federal Certified Realtime Reporter
119 Robert A. Grant Courthouse
204 South Main Street
South Bend, Indiana 46601
(574) 246-8038
Joanne_Hoffman@innd.uscourts.gov

1 THE COURT: You may be seated.

2 Good afternoon. We are gathered for a status
3 conference in our Cause Number 3:12md2391, *In Re: Biomet M2a*
4 *Magnum Implant Products Liability Litigation*, also MDL Docket
5 2391.

6 We are in a different courtroom. If we sound
7 different to people who are on the telephone, we are using the
8 magistrate judge's courtroom because he is using mine for a
9 jury trial. I just passed him in the hallway coming down, he
10 in his robe and I in mine, and we each asked each other to be
11 kind to each other's courtrooms.

12 Let me ask you to state your appearances for the
13 record.

14 MR. PRESNAL: Justin Presnal for the plaintiffs,
15 Judge.

16 MR. WARD: Navan Ward for the plaintiffs, Your Honor.

17 MS. HANIG: Your Honor, Erin Hanig for Biomet.

18 MR. WINTER: John Winter for Biomet. Good afternoon,
19 Your Honor.

20 MR. LaDue: John LaDue for Biomet.

21 THE COURT: Okay. As we ordinarily do, I met with
22 counsel for both sides in chambers.

23 The purpose of those conferences is to let me know,
24 generally, what's coming up so I can have a chance to think for
25 a moment about them before I hear argument, and to let you know

1 if any problems have arisen.

2 Today, also, since about half of the agenda rests on
3 what I'm going to do, I outlined generally for them what I
4 intend to put on the table for discussion today with respect to
5 the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee II's motion for common
6 benefit fees and costs, and the parties' need for a scheduling
7 case management order.

8 Let's start with what I gather will be the briefer of
9 the two, and those are the parties' issues.

10 Who wants to take up topic one on the case count?

11 MR. WINTER: I'll do that, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Why don't I ask you to be seated, because
13 we don't have a lectern, and the microphones will let people
14 hear better on the phone.

15 MR. WINTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 Your Honor, there are, we believe, 13 cases pending in
17 various state courts, actually down one from the last case
18 management conference: seven in Florida, one in California,
19 one in Missouri, and three in Indiana.

20 Right now, with respect to the cases that are
21 currently before this Court, we are in the process of working
22 through with PSC I and Garretson, who was sort of the payor at
23 the end of the escrow, to come up with the firm list of cases
24 that actually have been paid, from Biomet's perspective,
25 because we're running into a little bit of an issue getting

1 dismissals on file, although through no fault of either PSC I
2 or Biomet.

3 So that process is ongoing. We believe there are
4 close to 900 cases that have been settled and paid that we
5 don't have dismissals on file, which is why the case count is
6 still high here. There's about 450 other cases that have just
7 gone through a process of getting paid, so that's going to take
8 another 30 or 60 days before they work through the course. We
9 think at the end of that, right now there's probably about
10 250-some-odd cases, we think, that are pending.

11 There are stragglers that -- you know, we got a
12 release yesterday from someone. We get a phone call, you
13 know --

14 THE COURT: When you say that are "pending," do you
15 mean that you say is actually pending that you haven't paid
16 anything on?

17 MR. WINTER: Correct.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. WINTER: So whether that number is 250, 260, or
20 275, by the next case management conference, I think that's the
21 range, or maybe less, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Okay. Does the plaintiff have anything to
23 add on that?

24 MR. WARD: Your Honor, no, we don't. We only just
25 request that because we are in constant communication with many

1 of the remaining cases and, quite frankly, cases that haven't
2 been settled yet, PSC II would certainly want to be a part of
3 the process of working this out so we'll be able to properly
4 inform the various attorneys that contact us with regard to
5 these issues.

6 THE COURT: Okay. So you're requesting to --

7 MR. WARD: Just to be made part of the process with
8 regard to figuring out which of those 900 or so cases, where it
9 is in its process for settlement.

10 THE COURT: I guess I -- can you give him the list of
11 the 900 cases?

12 MR. WARD: More specifically, Mr. Winter has suggested
13 he's going to reach out to PSC I, and I'm just simply saying
14 reach out to PSC I as well as PSC II.

15 THE COURT: Copy you in on it?

16 MR. WARD: Yes, to be a part of that so we'll be
17 informed and be able to advise anyone who contacts us on those
18 issues.

19 THE COURT: Any problem with that, to the extent you
20 reach out to PSC I?

21 MR. WINTER: No, Your Honor. I mean, we actually have
22 to go back to Garretson and get Garretson to confirm to us,
23 which would be a proprietary thing between Biomet and
24 Garretson, as to who they've paid. Once we have that list,
25 we'll share that list with PSC I and we'll share it with PSC

1 II.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. WINTER: Then if we don't get traction on
4 dismissals within the next couple of weeks, at the next case
5 management conference, we may put some type of order to show
6 cause on the agenda to get this docket cleaned up.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 All right. Amended explant preservation order.

9 It sounds like I have to turn to Biomet on that one
10 first.

11 MR. WINTER: Yes, Your Honor.

12 The parties have gone through a meet-and-confer
13 process. Everyone knows FDA sent Biomet a letter following up
14 on its 5-22 order, which Your Honor was made aware of, and the
15 protocol FDA has required Biomet to follow in terms of
16 evaluating explanted devices.

17 FDA wrote to Biomet saying, in substance: You may
18 have explanted devices that are part of litigation. We want
19 you, Biomet, to affirmatively go out and get those explanted
20 devices and get them evaluated pursuant to the protocol.

