

G2N9GMC

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
-----X

3 IN RE: GENERAL MOTORS LLC
4 IGNITION SWITCH LITIGATION,

5 14 MD 2543 (JMF)

6 -----X

7 New York, N.Y.
8 February 23, 2016
9 9:36 a.m.

9 Before:

10 HON. JESSE M. FURMAN

11 District Judge

12 APPEARANCES

13 LIEFF CABRASER HEINMANN AND BERNSTEIN LLP
14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
14 BY: ELIZABETH J. CABRASER

15 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
16 BY: STEVE W. BERMAN

17 HILLIARD MUNOZ GONZALES LLP
18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
18 BY: ROBERT HILLIARD

19 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
20 Attorneys for Defendants
20 BY: ALLAN PIXTON
21 KIMBERLY O. BRANSCOME
21 ANDREW B. BLOOMER
22 RICHARD C. GODFREY
22 ROBERT C. BROCK
23 BRIAN D. SIEVE
23 WENDY L. BLOOM

24
25

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 (In open court; case called)

2 THE COURT: Welcome back, everybody. I was beginning
3 to miss you all.

4 We are on Court Call I believe so just a reminder
5 please try and speak into the microphone and to the extent that
6 you gentlemen speak, for example, if you could go to a
7 microphone, that would be great.

8 We will follow the agenda letter and a couple other
9 matters here and there.

10 But let's get started. On the bankruptcy proceedings
11 I appreciate the update. Anything that we need to discuss on
12 that. Obviously, the argument I think is on day two of the
13 bellwether trial, but I will be paying attention. Nothing to
14 discuss there.

15 On the status of the third amended consolidated
16 complaint. I am okay with your proposed schedule for
17 amendment. Anything beyond that that we need to discuss? Very
18 good.

19 Next is coordination and related actions. Two
20 questions there. Number one, any updates or anything that we
21 need to discuss with respect to related cases and then the
22 question I had raised in my endorsement is whether remains
23 necessary to update me on a biweekly basis. I certainly don't
24 mind the updates. I don't think they hurt. But I'm also -- I
25 wouldn't be opposed if you wanted to do it less frequently or

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 only as needed.

2 But Mr. Godfrey or Ms. Cabraser, yes.

3 MS. CABRASER: Your Honor, I believe our federal state
4 liaison counsel, Dawn Barrios, is listening in this morning.
5 She couldn't be here. And just on her behalf, to suggest that
6 the biweekly -- the biweekly reports are very helpful. They're
7 helpful to the plaintiffs in terms of federal/state
8 coordination. There are a dozen existing state cases that are
9 set for trial between May 2 and November. There are new cases
10 that are filed. Frankly, it's of great assistance to us on the
11 plaintiffs' side that GM make its reports because it enables
12 us, through Ms. Barrios, to reach out to the state court
13 judges, provide your Honor with contact information, and keep
14 the federal/state coordination going. And the upcoming trial
15 activity suggests to us that that may be more rather than less
16 necessary as we go on.

17 THE COURT: All right. I think that point is well
18 taken. So I'm persuaded to stay the course. Anything else to
19 discuss there? Any updates beyond what were in the most recent
20 letter?

21 MR. GODFREY: No updates, your Honor. I would say
22 that the -- as the court knows, in the past I've identified
23 cases that might prove nettlesome. Most times they go away,
24 but sometimes the court has had to make some calls.

25 We continue to have some concerns about the Missouri

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 cases but right now there is nothing that is urgent, that needs
2 to happen now, but we'll see in the next month or so. This is
3 motion practice, and there may be some issues we need to bring
4 to the court's attention, but it's premature at this time. But
5 the three Missouri cases are the ones we've talked about
6 before. It's the Shell case, the Alden case, and the Felix
7 case. But nothing immediate right now needs to be done, your
8 Honor, and hopefully nothing will need to be done longer term,
9 but those are the three cases that still cause us is concerns.

10 THE COURT: As you know, not a fan of dealing with
11 issues until they are ripe. I appreciate the heads-up but
12 nothing to do at the moment.

13 Document production and deposition updates. Anything
14 that we need to discuss on those subjects? Very good.

15 Then that brings us to the bellwether trial No. 2
16 briefing status. All contested motions are fully briefed and I
17 am actually prepared to rule at this time on all of the
18 plaintiffs' contested motions; that is, plaintiffs' motions in
19 limine numbers 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7. So let me give you those
20 rulings and then I'll have some additional comments with
21 respect to other matters. Plaintiffs' first motion in limine
22 seeks to exclude evidence and argument relating to
23 Mr. Barthelemy's prior convictions and a July 2014 arrest.
24 Beginning with the latter, plaintiff's motion to exclude
25 evidence of the July 2014 arrest is denied. Plaintiffs are

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 correct that evidence of the arrest is not admissible for
2 purposes of impeachment. But evidence relating to that
3 arrest -- in particular, statements that Barthelemy allegedly
4 made to the arresting officer denying any recent injuries and
5 statements he allegedly made after the arrest to multiple
6 medical providers that his five days sitting in jail, 24 hours
7 a day, caused him back pain (See New GM's first opposition
8 memorandum at page two) is plainly relevant to, indeed highly
9 probative of, the issue of causation. And in my judgment, the
10 probative value of that evidence is not outweighed, let alone
11 substantially, by the danger of unfair prejudice. See, for
12 example, *Picciano v. McLoughlin*, 2010 Westlaw 4366999 at page 2
13 (N.D.N.Y. October 28, 2010) (allowing introduction of the
14 plaintiff's prior arrests because they were relevant to his
15 damages claims); and the *Llerando-Phipps v. City of New York*,
16 390 F.Supp. 2d 372 at 380 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) (denying motion in
17 limine to exclude evidence of the plaintiff's prior drug and
18 alcohol use because it was "central" to his damages claims).

19 Plaintiffs' proposed stipulation that Barthelemy "sat
20 or stood on a hard surface for long periods of time over four
21 to five days and later reported to medical professionals that
22 this may have exacerbated his back pain," that's a quote from
23 page nine of plaintiffs' memorandum, does not suffice,
24 substantially for the reasons stated by New GM at pages four
25 and five of its brief in opposition. That said, I do not see

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 any reason to disclose to the jury that Mr. Barthelemy's arrest
2 was for a DWI; instead, consistent with Barthelemy's own
3 alleged statement to one of the medical providers (see New GM's
4 first opposition, Exhibit 4, and it's a Bates number ending in
5 124), the parties shall say only that he was arrested for
6 "traffic violations." In addition, the Court, that is I, will
7 give a limiting instruction advising the jury that it may
8 consider the arrest only with respect to the issue of
9 causation; that is, causation of Mr. Barthelemy's injuries.
10 And the parties shall confer and propose language for such a
11 limiting instruction no later than one week prior to the
12 beginning of trial.