21 We worked through with PSC I a process by which if a
22 case was resolved, there was a request, send it to Biomet;
23 they'll pay the Federal Express.

24 We then talked to PSC II about making that part of the
25 amended explant preservation order. We had a consensus on the

1 form of the order in terms of it applying to a case after it
2 was, quote-unquote, resolved here. When we went back and forth
3 on the last bit of verbiage, we, meaning Biomet, felt that FDA
4 was telling us we needed to get them back. So they should come
5 back.

6 I think the back and forth now is that we do have a
7 consensus on the verbiage of a paragraph which will go into an
8 amended explant order, which had to be amended anyway to
9 reflect PSC II's involvement. So, hopefully, we'll have
10 another back and forth, but we'd submit some agreed upon order
11 to you for the amended explant order.

12 THE COURT: Anything to add for the plaintiff?

13 MR. PRESNAL: No, Judge. Mr. Winter has correctly
14 stated the history here, and we appreciate him working with us
15 on which ones he's seeking access to and which ones he
16 recognizes we need to continue to protect and preserve, so I
17 appreciate that.

18 THE COURT: Okay. It's a short agenda for today.

19 The other two items are the discovery schedule and
20 case management order and the PSC II's motion for a common
21 benefit fees and costs order.

22 As I told counsel -- and will tell everybody on the
23 phone now -- this is purely tentative, and it's based only upon
24 having read the submissions that both sides made, and I'm
25 certainly open to objections or suggestions as to how not to do

1 it or how to do it better, but let me run through what I'm
2 proposing.

3 I'll start with the common benefit fund because it
4 kind of affects the second one.

5 The issue that we have here, of course, is that the
6 first Plaintiffs' Steering Committee performed considerable
7 work for the benefit of all the cases in the docket, and they
8 have been compensated for that. And the current steering
9 committee is a few steps down the road, but I gather not too
10 far down the road, simply because of what all has had to be
11 done so far, at doing work that ultimately will provide benefit
12 to all of the remaining cases.

13 And the problem that we all face is: Where do we draw
14 the line between what the first steering committee did and what
15 the second steering committee will do, short of having
16 individual fact-finding on each case that resolves between now
17 and then?

18 And the second Plaintiffs' Steering Committee proposed
19 something of a bright line as to how to resolve that, but it
20 was a bright line that looked backwards. So there would have
21 been, I think, 12 cases that settled since that bright line,
22 but would be subject to a holdback, as the Plaintiffs' Steering
23 Committee saw it, with that bright line. And, again, we need
24 to draw the line somewhere.

25 In Biomet's response and objection, Biomet noted that

1 they are still getting phone calls from attorneys who either
2 did not go -- did not resolve their cases through the
3 settlement provisions of the Master Settlement Agreement or who
4 were not eligible for it; but, regardless of those two, are
5 calling to see if the door is still open to discussions, I
6 guess, in the shadow of the Master Settlement Agreement rather
7 than under the agreement.

8 And since the common benefit fund idea is based on
9 unjust enrichment, it seems to me that anybody who does settle,
10 say, tomorrow without having -- based on the general outline of
11 the original settlement agreement, a holdback would not be
12 equitable under those circumstances. On the other hand, we do
13 need a bright line so that the current steering committee can
14 know when they are working for anybody.

15 Accordingly, what I proposed to counsel would be to
16 pick a date, three or four weeks down the road, by which time
17 if anybody settles with Biomet, they would file a notice of
18 settlement. It doesn't require that any checks be cut or
19 cashed or releases signed or dismissals filed, but simply a
20 notice that the case has been settled on concrete terms.

21 If between that notice and some later date the terms
22 of the agreement are modified somehow, my order would require
23 that the parties tell me that and we can figure out what to do
24 about it. But, basically, there would be three, four, maybe
25 more, maybe less, I don't know -- that's why I'm looking

1 forward to counsels' comments -- weeks within which everybody
2 could make those last calls to Biomet, who's interested in
3 making the last calls to Biomet, and get their notice of
4 settlement on file.

5 Whatever this deadline would be, we would look at the
6 docket the next day; and if there's a case pending that does
7 not have a notice of settlement on the docket sheet, then that
8 case would be subject to the holdback provisions for the second
9 steering committee's common benefit fund.

10 That's the general outline.

11 The issue also arose with respect to the plaintiffs'
12 attorneys in the state cases. And while I don't have the
13 language in front of me -- I think I'd have to go back and look
14 to see what other judges have done -- my proposal to the
15 attorneys was that it should depend on whether the attorney in
16 a particular state case sought the benefit from the steering
17 committee of the steering committee's work. And if that
18 attorney used any part of what the second steering committee
19 has done, then they would be on the hook for the holdback. If,
20 on the other hand, counsel in a state case wishes to go without
21 the work of the steering committee, they would also go without
22 the holdback obligation.

23 After I outlined that for the attorneys, the question
24 arose about pro se litigants, and I have no proposal on that at
25 this point because it is difficult.

1 The second steering committee, as I understand it, has
2 done what I asked, which is try to keep in close touch with the
3 pro se litigants, because it seems to be a growing population.
4 And at some point it would be difficult to figure out exactly
5 what work a pro se who received funds -- whether through
6 settlement or verdict -- what work they benefited from.

7 In any event, I'm interested in hearing your comments.

8 Then I'll go ahead and toss out what I was proposing
9 with respect to the case management order, and I started with
10 the common benefit fund issues because this would basically
11 require the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, the second steering
12 committee, to sort of hold up for a period of weeks, whatever
13 that new bright line would be, but then we'd want a scheduling
14 order in place to begin at that point.

15 The parties, at my request, both sides, submitted
16 proposed case management orders, and each of them are sort of
17 heading into a different direction; so they were kind of like
18 ships passing in the night, but, understandably, because
19 everybody was looking at this a little differently.

20 Biomet's proposal did not include a lot more general
21 discovery, but was looking toward resolution of some -- not
22 fully docket-wide issues, but issues that would affect a good
23 chunk of the docket, and ultimately working their way to
24 bellwether trials, which is what we had originally set up.

25 The Plaintiffs' Steering Committee submitted a

1 proposed scheduling order that would build in time addressing
2 document discovery, which, again, was not identified in
3 Biomet's proposal, but which then would work toward sort of
4 rolling remands, I think is the best way to put it, of the
5 cases that are here, with case specific discovery being done
6 with respect to a certain group of cases, and then those cases
7 remanded, and then we'd start case specific discovery in
8 another group, and then they would be remanded.

9 And I outlined for the attorneys in chambers -- and
10 specifically asked them to don't argue this yet because I want
11 to wait until we get out there. But, first of all, at this
12 point -- and Biomet can certainly convince me to the
13 contrary -- it seems to me that with a docket of this size --
14 understanding we're going to be down plus or minus 250 cases
15 once we work through the things Mr. Winter talked about
16 earlier -- it's a far different situation than the 2,500 cases
17 we were working toward at the time of the original case
18 management order; and understanding the expense involved in
19 bellwether trials, I'm not sure they're worth the candle at
20 this point in the development of the docket.

21 Generally, bellwether trials, although they can be
22 helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of a witness or a
23 theory, generally they serve the purpose of helping the parties
24 figure out a settlement value, what a case might be worth. And
25 I think we've already got that in place here, in the sense that

1 the Master Settlement Agreement resulted in the resolution of
2 about 90 percent of the cases, and, perhaps, that's 90 percent
3 so far, depending on how many people call Biomet within the
4 next X weeks, but I think we've got a pretty good feel for the
5 heartland value of the cases. We have cases remaining where
6 one side or another thought the case was outside the heartland,
7 either above or below, but I don't think we really need
8 bellwether trials to let us know what an anchor is to work
9 from. So I would propose not to order bellwether trials.

10 Turning to the plaintiffs' proposal, I would also
11 propose not to include in our scheduling order case specific
12 discovery, in the sense that I think it would be more
13 effectively done by the filing counsel, or whoever is going to
14 try the case in the transferor court, rather than having 200 --
15 if we work on a 25-case increment, which I think is what was
16 proposed -- rather than having 225 cases waiting for remand
17 while we work up 25 that are going to go back for trial, I
18 think we're better served to just go back for trial with
19 completing discovery there.

20 And I assumed that the case specific discovery was
21 proposed with the understanding that is generally true, that
22 what my job is as a transferee judge is to get the cases either
23 resolved, if they can be resolved here, or remanded in a trial
24 ready condition. And in this docket, I'm not sure that trial
25 ready would really conform with the purpose behind the

1 centralization. It's supposed to be for a just and efficient
2 handling of the case, and I think there are some things from a
3 justice standpoint and an efficiency standpoint that might have
4 to be left to the transferor courts, in the event there are
5 remands, such as matters that turn on a particular state's law
6 or discovery that would be useful in that particular case but
7 not in anybody else's.

8 So I also outlined for counsel that I'm happy to send
9 things back -- if we get to the point of remand, I'm happy to
10 remand with an explanation to the transferor judge: We did all
11 of these things, and these things were left because it would
12 not have been a just and efficient handling of the case for us
13 to do it here as opposed to doing it there.

14 Understanding we need to do as much here as we can,
15 but just that we can't do all of that.

16 So then wrapping all of that up, what I asked is -- or
17 proposed to ask -- and, again, I'm more than happy to be talked
18 out of it -- to ask the attorneys to get their heads together
19 again after this conference with respect to a case schedule. I
20 can't tell from the plaintiffs' submission whether they know
21 they need to do more document and custodian discovery or
22 whether they were trying to preserve it in case their review of
23 the records indicated they need it.

24 And I can't tell from Biomet's submission what sorts
25 of issues there might be that we can resolve here that would be

1 generally applicable or applicable to a large segment of the
2 cases, more than one or two.

3 So what I would be asking counsel to do, as we finish,
4 is to -- first, for Biomet, to put together a list of common
5 issues that Biomet thinks could be handled at this level,
6 rather than better handled at a post-remand level, and the
7 cases that would be involved in those.

8 And, then, to the extent the Plaintiffs' Steering
9 Committee disagrees, they can tell me why they don't think it
10 could be handled here or why more could be handled here,
11 whatever, and ask counsel to sit down and figure out the timing
12 that they would prefer. If they can't agree, obviously I can
13 select times, but I'd prefer to let them take the first crack
14 at it.

15 Is there anything I threw out to you folks in chambers
16 that I haven't covered?

17 Mr. Winters is shaking his head.

18 MR. PRESNAL: I don't see anything in my notes, Judge.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Let me start with the plaintiff and
20 invite you to address my proposal and what it needs or what it
21 shouldn't have, et cetera.

22 MR. WARD: Your Honor, with regard to the common
23 benefit order, we have no objection whatsoever to your
24 recommendation.