13 By contrast, plaintiffs' motion is granted with
14 respect to evidence of Barthelemy's prior convictions. In the
15 circumstances of this case, where Barthelemy remains employed
16 by the same employer and claims lost earnings based solely on
17 changes in his job and compensation structure, the evidence of
18 Barthelemy's prior convictions -- which are either very old or
19 relatively minor -- has limited or no relevance. Any probative
20 value from the correlation between incarceration and lower
21 earning potential is slight and would be substantially
22 outweighed by the obvious prejudice of introducing that
23 evidence. Finally, I will not preclude Mr. Barthelemy from
24 seeking damages for his alleged lost earnings. Although he
25 certainly could have done a better job of disclosing that

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 theory of damages, it is not a true lost earning capacity claim
2 that would warrant extensive discovery or expert testimony, as
3 New GM alleges. See pages five to six of its opposition.
4 Instead, the relevant evidence would be evidence of
5 Barthelemy's injuries and employment history, which has surely
6 been pursued through discovery already.

7 Accordingly, plaintiffs' first motion in limine is
8 granted in part and denied in part.

9 Plaintiffs' second motion in limine -- which seeks
10 categorically to exclude any evidence or argument with respect
11 to whether the airbags in their car should have deployed can be
12 swiftly denied. The fact that plaintiffs concede that their
13 airbags should not have deployed in their crash does not make
14 any and all evidence that the crash was not a deployment-level
15 event irrelevant or unfairly prejudicial. Such evidence is
16 clearly probative of the severity and cause of plaintiffs'
17 injuries. And the risks of unfair prejudice actually cuts the
18 other way. That is, allowing New GM to present some evidence
19 on the issue will help ensure that jurors do not speculate
20 (incorrectly, no less) about whether plaintiffs' airbags should
21 have deployed, particularly if plaintiffs are permitted -- as
22 they argue they should be and as I will address in due
23 course -- to present evidence of other incidents in which
24 airbags did not deploy were they should have.

25 To be clear, my ruling should not be construed to give

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 New GM carte blanche to introduce any and all, let alone
2 extensive, evidence concerning the fact that the crash in this
3 case was not a deployment-level event. I can and will rule on
4 specific objections at trial. And given that the point is
5 ultimately undisputed, I do think it would be a waste of time
6 to dwell at any great lengths on the issue so I intend to limit
7 the amount of evidence that New GM may offer. But to the
8 extent that Plaintiffs' motion seeks categorically to exclude
9 evidence that the crash was a non-deployment event, the motion
10 is without merit and denied.

11 Plaintiffs' fourth motion in limine seeks to exclude
12 evidence and argument relating to prior lawsuits filed by
13 Mr. Barthelemy. Plaintiffs wisely appear to concede that
14 evidence of Mr. Barthelemy's prior injuries is relevant to the
15 issue of causation. See their reply memorandum at pages one to
16 three. I agree, however, that the fact that Mr. Barthelemy
17 filed lawsuits or otherwise pursued claims with respect to
18 those injuries has limited or no relevance to the issues in
19 this case and whatever little probative value that evidence has
20 would be substantially outweighed by the prejudice of
21 suggesting that Mr. Barthelemy is overly litigious. See
22 plaintiffs' reply at pages three to four. Accordingly,
23 plaintiffs' fourth motion in limine is granted or granted at
24 least in part. That is, New GM may introduce evidence of
25 Mr. Barthelemy's earlier injuries but not of the fact that he

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 pursued legal claims with respect to those injuries.
2 Plaintiffs' sixth motion in limine asks the court to exclude
3 "evidence and testimony from Officer David Kramer beyond the
4 facts he actually witnessed," as well as the police report that
5 Officer Kramer, or I think Sergeant Kramer, maybe former
6 Sergeant Kramer prepared. That is plaintiffs' sixth
7 memorandum, pages one and five. To the extent that plaintiffs
8 seek to exclude Kramer's testimony and report as a categorical
9 matter, their arguments are unpersuasive. First, although
10 Kramer did not witness the accident itself, he was on the
11 bridge and witnessed other crashes (indeed, he allegedly
12 suffered a crash himself) near the time of the accident in this
13 case. See New GM's opposition memorandum at page two.
14 Notably, plaintiffs themselves admit that "Kramer can testify
15 about what he personally observed at the scene." That
16 certainly should be a relatively uncontroversial proposition.
17 His testimony about the conditions on the bridge are plainly
18 relevant to the conditions at the time of the crash, and
19 plaintiffs provide no reason to think it would be unfairly
20 prejudicial; it is not, in my view, "thinly veiled OSI
21 evidence," because it bears on the facts of the plaintiff's
22 crash and the causation issues themselves. That is a quote
23 from pages four to five of plaintiffs' memorandum.
24 Accordingly, Kramer has a proper basis for his testimony under
25 Rule 701 and his testimony is admissible under Rules 401

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 through 403. I will entertain any specific objections with
2 respect to the portions of Kramer's deposition that are
3 designated by New GM; to the extent that plaintiffs seek to
4 preclude his testimony as a categorical matter, however, the
5 motion is denied.

6 Plaintiffs' motion is also denied with respect to the
7 accident report. Separate and apart from any application of
8 Order No. 52, plaintiffs themselves more or less concede, and
9 wisely so, that such accident reports are generally admissible
10 under either or both Rule 803(6) or 803(8). See plaintiffs'
11 memorandum at page five as well as *Spanierman Gallery, Profit*
12 *Sharing Plan v. Merritt*, 2003 Westlaw 22909160 at page five
13 (S.D.N.Y. December 9, 2003) (collecting cases). Instead,
14 plaintiffs' principal contention is that the report is
15 inadmissible because it was based on inaccurate information and
16 is facially untrustworthy. See their memorandum at pages six
17 to seven. Most of those arguments, however, go to weight, not
18 admissibility. And contrary to plaintiffs' contentions,
19 opinions and conclusions are admissible as part of an
20 investigative report under Rule 803(8), so long as they
21 themselves are based on a factual investigation, as I find they
22 were here. See *Beach Aircraft Corp. v. Rainey*, 488 U.S. 153 at
23 170 (1988). Here, Kramer engaged in a factual investigation by
24 observing the scene of the crash and interviewing witnesses.
25 See New GM's opposition memorandum at pages one through four.

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 As for trustworthiness, plaintiffs offer no evidence that the
2 witnesses Kramer interviewed were interested or biased, nor do
3 they provide any reason why "specialized skill" in accident
4 reconstruction, as opposed to the experience of a veteran
5 police officer, would be required for a police accident report.
6 That is from page seven of plaintiffs' memorandum. As for
7 timeliness, Kramer began his investigation on the night of the
8 crash; the only delay in completing the report was to complete
9 the investigation itself. See New GM's opposition memorandum
10 at page 14, note 7, as well as Baker v. Elcona Homes Corp., 588
11 F.2d 551 at 558 (6th Circuit 1978); and Thibodeaux v. WellMate,
12 2014 Westlaw 1329802 at page 3 (E.D. La. March 31, 2014).
13 Finally, New GM agrees that any inadmissible hearsay within the
14 report can be redacted. See the opposition brief at 15. The
15 parties shall confer with respect to such redactions and raise
16 any disagreements with me with respect to those matters within
17 one week of the beginning of trial.