25 After the last hearing, we had an opportunity to reach

1 out to those plaintiffs and/or counsel who were in that gray
2 area. We were able to gather more information from them, which
3 helped us to be able to more properly place them in the proper
4 bucket, so to speak, of where their case settled and belonged.
5 More importantly, with the defendant's response to our
6 petition, it gave us actual names as well as other identifying
7 information to allow us to understand what cases would be
8 appropriate or fit into that gray area.

9 In our reaching out to the plaintiffs' counsel, there
10 were certainly some that were willing to be part of the case
11 assessment and then there were certainly some that, based on
12 their facts, we understood that it would not be proper.

13 So with their recommendation, we have no problem
14 whatsoever with picking a three, four-week timeframe for that,
15 quote-unquote, bright line or demarcation date, so to speak,
16 for it to be the official deadline for the cases that would fit
17 in going forward or fit into the current settlement as it is.

18 THE COURT: Let me back up to a point that I forgot
19 when we were in chambers and then forgot again just now.

20 Obviously the people who are most impacted by this are
21 the attorneys who are not on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee
22 and whatever state court attorneys -- plaintiffs' attorneys
23 there are who are not here, and so I guess, before entering
24 anything, they should have a right to be heard, a right to
25 object.

1 The motion that is currently before me doesn't propose
2 what I just proposed, and I guess I wonder if it would be
3 helpful for the plaintiffs for me to deny that, understanding
4 there would be a follow-up motion, where you would make a
5 motion asking for what we just talked about -- again, I'm
6 waiting to hear from the defense, so I'm getting the cart
7 before the horse a little bit -- and then allowing a two-week
8 period or something for the more directly affected people, at
9 least who would be affected by the holdback, to have an
10 opportunity to object.

11 Would that be cleaner, do you think?

12 MR. WARD: Well, you're speaking specifically with
13 regard to the common benefit issue?

14 THE COURT: Yes.

15 MR. WARD: Well, from our communications with the
16 other counsel, I think this is, obviously, from the PSC II
17 standpoint, a compromise that should -- we don't see other
18 plaintiffs or, for that matter, defense counsel objecting to
19 it. It just makes it a non-issue with regards to cases that
20 are still pending. And the four-week timeframe that you've
21 outlined would certainly be more than ample for any remaining
22 issues to be wrapped up in order to give a clearer deadline.

23 And so it's clearly Your Honor's preference as to how
24 he wants to move forward with it. I think the four weeks that
25 you've given and the proposal that you've given, that we have

1 no objection to, should make this issue a moot issue. And I
2 don't see -- and I could be wrong -- but I don't see where
3 someone would object to wanting to be on the side of a holdback
4 situation when they, if they're in that gray area, have the
5 opportunity to finish their case and not be subject to a
6 holdback.

7 MR. PRESNAL: And I think that's particularly true,
8 Judge, in light of the fact that you sort of had a carveout
9 provision for state court cases that aren't directly a part of
10 this MDL. In other words, you've indicated that if they ask
11 for assistance from us, then they'll be subject to a holdback.
12 But if they don't and want to go it alone, then they probably
13 wouldn't be.

14 So I don't know that it's necessary to do it that way,
15 but if you would prefer that we submit a new proposed order
16 that reflects what you've proposed today, we would be happy to
17 do that.

18 THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

19 Do you want to address the case management order
20 proposed -- well, why don't we go ahead and do these one at a
21 time.

22 Mr. Winter, as far as the common benefit fund?

23 MR. WINTER: Your Honor, I think, as provided that
24 every lawyer knows as of today or tomorrow, that come this date
25 certain their case will be subject to a 6 percent assessment,

1 however that's done, should be done.

2 Just on the four-week thing, I start a trial --
3 because ultimately I'm the person that has to do this --

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. WINTER: -- to the extent people call, and I start
6 a trial October 22nd, which is going to go to, like,
7 November 9th or 10th, so if we could just pick that Friday of
8 that week.

9 THE COURT: The Friday before October 22nd?

10 MR. WINTER: No.

11 THE COURT: Oh, the one when you get back?

12 MR. WINTER: Like, I start a trial October 22nd, and
13 it will finish probably November 11th, which is a Wednesday.
14 So whatever that Friday is, which sounds like November 13th, if
15 we'd pick that day, that's fine, Your Honor, because that just
16 gives me a little bit of time, to the extent people --

17 THE COURT: That would be about five weeks and two
18 days, which, under the circumstances, sounds like probably the
19 best we can do.

20 MR. WINTER: And, finally, Your Honor, on the pro se
21 litigants, to the extent someone hires a lawyer -- who is now
22 pro se and hires a lawyer, that's not an issue. Our experience
23 in other MDLs, where there have been significant numbers of pro
24 se litigants -- I mean, I've done them where they end up with a
25 hundred of them -- it is a difficult thing for a pro se

1 litigant to get a communication from the PSC totally, "Here's
2 your cases; thank you very much." I then resolve the case,
3 which generally is going to be on stingy terms, to use a
4 euphemism, Your Honor, and then the person finds out that they
5 have to pay 6 percent.

6 THE COURT: To a lawyer they didn't know they hired.

7 MR. WINTER: Right. I mean, it's one thing for a
8 lawyer to interact with a lawyer and everyone -- you know,
9 caveat emptor applies, but I've seen this happen. So whatever
10 we're going to do, we have to build something in for that, for
11 a true pro se litigant.

12 THE COURT: Okay. I guess what I would propose to do,
13 then, is -- let me ask that you do submit an amended motion, so
14 that everybody knows what they're looking at, and we'll give
15 everybody two weeks, then, to look at it. Maybe nobody is
16 going to object, but if they do, then we'll still have that
17 November 13th date out there that we can keep, because that
18 will be on down the road.

19 I simply, at this point, have no proposal on the pro
20 se litigants. Let me try to look it up, what other judges have
21 done, and --

22 Do you have a suggestion, Mr. Presnal?

23 MR. PRESNAL: I have a comment.

24 We're obviously trying to predict things and
25 eventualities that may come down the road. I don't have a

1 basic disagreement with Mr. Winter that if a pro se litigant
2 that really doesn't benefit directly from any of our work and
3 settles their case, I don't particularly have a problem with
4 that person not paying an assessment. It is possible, however,
5 that there could be someone out there who insists on trying his
6 or her case and wants the depositions that we've taken and goes
7 and puts on a pro se trial. That person probably should be.

8 So it may make sense to sort of kick the can down the
9 road and say that we will handle those on a case-by-case basis,
10 since I think we're probably only going to be dealing with a
11 handful of them anyway. Knowing right now that we would not
12 object to someone that really doesn't benefit from the work not
13 having to pay an assessment.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Let me see if I can come up with
15 some language. It might be the cleanest way, because I think
16 Mr. Presnal is correct, that we probably aren't going to have a
17 lot to deal with, but I guess I would propose -- I'm not ready
18 to propose yet, but let me see if I can come up with language
19 that would require Biomet to notify the Plaintiffs' Steering
20 Committee of any settlement with a pro se plaintiff, and then
21 give the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, say, two weeks to
22 request application of the holdback order because they had the
23 following communication, and attach it, to the extent it can be
24 attached.

25 MR. PRESNAL: And I think our default provision would

1 probably be that they aren't, but there could be extenuating
2 circumstances, so that's all I want to preserve.

3 THE COURT: Okay. If you want to try your hand at the
4 language as part of the modified -- the new motion, the amended
5 motion, that's fine.

6 MR. PRESNAL: Okay.

7 THE COURT: If I think I can improve on it, I will.

8 MR. PRESNAL: Okay. Thank you, Judge.

9 THE COURT: Okay. Proposals on the scheduling order.
10 Plaintiff?

11 MR. PRESNAL: Judge, first of all, I appreciate your
12 comments and your outline of how you see the case. As you know
13 from our submission, we, as PSC II, do see the case in a
14 different posture than it was before the Master Settlement
15 Agreement went into effect.

16 We certainly agree with the idea that the primary
17 purpose of bellwethers is to sort of establish the market value
18 of cases; and as you noted, we've sort of done that here, and
19 we're left with what's left over. So, particularly, when you
20 consider the cost benefit aspect of going forward with the
21 bellwether process, it just isn't warranted under these
22 circumstances.

23 We would prefer, and we proposed in our submission to
24 you, that we, as PSC II, really focus on core discovery and
25 putting together, what we call on our side of the docket, "a

1 trial in a box," a trial package to allow those lawyers across
2 the country that have these cases to move forward and handle
3 their cases. That's what we wanted to focus our resources and
4 effort on, because that's what we see as the primary purpose of
5 this MDL at this point in time.

6 We have no objection to, essentially, delaying case
7 specific discovery to the transferor court. Frankly, we think
8 that makes a lot of sense, especially in light of the fact
9 specific issues that would go there that, frankly, would take
10 up a lot of your time, that would be probably not the best use
11 of that. There will be state law issues that will impact a lot
12 of that.

13 So judges have done it both ways. Some have overseen
14 case specific discovery in the MDL and handed the case ready to
15 go to a transferor court. Others have handled core discovery
16 and left it up to the transferor court. We certainly believe
17 that case specific things like *Daubert* issues and all of those
18 should be handled by the transferor court. That's really an
19 evidentiary admissibility issue.

20 THE COURT: You think *Daubert* should be handled by the
21 transferor court?

22 MR. PRESNAL: I'm sorry?

23 THE COURT: *Daubert* should be handled by the
24 transferor court?

25 MR. PRESNAL: The case specific *Daubert* issues, Judge,

1 and we sort of put those into two categories. We envision
2 having general liability experts that would talk without regard
3 to one particular plaintiff's case, but, in general -- why do
4 we think the product is defective, what the product generally
5 does in the human body -- without reference to a particular
6 client or a particular patient's case. Now, that is something
7 that I think would be appropriate for you to examine under a
8 *Daubert* analysis, but any particular case specific discovery
9 issue --

10 THE COURT: Let me be sure I understand the line
11 you're drawing, and correct me if I'm wrong. It sounds like
12 you're talking about whether this product can cause, say,
13 metallosis in the human body and tends to do so, that would be
14 here. Whether it did so in the body of a particular plaintiff
15 would be back with the transferor court?

16 MR. PRESNAL: That's correct.

17 MR. WARD: That's correct, Your Honor, and just to
18 further clarify, regardless of which way you decide, that is a
19 package that this PSC is providing and would be available, if
20 necessary, whether it's handled here or at a local court. And
21 we have over the last few months and continue to make sure that
22 our local -- or the rest of the attorneys have been up to speed
23 on all the work product that we have been able to assemble to
24 date, and moving forward, and that would be one of those pieces
25 to complete the puzzle, so to speak; that the other attorneys

1 would be equipped with, that we would be able to provide them,
2 whether those issues are handled either here or locally.

3 THE COURT: So you would be providing the -- let me
4 just say "filing attorneys," understanding that all may change
5 as we go along -- but you would be providing the attorneys who
6 filed the cases work product both on the "this product tends to
7 cause metallosis in the human body" and, also, "this product
8 caused metallosis in this plaintiff"?