18 Accordingly, plaintiffs' sixth motion in limine is
19 denied.

20 Finally, plaintiffs' seventh motion in limine, as
21 modified by their memorandum of law, seeks to exclude a
22 recorded conversation between an insurance representative and
23 Ms. Spain. That motion is denied. As plaintiffs concede,
24 Spain's own statements are admissible as statements of a party
25 opponent pursuant to Rule 801(d)(2)(B). That is page two of

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 plaintiffs' reply. The statements of the insurance
2 representative, by contrast, are plainly admissible to provide
3 context for Ms. Spain's statements. As they are not admissible
4 and will not be admitted to prove the truth of the matter
5 asserted, they do not qualify as hearsay or for that matter
6 present improper opinion testimony. See, for example, United
7 States v. Perez, 2005 Westlaw 2709160 at page two (S.D.N.Y.
8 October 20, 2005) (citing cases). The parties' arguments about
9 what Ms. Spain meant when she responded to the insurance
10 representative's comments or questions is ultimately a matter
11 for argument to the jury and for the jury to decide. There is
12 no question, however, that New GM is entitled to introduce her
13 statements against her.

14 That said, plaintiffs are entitled again to a limiting
15 instruction to make clear that the jury may consider the
16 insurance representative's statements only for context and not
17 for the truth of the matter asserted. And, if requested, I
18 suppose that there is no evidence that the insurance
19 representative has any firsthand knowledge about the accident
20 in this case. Again, the parties shall confer and submit
21 proposed limiting instructions on that point no later than one
22 week before the beginning of trial.

23 All right. That resolves plaintiffs' open motions in
24 limine. If I'm not mistaken, that leaves only New GM's motion
25 in limine number 20 and the parties' OSI disputes, which are

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 obviously related, plus the summary judgment motion.

2 Is that correct? Am I missing anything?

3 THE COURT: All right.

4 MR. BLOOMER: That's correct, your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Great. So I will reserve judgment on
6 those issues and will rule on them in due course.

7 I, however, have one thing to say -- or a couple
8 things to say with respect to the issue of OSI. Insofar as it
9 has implications for Mr. Pribanic's case and the upcoming
10 deadlines in that case. I believe, in fact, that one of those
11 deadlines is later this week.

12 What I want to say is that I agree with New GM that
13 the disclosure and the briefing in this case was not quite what
14 I had in mind when I set up the pretrial process to adjudicate
15 any disputes with respect to OSI. That is to say, that I don't
16 think the disclosure in this case was sufficiently specific.
17 And I certainly don't think that the briefing is sufficiently
18 specific. In my view, both the disclosure and certainly the
19 briefing should specifically identify the specific incidents
20 that plaintiff proposes to introduce and the actual evidence
21 that the plaintiff proposes to offer in connection with each of
22 them; that is to say, which witness will be testifying and/or
23 what exhibits will be offered and then, in the briefing, should
24 discuss in detail the purposes for which each incident is
25 offered and citing applicable law why the incident is

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 admissible for that purpose. I'll have more to say on that in
2 connection with the Barthelemy trial in my forthcoming opinion
3 and the implications, if any, for that trial. But I did want
4 to make that clear for purposes of a third bellwether case
5 because those deadlines are rapidly approaching. Any
6 questions? Anything to discuss on that?

7 I also did have one question. I had understood from
8 the show cause briefing, if I can call it that, that New GM
9 intended to revisit or address the admissibility, or the
10 redaction of the Valukas report and the statement of facts in
11 one or more of their motions in limine. Motion in limine 20 in
12 the OSI preview obviously touched on that and I presume any
13 ruling that I made may have bearing on that, but I don't think
14 I received any motion in limine that was more specifically
15 targeted. Is that correct?

16 Mr. Godfrey.

17 MR. GODFREY: Yes. That's correct, your Honor. The
18 summary judgment motion and the two motions the court just
19 identified, depending upon how the court rules, could have
20 impact on the statement of facts in the Valukas report but
21 until the court rules we can't address that.

22 THE COURT: Refresh my recollection. I didn't
23 establish any process yet to adjudicate disputes in the wake of
24 those rulings, did I?

25 MR. GODFREY: No. And I was going to raise it at the

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 end, but I didn't know whether your Honor was going to rule on
2 it or not today, or what the schedule was. But I was going to
3 ask that question at the end.

4 So, for example, take OSI. As the court knows,
5 there's extensive OSI in both the Valukas excerpts and in the
6 statement of facts. Depending on how the court rules on OSI,
7 that will bear on that. But we don't have a process. I was
8 going to ask the court a question at the end as to if you were
9 going to grant those motions over and apart and if -- once the
10 court rules on the OSI motion, for example, and if we concluded
11 it had an impact on Valukas report excerpts or the statement of
12 facts, I was going to ask the question at the end how does the
13 court want us to proceed? A letter brief? A motion? That was
14 one of my questions to ask about trial procedures, if you will.
15 We're not at that stage yet, but the court will rule on that,
16 and at that point we'll have to make an assessment.

17 THE COURT: Well, suffice it to say I hope to get you
18 opinions on the remaining issues shortly. And in that regard
19 I'm mindful of the approaching trial date and the need to deal
20 with these sorts of things.

21 I haven't given the issue enough thought is the short
22 answer. I guess what I would say is certainly as a first step
23 I think the parties should meet and confer with respect to the
24 implications of any ruling and, in that regard, only raise to
25 me issues that are in dispute. If you can resolve the

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 implications of the rulings yourselves, as you know, that's
2 certainly the preferred method.

3 I guess what I will do is say the following. I think
4 you should discuss it now with the expectation that you'll have
5 rulings on these issues, if not this week then hopefully early
6 next week, and really hopefully this week. And if you have any
7 suggestions with respect to a process or procedure to follow in
8 applying it to those documents and other issues, you can submit
9 a joint letter telling me. If I don't receive it, or actually
10 either way, I will provide some guidance in whatever my rulings
11 are in my rulings with respect to how you should proceed. But
12 if you want any input into what the process is, then you can
13 submit a letter to me in the next day or two and I'll take it
14 under advisement.

15 MR. GODFREY: Thank you, your Honor. We will have a
16 conversation with Mr. Jackson and Mr. Hilliard on that. My
17 suggestion was going to be within six days, but we'll talk
18 about it with counsel and see if we have a joint agreement.

19 THE COURT: Anything else to discuss? Mr. Hilliard?
20 Mr. Jackson?

21 MR. JACKSON: No, your Honor. May I ask a question.
22 Earlier your Honor made a reference.

23 THE COURT: Make your way to a microphone, please.

24 MR. JACKSON: Sorry. Earlier your Honor made
25 reference to the part of the agenda that addressed depositions.

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 My understanding is that you were referring to the larger
2 question of depositions for the MDL.