9 MR. WARD: Well, with regard to the general, the
10 portion -- I was just making clarification to --

11 THE COURT: -- to the first part.

12 MR. WARD: -- the first part, the general information.

13 THE COURT: Okay. I got it.

14 MR. PRESNAL: And just to address a couple of other
15 issues that you raised, Judge.

16 One thing that I want to acknowledge is that you've
17 asked us to meet and confer with Biomet on a proposed timeline
18 now that we understand sort of where you are and how that may
19 affect that.

20 Our proposed -- our submission supposed that we would
21 be doing sort of dual track case specific discovery and core
22 discovery. We may be able to sit down and streamline that
23 somewhat, since we now, under your proposal, would not be
24 having to devote resources to case specific discovery. That
25 may allow us to do that more expeditiously, and we certainly

1 will try to do so.

2 We also will work with Biomet to see and help identify
3 matters which we think can be resolved here in your court that
4 further streamline the docket or make it easier for transferor
5 courts to handle the cases. We probably won't agree on
6 everything, but we certainly will try to do what we can to make
7 that process simpler for you.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 Biomet.

10 MR. WINTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 It is hard to argue with success in terms of setting
12 heartland values for 90 percent of the cases, Judge. So, upon
13 reflection, your point is well-taken about bellwethers.

14 But with respect to what we do in this MDL, several
15 comments. One, we don't think it's fair to Biomet to
16 let whether it's 250 or 200 cases sit here for whether it's a
17 year or 15 months or 18 months, to not let us learn stuff about
18 the underlying facts before they are disbursed around the
19 country. So the notion that we don't do any case specific
20 discovery, I think, violates the just and efficient parts of
21 why MDLs are created.

22 So how we do that, we'll meet and confer, but we don't
23 think it is right to just do a Biomet discovery MDL, then
24 remand cases, you know, in 2017, or whenever, and then say,
25 okay, start doing plaintiff depositions.

1 So that's just as a general perspective on this case
2 specific/non-case specific.

3 As to things that we believe you should handle, there
4 are right now 48 cases -- I checked our submission to you --
5 48 cases where the device was implanted before 2006. And if
6 you look at any complaint that's been filed, the notice -- like
7 notice provision in a complaint in terms of assertion is
8 something in 2006, which is why we picked that point,
9 Your Honor.

10 So we think state of the art and the adequacy of our
11 warnings as of that point in time has general applicability to,
12 right now, 20 percent of the cases, and that's something you
13 clearly could handle.

14 Now, in the context of doing that, Your Honor, that's
15 going to involve some testimony from surgeons in those cases
16 for you to assess state of the art, because learned
17 intermediary is part of this. It's not some abstract concept.

18 So even when we do that issue, there has to be some
19 specific cases worked up to some degree so that you can make an
20 informed judgment on that.

21 I think design defect, again, is one that's going to
22 go across the board for many different reasons, and we think
23 that, too, is something you can look at. Again, we're going to
24 need some case specific discovery. Because, yes, we understand
25 general causation and case specific causation, but general

1 causation in these types of product liability cases actually is
2 never really done in the abstract. It has to be done in the
3 context of a particular case.

4 Spoliation. We can give our colleagues a list of at
5 least 50 cases that are pending here, where, according to the
6 fact sheet, the device is no longer available, and the device
7 was explanted after your first -- I think it was a pretrial
8 order, pretrial order number one, where everyone was on notice
9 to preserve relevant information.

10 So how someone could think their explanted device was
11 not relevant to one of these cases, I think that's clearly an
12 issue in your wheelhouse because it's your order. Now, what
13 the implications of your order might be as to whether it's
14 dismissal for intentional spoliation under a certain state law
15 or it's negligent spoliation, that issue could ultimately be
16 worked out, but you should be able to decide this and come up
17 with a ruling that people would understand when it got to
18 another -- on a remand, what you meant.

19 The other issue is statute of limitations. I think
20 there are 23 cases that we believe are statute of limitation
21 cases, but, as I said, Your Honor, I think two or three of
22 those may be pro se litigants. Now, they may turn out to be
23 non-pro se litigants at some point in time.

24 But those three buckets, Judge, are half the MDL.

25 THE COURT: I've got four buckets: state of the art,

1 design defects, spoliation, statute of limitations.

2 MR. WINTER: Design defect would be like -- it would
3 go to almost everything, so spoliation, statute of --

4 THE COURT: It's a big bucket.

5 MR. WINTER: -- of limitations, those three buckets
6 are 50 percent of the cases, round number.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. WINTER: To go back, when we submitted our
9 proposed order, we assumed that everything would be going in
10 parallel. So we didn't build in, like, extra time for company
11 discovery and more document discovery. We thought we would be
12 just churning along with everything, which is what we would
13 hope to do with the new order.

14 THE COURT: Okay. As I understand it, then -- and I
15 appreciate the identification of the issues that I might have
16 to deal with -- you started with the idea that it's unfair to
17 make cases stay here without Biomet able to do case specific
18 discovery. To what extent would you want to proceed with
19 cases, with all the cases open to it or --

20 MR. WINTER: Well, over 18 months -- I mean, I, quite
21 frankly, need to reflect on this, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. WINTER: Because I think a fair number of the
24 cases should have basic core discovery done; you know,
25 plaintiffs deposed, surgeon deposed, if the sales rep wants to

1 be deposed, if there's another surgeon, a discrete number of
2 people, whether it's four or five per case. We should have the
3 ability to do that. Now, whether it's for all of the cases or
4 half of the cases or a third of the cases, I need to go back
5 and think, Your Honor. But it's got to be, from our
6 perspective, some percentage of that. You know, we laid out in
7 our proposed order what we thought the discovery would be.

8 THE COURT: Right, but that was for bellwether trials.

9 MR. WINTER: Right. It was working up 50 cases to
10 come up with a list of bellwethers. The discovery that we
11 proposed for the bell would be what we would propose as the
12 core case specific discovery.

13 The number, I would have to go back and think it
14 through. I mean, what I would do is back out what we think are
15 the spoliation cases, back out the statute of limitations, see
16 what's left, and then think what would be, in a meet and
17 confer, half, if that's like a reasonable number, or a third,
18 if that's a reasonable number.

19 THE COURT: All right. Understanding that Biomet
20 wants to think about that, do you folks have any -- for the
21 sake of those not here, I'm turning to the Plaintiffs' Steering
22 Committee.

23 Do you have any thoughts you want to share as far as
24 case specific core discovery?

25 MR. WARD: Sure, Your Honor.

1 When the plaintiffs provided their petition, we
2 anticipated that, to the extent this case would continue in the
3 MDL, that there would be some necessary discovery needed. The
4 discovery that we anticipated would be plaintiff discovery with
5 regards to plaintiff depositions, certainly plaintiff fact
6 sheets, interrogatories, requests for production. We did not
7 anticipate it being much more than that, if anything, besides
8 the general -- the general expert issues that you discussed.

9 However, having these cases remanded -- and it's a
10 small amount of cases that are left here. Having these cases
11 remanded would put the defendant in no different of a position
12 than they would have been. And, quite frankly, because of
13 everything that's gone on to date, and the product that would
14 be available for both the plaintiffs and the information that
15 Biomet has learned to date with regard to this case, in
16 general, and how to defend it, there would be no different --
17 and, actually, they're in a better position than it would be
18 but for this MDL.

19 This MDL has provided a very good service to both
20 parties, and at some point in time we'll be talking about case
21 specific here, case specific there, that those are resources
22 that will have to go forward, and it doesn't really matter
23 whether it goes forward here or there. It's what they
24 would have -- both parties would have to do.

25 And by your suggestion and by your recommendation of

1 sending it back, it would allow more people to be involved in
2 that process in order to get it done more effectively, again,
3 with the wealth of information that everyone would have
4 benefited from this MDL up to this point.

5 You are also correct, we agree with you
6 wholeheartedly, that there are a plethora of issues that, quite
7 frankly, it would be unfair for this Court to have to research
8 the 50 state's laws on the various issues for those particular
9 issues, when the local state court, federal courts hear on a
10 daily basis and would be able to more efficiently and easily
11 deal with those types of issues, such as statute of limitations
12 issues.

13 So from our papers and from our perception of the
14 direction that this Court wants to go, it appears that this
15 would be a very fair way of being able to move these cases
16 back; and, depending on how fast you want to remand them, would
17 certainly address some of their issues.

18 THE COURT: First of all, I'm not worried about the
19 unfairness of my having to decide them; I'm worried about my
20 odds of getting all 50 state laws right. The more I have to
21 do, the more likely I'm going to make an error.

22 MR. PRESNAL: If I could add briefly, Judge?

23 Biomet does know a lot about the cases that have been
24 filed, and particularly ones that went through the Master
25 Settlement Agreement process. They've had a chance to evaluate

1 them and in many cases dispute on very specific grounds why a
2 plaintiff claimed they were categorized to receive one amount
3 of compensation, and they objected and proposed something very
4 different. They went through mediations in a number of those
5 cases. So they're not operating in a vacuum. They've got a
6 detailed plaintiff's fact sheet. There's a supplemental fact
7 sheet that they've been provided with. So it's not really
8 accurate to say they really don't know anything about the
9 cases.

10 That said, there may be a middle ground where some
11 case specific discovery can be done, perhaps plaintiff
12 depositions, which require minimal resources. But where you
13 get into a problem is when you start deposing surgeons all over
14 the country. They're expensive. They're hard to schedule.
15 There's a lot at stake. And, frankly, we wouldn't be doing our
16 job as the PSC if we didn't have time to help educate the folks
17 that we're working on behalf of on how to deal with those
18 things. But presenting plaintiffs for depositions and allowing
19 Biomet to evaluate them personally, that's probably something
20 that could be done without being too taxing on the resources
21 here.

22 Then, one other point, Judge, just so you understand
23 the issue before it gets -- before we get the cart too far out
24 of the barn here. On the spoliation issue, most of the calls
25 that I get are from someone who had a revision a month ago, two

1 months ago, and they've since learned that there's a problem
2 with the implant that they had, and they're wanting to hire a
3 lawyer. Now, when that happens, there's not a whole lot I can
4 do. We try. Every time, we try. If we know about it ahead of
5 time, we do everything we can to preserve the device. But one
6 of the most common revision techniques is to use another Biomet
7 product that allows the patient to retain the acetabular cup,
8 and they use a different articulating surface, which actually
9 works pretty well in a lot of people. But if that happens, the
10 one person who definitely is in the room when the surgery
11 occurs and the revision occurs is a representative of Biomet.

12 So before we get too far down the road on spoliation,
13 I just wanted you to understand the parameters of what we're
14 talking about there. And to impose an order that you signed in
15 2012 on a patient laying in an operating room, who doesn't even
16 know they have a claim at that point in time, is a little bit
17 unfair.