3 To the extent that there are deposition issues that we
4 wanted to raise to the court specific to bellwether trial two,
5 I would -- we just wondered whether there was an appropriate
6 time to raise that with the court.

7 THE COURT: I wasn't aware that there were any issues
8 to discuss but we can either do that now or I suppose under the
9 trial witnesses category that's coming up, but since you're
10 standing why don't you do it now and I'll adjust accordingly.

11 MR. JACKSON: Thank you, your Honor. Essentially I
12 think that we were just hoping for some guidance from the court
13 with regard to how the court understood the process for
14 depositions going forward in terms of what the process should
15 be, if any. It's our understanding that discovery has closed
16 in this case. And we're -- we've been discussing with counsel
17 for GM the fact that they have -- we're attempting to reach a
18 stipulation on a number of different exhibits. And we're
19 hopeful that we will reach a stipulation. It's certainly my
20 goal to avoid having to bring in a bunch of custodians of
21 records, etc. But there have been numerous depositions over
22 the last couple of days. We recently received notice of, for
23 what New GM has called foundational depositions, people that
24 they need in order to introduce certain pieces of evidence.
25 It's like -- it's a lot of people. And, frankly, it's going to

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 be daunting if we're required to engage in all of those
2 depositions. We have asked the question and we haven't
3 received an answer yet, on a couple of occasions: What is the
4 basis for conducting a deposition at this stage of the
5 litigation? And what is the -- what is their belief in terms
6 of what justifies that process right now. So we're just hoping
7 for some guidance from the court.

8 THE COURT: Well it sounds like it might not be ripe
9 for guidance from me because you guys are in the midst of
10 discussing it.

11 Mr. Bloomer.

12 MR. BLOOMER: Yes, your Honor. I think there is an
13 issue, as Mr. Jackson says, it's potentially brewing. We take
14 very seriously the court's guidance that the parties should try
15 to reach agreement on issues of foundation for documents. And
16 on February 7, so two weeks ago, we sent the plaintiffs a
17 proposed stipulation relating to 40 case-specific documents.
18 So these are documents specific to this case; medical records,
19 employment records, accident records, things of that nature.

20 And we have not been able to get agreement on those
21 documents, which we thought should be a fairly routine thing.
22 And we're mindful of what the court said in the January status
23 conference about the need for a sponsoring witness. So we're
24 trying to make sure we have all of our bases covered. But
25 we've for whatever reason --

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 THE COURT: Sponsoring witness or stipulation. So I
2 would hope that the parties could cooperate in doing the latter
3 with respect to a lot of the custodial and foundation issues.

4 MR. BLOOMER: That was our goal, your Honor, was to
5 say can we get stipulations so that we do not need sponsoring
6 witnesses for case-specific documents.

7 The plaintiffs have -- we've discussed it, but the
8 plaintiffs have objections to that. And so we are in a
9 position where we have no choice, with the sand running through
10 the hourglass, but to notice depositions and take foundational
11 depositions, if we have to, to be able to get this stuff into
12 evidence. Frankly, I haven't encountered this in an awfully
13 long time, if ever, in terms of reaching agreement on the stuff
14 that in these types of cases the parties regularly will get
15 agreement on. So we're hoping to do that. But, we've had 40
16 case-specific documents and stipulations that have been sitting
17 there since February 7. And we're, understandably, concerned
18 about whether this is actually going to happen.

19 So I think we're in a position where we have to
20 proceed with these depositions unless something happens really
21 quickly. And if there are going to be remaining objections on
22 401, 403 grounds, things like that, that we just need to get
23 them teed up so that the court is not facing this in the middle
24 of trial. That is certainly -- that is certainly our goal to
25 be able to do that. It's just that it hasn't happened yet

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 because the plaintiffs have objected and, frankly, we don't
2 understand the nature of some of these objections. We've had
3 some foundational depositions already where witnesses are being
4 examined by the other side as to whether a printout of a
5 medical record was actually accurate. You know, the witness
6 has said I see these printouts all the time, I rely on them.
7 So that's what we're dealing with. And we're trying to find a
8 way past it to just get agreement on this kind of stuff. It
9 just hasn't happened yet, which has put us in the position we
10 are, which is why I think Mr. Randall is raising the question
11 he's raising.

12 MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, just to clarify --

13 THE COURT: It's Mr. Jackson, to clarify.

14 MR. BLOOMER: I'm sorry. Mr. Jackson. Mr. Randall
15 Jackson.

16 MR. JACKSON: Just to clarify. We haven't been
17 sitting on those documents. What we have told counsel for New
18 GM is that we don't intend to contest authenticity for any of
19 the documents that are at issue. And we anticipate not
20 requiring sponsoring witnesses for the bulk of the documents
21 that are reliable. We've raised a number of specific issues
22 with regard to aspects of the documents that we think are
23 inadmissible, and we've attempted to get clarity as to what
24 precisely the exhibits are that are coming in. All of that is
25 sort of something, as your Honor said, that the parties need to

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 discuss more.

2 What is ripe, your Honor, for the court to I think
3 provide guidance on, and the reason that we're asking this now,
4 is your Honor entertained our letter last time about a specific
5 deposition that was noticed, we didn't think was appropriate.
6 We thought we had engaged in a fair amount of meet and confer
7 about it. New GM indicated in the letter to the court that
8 they didn't think we've met and conferred. But we were put in
9 the position of to either not attend the deposition and
10 potentially waive our rights or to attend the deposition and
11 then subsequently notify the court of what our concerns were
12 with regard to the process that had led to it. And right now
13 we're in a situation where there are numerous depositions
14 noticed that we don't think there is a basis, and that there is
15 no basis in the discovery plan that we set out or any of the
16 other orders, for them to notice a series of depositions over
17 the next two weeks. So we're just asking that if the court
18 could give us some guidance on that.

19 THE COURT: All right. I'm a little bit puzzled and
20 maybe frustrated too because I don't understand where the
21 daylight is. You say you need these depositions because they
22 haven't agreed to a stipulation with respect to authenticity
23 and foundation and Mr. Jackson is telling me that they're not
24 going to contest that. So why can't you reach a stipulation,
25 resolve this issue, and do away with the need for any

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 depositions and put aside the question of whether they're
2 proper at this point.

3 MR. BLOOMER: I think we should be able to, your
4 Honor. But, for instance, we still are getting business record
5 objections to things like medical records and other things. So
6 we're getting arguments like well some of it -- that the
7 record, which is pursuant to the process the parties agreed to
8 with MRC to authenticate medical records. I think the
9 plaintiffs are willing to say, or what they've told us is:
10 Well, we'll agree to some of that as a business record but not
11 other portions of it. And that we don't think makes any sense,
12 given the process the parties engaged in.

13 We think it should all be able to come in without a
14 sponsoring witness and not to have to do trench warfare on
15 specific objections that relate to whether it's a business
16 record, whether it's foundation.

17 And so I stand here in front of your Honor saying,
18 yes, this should be relatively easy. But I can tell you for
19 whatever reason we haven't been able to get that stipulation,
20 which we think should happen. And so that's put us in the
21 position we're in.

22 If Mr. Jackson is standing here saying there will not
23 be an objection to things that are business records and that
24 they do not need to go in with any sponsoring -- that they're
25 in and they do not need a sponsoring witness and that, for

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 instance, with a medical record we can examine Ms. Spain or
2 Mr. Barthelemy with that medical record without an objection,
3 then I think we should be able to get this done pretty quickly,
4 but that has not been their position to date.

5 THE COURT: Mr. Jackson, I mean I should -- again, I
6 don't really understand what the dispute is here. To the
7 extent that there are issues beyond authenticity that you're
8 not willing to concede, I would think that a stipulation could
9 preserve your ability to object on other grounds. But if these
10 custodians are being called and deposed for purposes of just
11 identifying something as a business record, that does seem like
12 a pointless exercise for both sides and a waste of time and the
13 precious time that you have between now and the beginning of
14 trial. So, I guess I'm just voicing my frustration as to why
15 you guys can't get this resolved and deal with it.

16 MR. JACKSON: And, your Honor, we completely agree.
17 We don't have any desire to waste any time on this. I think we
18 have been the party that has been forthright in saying we want
19 to stipulate as to authenticity and as to business records.

20 THE COURT: But you've have a proposed stipulation
21 since February 7. It's now February 23, so.

22 MR. JACKSON: Because we've asked a couple of very
23 specific questions, your Honor, about what the scope of these
24 records are. There are two very sensitive issues with regard
25 to these records that I don't want to speak about here that

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 relate to certain medical issues that we've asked the question
2 to GM. We only recently got the beginnings of an answer to
3 that question as to what exactly is the scope of what they're
4 trying to put in.

5 Besides, that there's just one other thing, your
6 Honor. We've also asked them: Is there going to be some agree
7 of reciprocity here? Are they willing to say in good faith
8 that they are willing -- that they are going to be willing to
9 similarly stipulate to the authenticity and the lack of getting
10 a sponsoring witness for the uncontested exhibits that we
11 intend to put in. We haven't gotten an answer to that
12 question.

13 Those are all questions that I think the parties can
14 work out. I agree with the court. There's not that much
15 daylight but, regardless, they have noticed a long series of
16 depositions, as we're tending to work these issues out, and we
17 don't think that it's fair for us to, as we're trying to get
18 answers to basic questions we're trying to get answers to,
19 especially when we have stated in good faith that it's our
20 intention to stipulate and they haven't responded to that. We
21 don't think that it's fair that we're going to be required to
22 attend depositions throughout the country over the next two
23 weeks when discovery is closed and there is no basis for the
24 depositions.

25 THE COURT: I'll tell you what. I want you guys to

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 meet about this today, see if you can work out a stipulation
2 and resolve or at least limit the number of issues that are in
3 dispute; and if you can't, I want letters from you tomorrow
4 with specifics about what is at issue, what depositions are
5 needed or not needed and we'll deal with it.

6 As a general matter, I'm in agreement with Mr. Jackson
7 that I don't quite understand why depositions should be going
8 on at this juncture in the case. Quite frankly, with respect
9 to the first bellwether trial, I was surprised to learn in the
10 middle of the trial that there were depositions going on in the
11 middle of trial, but both sides seemed to be okay with that so
12 I didn't say anything about it. I think it would be a little
13 bit -- given that I didn't say anything about it and given that
14 both sides were in agreement in the last trial, I think it
15 might be a little bit unfair for me to rule categorically at
16 this point that they're not going to be permitted. But as a
17 general proposition I think that discovery ended and this isn't
18 what we should be devoting the time to. But I also think that
19 we shouldn't need to be devoting this time and you should be
20 able to work this out.

21 So I want you to meet today. If you can't resolve it,
22 you can address in letters tomorrow with specificity what the
23 issues are, what the specific records or exhibits are that are
24 at issue and I will tell you how we're going to proceed. All
25 right.

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 MR. JACKSON: Thank you, your Honor.

2 MR. BLOOMER: Your Honor, thank you.

3 MR. GODFREY: Your Honor, I want to make one point
4 because I think the court needs to be aware of the fact. The
5 parties had agreed at the start of the bellwether process to an
6 MRC process to avoid all this. The problem here is the
7 plaintiffs no longer feel bound by the MRC process which is why
8 we're in this position.

9 THE COURT: What is MRC?

10 MR. GODFREY: It was authentication -- it was a
11 certificate from the provider of records saying they are
12 business records, etc. Now they don't want to follow that. If
13 they take deposition, then the consequences are -- that's why
14 we had the deposition in the last trial.

15 This should be solvable. We shouldn't be in this
16 position. But we should have had an answer before now. And
17 when Mr. Jackson says well there's an issue here and an issue
18 there. No, it's not. There's been a flatout refusal to agree
19 with this. And I'm glad to hear this morning that he has a
20 different position. I hope that we get this resolved. If not,
21 we will be back because we are out of time. We are running out
22 of time.

23 THE COURT: Good. You are both running out of time
24 and I would think that you can both get this done and resolve
25 what needs to be done without the need for much, if any,

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 intervention from me. So I trust you will make your efforts to
2 do that.

3 Next is trial exhibits and demonstratives. I did
4 receive the proposed order from counsel yesterday. I generally
5 think that an order of that sort is a good idea and in general
6 I'm okay with it but I have two comments. The first is I would
7 think that if we could revise it so that it is not -- so that
8 it would apply to future bellwether trials, it would make sense
9 to do that, which is to say that to the extent that we can peg
10 the deadlines just X number of days in advance of trial rather
11 than specific dates, I think it would be helpful for purposes
12 of the MDL going forward. And I'll have more to say on the
13 bellwether process in short order.

14 The second, and maybe this is more significant for
15 immediate purposes, is under the process that you have outlined
16 disputes would not be presented to me for my resolution until
17 8 a.m. on the day that they are relevant. And that, quite
18 frankly, just doesn't give me enough time to resolve disputes.
19 And it's one thing if these are disputes that I can simply say
20 yes or no and doesn't require any much thought, let alone
21 research. But in my experience that hasn't necessarily been
22 the case here. And given that, I don't know how you expect me
23 to get to the courthouse or when you expect me to get to the
24 courthouse. But presenting these things to me at 8 and
25 expecting me to be able to rule on them by 9 is just not

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 realistic.

2 So, I'm inclined to say that I need them by the prior
3 evening at the latest. I would say by 7 or perhaps 8 at the
4 latest. Let's say 7. And I think that presumably means that,
5 working backwards from that, the other deadlines need to be
6 adjusted by twelve hours or so.

7 So, why don't you guys talk about it with those two
8 things in mind and submit a proposed revised order that
9 addresses those two issues. But bottomline is you need to give
10 me enough time to think about these things and to give you
11 rulings and if you don't it's going to have some serious
12 implications for an orderly trial.