18 THE COURT: It may well be that they can't all be
19 resolved, but it is at least an issue that we can discuss, and
20 that's the kind of thing that I would like you folks to discuss
21 in what would be necessary to respond to a motion for Biomet.

22 As I'm listening to you, it makes sense to me that
23 Biomet shouldn't have to wait another 12, 15, 18 months. We've
24 got some people who had implants ten years ago, and memories
25 don't improve during that period of time. On the other hand,

1 if we take five depositions for core discovery and multiply
2 them by \$250, we're going to have people doing a lot of
3 individual casework that could be done more economically, I
4 think, back home or wherever the case came from. So I'm kind
5 of on the fence.

6 Let me ask you, as you folks try to work out this
7 scheduling order, see what discovery you think might be
8 appropriate, case specific discovery. To the extent you can
9 agree on it, fine, and I don't have any huge objection to it.
10 But to the extent you don't agree to it, then I'll have to
11 rule.

12 MR. WINTER: Your Honor, if we have a case that's
13 pending here that comes from West Virginia, the surgeon in
14 West Virginia is going to be deposed in West Virginia,
15 represented by the lawyer who filed that case. The cost of
16 that deposition is no different three months from now as
17 opposed to 18 months from now. And if we are going to
18 remand -- I'm going to make up a number -- 175 cases, that
19 would be chaos, because I'm going to have transferee judges
20 saying, You've got to complete all of your discovery in 120
21 days.

22 So it's not more expensive to do some of this
23 discovery. We're not making people travel here to be deposed.
24 We're not asking people who don't have the case to defend the
25 deposition in their own case.

1 So the notion of it's more efficient to kick the can
2 down the road, I will have a robust meet and confer with my
3 colleagues, but I'm having a hard time --

4 THE COURT: I like the way you put that.

5 MR. WINTER: I'm having a hard time understanding why
6 it doesn't make sense to do some discovery now, or then just
7 say, okay, have a free-for-all.

8 THE COURT: You might be right. Again, I see
9 strengths on both sides.

10 So basically what Biomet would want would be for me to
11 lift the discovery stay, at least to the extent of the core
12 discovery you listed, in at least some of the cases?

13 MR. WINTER: That's correct, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: I think that might be appropriate.

15 If counsel who filed the case are of record in this
16 case, then, I guess, if the steering committee got the video of
17 the deposition, the steering committee members wouldn't have to
18 be there, so they might not even need the video.

19 Anyway, again, see what you folks can agree on, and
20 let me think about it because, again, I do see arguments on
21 both sides.

22 MR. PRESNAL: And we don't have the benefit of all of
23 our group being here to confer with. What I would say is that
24 I think there are some aspects of plaintiffs' specific
25 discovery that could certainly go forward without really

1 requiring too much coordination and effort and all of that.
2 But we think that when you start talking about surgeons,
3 that's -- that, in a lot of cases, is the whole ball game.
4 Candidly, that's why Biomet wants to take them and, candidly,
5 that's why we would rather wait until we've had the benefit of
6 some core discovery before doing those.

7 THE COURT: I'm never pleased hearing one side tell me
8 what the other side really wants, so I'll let -- Biomet can
9 speak for itself.

10 Let's see. For the next conference -- well, I should
11 ask first: Anything else you want to talk about today?

12 MR. WINTER: No, Your Honor.

13 MR. WARD: No, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Okay. I guess, logically, we should be
15 looking at sometime the week of November 16th -- maybe not.
16 The following week is Thanksgiving week, and I don't relish
17 trying to get everybody in here for that, and I want to let all
18 of the dust settle on everything else here, and let me get my
19 order out -- orders out.

20 I'm looking at the week of November 30th. I've got
21 some jury trials set then that at least now might go.

22 How about December 7th? That's a Monday. I have to
23 be gone on judicial business from the 8th through 11th, which
24 is why I'm offering you only the Monday of that week. Would
25 that work for you? I could do it morning or afternoon,

1 depending on what works for you folks.

2 MR. WINTER: Works for Biomet, Your Honor.

3 MR. WARD: Works for plaintiffs, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Any preference between morning or
5 afternoon? I haven't flown in here on a Sunday before.

6 MR. WARD: Afternoon would be best for us.

7 MR. WINTER: That works for us, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Okay. So I'll set it for 1:30 on
9 December 7th, and, again, at 1:00, we'll do our conference, the
10 warn-me-about-what's-coming-up meeting.

11 MR. WARD: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 MR. WINTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Thank you, folks.

14 I will look, then, for the amended motion from the
15 plaintiff and will, by separate order, give everybody two weeks
16 in which to object.

17 How soon do you folks think you can -- well, how soon
18 do you folks think you can do the meet and confer and get in a
19 proposed or, at least, jointly or partly jointly scheduling?

20 MR. WARD: We certainly will work with Biomet's
21 schedule, being that Mr. Winter has an upcoming trial.

22 MR. WINTER: Your Honor, we'll talk. Maybe next week
23 we'll have, like, the first conversation, and then figure out
24 how we would go from there.

25 THE COURT: Okay. I won't put a date on it then. I

1 will just watch for it and act when I get it.

2 Thank you, folks.

3 MR. PRESNAL: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 MR. WARD: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 MR. WINTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 (Proceedings adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)

7


CERTIFICATION

8

9 I, JOANNE M. HOFFMAN, Federal Certified Realtime
10 Reporter, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
11 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

11

12



October 8, 2015

14

Certified Realtime Reporter
United States District Court
Northern District of Indiana
South Bend Division

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25