13 Any questions? Any issues on that?

14 MR. GODFREY: I hate to ask, but is 7 o'clock enough
15 time for the court? We could try to do it by 6 or 5. I
16 want -- I appreciate the Court's comment. I know how hard the
17 Court worked in the first trial and I saw sometimes that
18 problems were caused by the 8 a.m. filings. So taking that
19 into -- the court's comments into account, if 7 o'clock is
20 workable, then that would be great for us, but if you need an
21 hour or two earlier, we'll try to do that as well. We'll
22 discuss it with the plaintiffs. I just want to be fair to the
23 court.

24 THE COURT: I mean the more time the better. Let me
25 put it that way. If you're prepared to and can get it to me by

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 5 p.m. that would be fantastic.

2 MR. GODFREY: I think we'll try to do that then, your
3 Honor.

4 THE COURT: Very good.

5 One other note that I think I may have mentioned it in
6 connection with the first trial, but if not I'll say it now. I
7 do, if it's not too late, I think you should strive to have a
8 slightly simpler system for numbering exhibits in trial No. 2.
9 I found it extremely confusing that there was exhibit 124.6235.
10 And I'm quite confident in saying that the jury would have
11 found it difficult if they had been asked to deliberate. I
12 think, if I'm not mistaken, that the point and the number
13 following the point usually referred to a page number. I think
14 it would be easier just to say exhibit X page number Y and
15 leave it at that. But in any event if you could strive to have
16 a simpler system for referring to exhibits, that would be
17 helpful.

18 Trial confidentiality. I am fine with adopting the
19 same protocol that was used in the first trial. In fact,
20 unless and until I order otherwise I think that that protocol
21 should apply to any further trials in the MDL. Anything else
22 to discuss on that?

23 Trial witnesses. Anything to discuss beyond what we
24 just discussed?

25 MR. GODFREY: Yes, your Honor. And I think we will

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 have a meet and confer about this. I spoke with Mr. Hilliard
2 this morning. If we can't resolve it, I think we'll have
3 letter briefing, at least I request it. So this goes back to
4 Mr. Gruskin who the court has considered before.

5 THE COURT: I noticed he was on the list of witnesses
6 on the JPTO.

7 MR. GODFREY: Yes. It's a may call. And then last
8 night we received their designations of deposition. And I
9 looked at those this morning. There's 24 witnesses listed by
10 deposition. For 23 of them, not Mr. Gruskin, the average
11 length of the deposition designations is a page of material in
12 terms of the line items, etc. that it takes a page. For
13 Mr. Gruskin they've listed 16 pages, basically more than 20 of
14 the other witnesses combined.

15 I hesitate to suggest that one might see gamesmanship
16 here because, after all, he is listed as a may call. After
17 all, his involvement was very limited. His involvement, if any
18 involvement, will depend in part on the court's OSI ruling.
19 Where, as we've said before, Mr. Gruskin is the person who is
20 managing the litigation and he's central to efforts to
21 alternatively resolve this short of trial. And for reasons
22 that escape our understanding, particularly given that all
23 their lawyers who are listed on their deposition designations
24 are Ms. Palmer for half a page of designations, Mr. Millikin
25 for half a page of designations, people far more centrally

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 involved, at least as we've understood the plaintiffs' case
2 until now. We think that the deposition designations, the
3 listing of it, is not in good faith, to be perfectly candid.
4 We're not sure why they were raising these issue. We will have
5 this discussion. I raised it with Mr. Hilliard. Perhaps they
6 can explain it to us. But we're going to ask that the court --
7 we may wait to see the OSI ruling, we're going to ask that we
8 get to the bottom of this because we can't keep going through
9 this each time about listing Mr. Gruskin simply to try to --
10 I'm not sure what purpose is served by this.

11 Mr. DeGiorgio is listed for a page and a quarter.
12 Mr. Gruskin somehow is 16 pages. There's just, objectively
13 looking at it, it just -- it's gamesmanship going on here. We
14 don't see any other basis for them listing him. There's just
15 nothing that he adds to the case.

16 So if we can't work this out we'll be filing a motion
17 to allow Mr. Gruskin to appear at the trial without being at
18 the risk of being subpoenaed, and we will test the validity of
19 the designations.

20 But we'll try to work this out. I raised this with
21 Mr. Hilliard but I've not had a chance to talk about it,
22 Mr. Jackson, just came in last night, and it is -- the facts
23 speak for themselves.

24 THE COURT: I'm not inclined to get into it now.
25 There is a process in place to resolve deposition designation

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 disputes and a deadline to raise them with me and I think you
2 should adhere to that. My hope is that you can work this out
3 or at least minimize the issues that I need to resolve. But
4 I'll leave it to you to discuss. All right.

5 Very good. Anything else on the trial witness front?

6 That brings us to deposition designations. And the
7 deadline for counterdesignations I think is next Monday, if I'm
8 not mistaken. And consistent with what I just said the
9 deadline for raising disputes with me is March 4. I do want to
10 just underscore and repeat again that my intention in setting
11 that deadline is to have all disputes presented to me on these
12 issues before trial. That is to say, the last trial I sort of
13 entertained these issues in real time throughout the trial and
14 I think that is not an ideal approach. And I will be less
15 forgiving of failure to comply with the deadline in this trial.
16 So everybody should hear me loud and clear with that and to the
17 extent that there are disputes, present them to me by March 4
18 but not before you try to work them out in good faith with one
19 another and minimize the issues that are in dispute.

20 I should also say, this probably goes without saying,
21 but my rulings on the disputes in the Scheuer trial
22 presumptively apply here. I recognize there may be
23 distinctions particularly depending on my rulings with respect
24 to the open motions, but unless there is some difference in
25 either the law or the facts that would warrant differential

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 treatment of the depositions, you should assume that my rulings
2 remain the same and, put it another way, this is not an
3 opportunity to seek reconsideration or reargument of things
4 that I decided in the last trial. Anything else to discuss on
5 the deposition designation front?

6 That brings us to the bellwether trial procedure. The
7 threshold question that I posed in my endorsement -- yes,
8 Mr. Jackson. Get to a microphone though. Maybe you and
9 Mr. Pribanic can switch seats.

10 MR. JACKSON: I'm sorry, your Honor. Just on the
11 deposition designation front. Just wanted to raise a question
12 with your Honor as to whether or not the court would be willing
13 to entertain -- this ties in with what your Honor previously
14 mentioned -- whether your Honor would be willing to entertain a
15 motion to the extent that the parties are unable to reach an
16 agreement and we've attempted to but I don't think that we
17 have -- we've been able to so far.

18 With regard to how the depositions are going to be
19 played. It's my understanding previously the court ruled that
20 the court wanted all of the depositions played for any
21 particular witness at one time. And we understand that ruling.
22 That makes sense to us. We were curious as to whether or not
23 the court would consider a modification that involved
24 splitting, at least with regard to when those depositions were
25 played, splitting the portion that is played by the plaintiff

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 and then designating the portion that is played by the defense
2 after that; playing them at the same time in the case but
3 making a distinction at the trial between the two portions.

4 THE COURT: I'm skeptical, but how do you propose to
5 make that distinction?

6 MR. JACKSON: I think there are a number of ways we
7 can do it mechanically, your Honor. But I think that the basic
8 thing that we would do is just say we're playing the
9 plaintiffs' designated portion of the deposition and then
10 saying we're playing the defense portion of the designated
11 portion of the deposition. There are a few reasons for that,
12 your Honor. One of them is --

13 THE COURT: It makes no sense in the sense that
14 often -- and this was certainly the case in the first trial --
15 plaintiff may designate these lines on one page and then lines
16 on the next page and then a defendant designates a handful of
17 lines between those two and it would make -- defeat the point
18 and undermine the reasoning behind my ruling, which I think I
19 made clear in the first trial, that the jury needs to
20 understand the context for those designations. So to take it
21 out of context and force New GM to play those two lines after
22 the fact when the jury won't know where it falls within the
23 deposition just doesn't make sense.

24 I'm open, if you think that there is some other way of
25 doing this. For example on the video or on a transcript to

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 accompany the video, having a label on it that says "plaintiff"
2 or "GM" or something like that so that the jury is mindful of
3 who designated.

4 I also don't think it ultimately matters. I mean the
5 jury is going to be told that they need to consider all of the
6 evidence in reaching a verdict. And at the end of the day, all
7 things aside, I don't think it's going to matter for the jury
8 whether something was designated by the plaintiffs or
9 designated by New GM.

10 So I don't really think it matters. If you can think
11 of an idea that allows for it to be played in an uncut way that
12 allows you to specify for the jury, I'll consider it. But
13 unless you can come up with an idea like that the answer is no.

14 MR. JACKSON: We appreciate that, your Honor. So
15 we'll discuss that possibility. What your Honor raised was one
16 of the possibilities we were evaluating. We'll discuss that
17 with counsel for New GM and potentially raise that.

18 The other thing, in the event we can't come up with a
19 mechanical solution that works, that we discussed raising with
20 the court is whether or not the court would be willing to give
21 some sort of an instruction that just makes it clear to the
22 jury that these are portions that have been designated by both
23 parties.

24 THE COURT: I did that in the last trial and I will do
25 that again and I will tell them that there is a process for

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 both sides to identify portions that are to be played at trial
2 and for me to resolve any disputes and that this is the product
3 of that. If you have any new language that you would propose
4 for me to use for that I'm certainly open to it. But I did
5 that the first trial and I'm prepared to do it again.

6 MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

7 THE COURT: Anything else on that issue?

8 MR. BLOOMER: No, your Honor. We agree it should be
9 just played sequentially in the manner that testimony is given.

10 THE COURT: Very good.

11 Bellwether trial procedure. The threshold question is
12 whether there's any reason we can't discuss it now. I know the
13 requests, as I indicated, had been for a telephone conference.
14 I don't know if there were reasons for that.

15 MR. BERMAN: Yes, your Honor. That was an error. I
16 apologize.

17 THE COURT: Microphone, please.

18 MR. BERMAN: It was an early draft of our letter where
19 we requested a telephone conference because we thought we were
20 going to get it teed up earlier. We then met with GM. They
21 agreed that we would file our brief; that we would mention the
22 briefing schedule on the status conference. And I apologize.
23 I looked at that letter so many times I didn't realize it still
24 requested a telephone conference.

25 THE COURT: No worries. But -- no worries.

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 I am prepared to address it now and let me give you my
2 thoughts on that having reviewed both sides' letters. The
3 short answer is that I'm unpersuaded by the lead counsel that
4 we should abandon the bellwether system at this point for many
5 of the reasons discussed by New GM in its letter in opposition.
6 That is not to say that the bellwether system is perfect. Far
7 from it. As I've said before, I think it's an expensive way of
8 yielding data for settlement purposes and arguably too small a
9 dataset to yield statistically significant data at that,
10 although as I made clear in the order denying Mr. Cooper's
11 motions, I think it's a mistake to focus only on the bellwether
12 trials in the MDL. The dataset is broader than that. It
13 includes other related trials as well. But the bottomline is
14 that I'm not aware of and the parties haven't suggested to me a
15 better alternative. It sort of brings to mind the old
16 Churchill quote, that is to say, paraphrasing, "Bellwethers may
17 be the worst means of settling mass tort cases except for all
18 other means," and I think that there's something to be said for
19 that here.

20 Having said that, I think I've made clear I am very
21 open, indeed interested and eager, to consider alternatives or
22 perhaps more to the point additional tools for purposes of
23 helping to settle the cases that remain in the MDL even tools
24 that are new and creative. But I haven't yet been presented
25 with any particularly good options on that score and I haven't,

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 despite some research, come up with any myself beyond the ones
2 that I've already floated and were not met with at least
3 unanimous agreement here.

4 I certainly don't think that remanding cases for
5 trials to -- and the transfer to courts is a good idea. In my
6 view it would only make matters worse as we would still have
7 the bellwether trials; they would just be spread out and with a
8 greater risk of inconsistent rulings and the like. All of
9 which is to say I think that the benefits of the MDL remain and
10 I think remanding them at this point would undermine the
11 benefits and the purposes behind the MDL.

12 All of that is to say that unless and until I am
13 presented with a better option or come up with a better option
14 I intend to stay the course on the theory that it is the best
15 and perhaps only option for resolving the individual cases in
16 the MDL and yielding data to be used to settle other cases.
17 But I do encourage you, as I have before, to think creatively
18 about other options and to discuss them with one another.

19 There are two things that I would say in particular
20 with respect to that, that you I think should think about and
21 perhaps discuss. The first is whether there is any potential
22 benefit -- and I'm not convinced that there would be, I want to
23 be clear about that -- but any potential benefit to engaging in
24 some sort of aggregated or even global summary judgment
25 practice with respect to cases, personal injury and wrongful

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 death cases in the MDL. I don't know if that make sense. I
2 don't have enough of a sense of the individual cases in the
3 MDL, let alone the different state laws that might apply. But
4 query whether there is some sort of global or aggregated motion
5 practice that could be done with respect to, for example,
6 whether there is or isn't a postsale duty to warn under state
7 law or the like that might streamline things and bring some
8 clarity.

9 Now, again, I want to be clear. I'm not persuaded
10 that that's the right way to go. Indeed, I would be -- you
11 would need to persuade me that it's not actually creating more
12 work rather than less. And it might make more sense to
13 continue as we have done, that is to say, tether motion
14 practice with respect to individual cases and presumably apply
15 those rulings to future cases as we go along, but I think it's
16 at least worth pondering whether there's anything of that sort
17 that might facilitate settlement discussions.

18 I also think it's worth at least thinking about
19 whether the remaining trials are, in fact, representative of
20 the cases in the MDL. And, as I made clear in the initial
21 orders and in my rulings on Mr. Cooper's motions, that is
22 ultimately the purpose of the bellwether process. It is not
23 intended for either side to pick cases that are strong for that
24 side only. It is really to pick and identify representative
25 cases.

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 Again, I'm not in the position to say whether the
2 remaining cases are or aren't representative but legal merits
3 aside, Mr. Cooper's motion did make the valid point, in my
4 view, that there -- or at least the observation that there had
5 been many cases that have been consolidated into the MDL since
6 the bellwether trials were selected and I certainly think it's
7 at least worth thinking about whether any of them would be
8 worthwhile trial candidates either in lieu of whatever trials
9 have been scheduled or arguably in addition to those trials.
10 That is to say, the answer may not be to replace one of the
11 trials that have been scheduled given the work that both sides
12 have already done with respect to those trials, although I will
13 say that that is a classic sunk cost fallacy, which is to say
14 that I'm not sure that one should evaluate work already done in
15 evaluating whether it makes sense going forward to stick with a
16 plan. But it may make sense to add more trials to the mix or
17 perhaps to remand some of those cases to other judges so that
18 trials can go on during the time that the remaining -- the
19 upcoming bellwether trials are happening or, for that matter,
20 for me to try and get other judges in this district to try
21 cases so that we can do so simultaneously. But I don't know if
22 that's doable. I don't know if that's desirable. And, again,
23 I'm not in a position to say whether the cases that have been
24 added to the MDL since the bellwether trials were selected are
25 or aren't more representative but I certainly think the point

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 is worth at least thinking about.

2 Bottomline, just to repeat, is that I do want you to
3 continue to think about options. But having said that, lead
4 counsel have not provided me with any more valid or persuasive
5 reasons to deviate from the present course than Mr. Cooper did
6 in his motion. So unless and until I order otherwise we will
7 plow ahead with the bellwether as the best system that we have.

8 Any questions? Anything to discuss on that?

9 That brings us to the question of settlement. And let
10 me say the following -- well let me ask if there's anything to
11 discuss on that. I have a few things to discuss myself.

12 Anything to discuss on that?

13 I know that New GM's application with respect to
14 keeping certain documents under seal with respect to the
15 memorandum of understanding. I believe the deadline to oppose
16 that has passed. So it's unopposed. I'll address that in due
17 course. Anything else that you want to raise?

18 MR. GODFREY: Simply that we have, as the court I
19 believe knows, we have said before we're willing, that is the
20 company is willing to discuss resolution short of trial with
21 people who have brought claims. We've had a number of
22 discussions. Whether they will bear fruit, it's too early to
23 tell. And we will keep the court advised in due course.

24 THE COURT: I appreciate that.

25 The question I have, which is not inconsistent with

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 that. On the whole I think you guys know what you're doing and
2 have tended to make progress on your own but I guess I wanted
3 to float the question of whether at this juncture it might be
4 appropriate to identify somebody who could basically play the
5 role of trying to get people to a table and figure out ways of
6 settling cases.

7 I recognize that the terms of the memorandum of
8 understanding are at least right now confidential. I recognize
9 that the Feinberg protocols were set up and run by Mr. Feinberg
10 and to some extent may also be confidential.

11 I also recognize that the first trial did not end with
12 a verdict but there are several trials coming up in the coming
13 months.

14 I guess the question I have, and this goes to also
15 something, potential alternatives or additions to the
16 bellwether process, is whether it might make sense for me to
17 appoint a special master or for you to choose a private
18 mediator or for Magistrate Judge Cott, who does this for a
19 living and does it quite well in my experience, to basically
20 take a more active role and try and facilitate discussions and
21 come up with ideas and perhaps think creatively along the lines
22 of what I said a few minutes ago about other ways that cases
23 might get to the settlement finish line. So I did at least
24 want to raise that question.

25 Mr. Godfrey.

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 MR. GODFREY: Without revealing precisely, I think the
2 court should assume we're making -- when I said we've had
3 conversations, they involve hundreds of cases. We're making
4 good progress. We don't think that we need the assistance of
5 someone yet. Part of it is just getting basic data so we can
6 evaluate, both sides can look at it.

7 But we are not -- there's a separate team, that's one
8 reason Ms. Bloom is here -- there's a separate team that has
9 been working away daily to see whether or not we can make
10 progress. And our judgment is that at this point we do not
11 need any outside assistance. I think we're making -- we feel
12 like we're making the same kind of progress that eventually
13 lead to Mr. Hilliard's settlement, but we won't know for a
14 while. It doesn't happen overnight.

15 THE COURT: Mr. Berman.

16 MR. BERMAN: Yes, your Honor. I think that we -- this
17 is now talking about the economic loss cases only.

18 THE COURT: It is or is not?

19 MR. BERMAN: Is. Just economic loss.

20 With respect to the economic loss case, because Rule
21 23 is involved and because millions of potential class members
22 will be looking at this settlement, Ms. Cabraser and I have
23 always felt in these cases that it's important for you to know
24 that there was someone else in the room who was making sure
25 that there was no collusion, which is one of the things that

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 comes up under Rule 23; there was no conflicts, that those
2 conflicts, if there were any, were handled from the get-go.

3 And so I raised with Mr. Godfrey the notion of having
4 a mediator appointed by the court before we really got into it.
5 And GM doesn't agree that's necessary. But we still feel that
6 because of the Rule 23 concerns that will be raised and
7 presented to the court in any settlement, that it is a good
8 idea earlier rather than later to get a mediator involved.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Godfrey.

10 I guess my immediate comment is there are, obviously,
11 any number of Rule 23 settlements that are approved even
12 without the assistance of a mediator. On the other hand,
13 courts often do, as I have before, noted the involvement of an
14 mediator as reinforcing the -- a finding that the settlement
15 was reached at arm's length and so forth.

16 So I do think that the point is valid; that it can
17 actually be very helpful in both doing away with objections in
18 the first instance as well as helping a court rule on them.

19 Yes.

20 MR. BERMAN: Can I add just one thing before
21 Mr. Godfrey goes; and that is, you're correct that there are
22 many Rule 23 cases where there is no mediator or special
23 master. But I think there's very few class actions of this
24 profile where that happens. I can't think of any that I've
25 been involved with. And I know, for example, Ms. Cabraser is

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 lead counsel in Volkswagen, and I'm on the committee. The
2 first thing the judge did there was to appoint a special master
3 to settle it.

4 THE COURT: Which is not an incidental part of why I'm
5 raising this issue.

6 Yes.

7 MR. GODFREY: I think it's premature to consider that.
8 We have motion practice and, again, hardly driven by data in
9 the plaintiffs' position. Ms. Cabraser and I have done two
10 settlements together; one with special master -- actually a
11 magistrate judge who was terrific a couple years ago and one
12 without. They were both high profile. There is no set rule
13 here.

14 I think that this current time though is premature
15 because depending upon where plaintiffs are there may be
16 nothing to discuss. We have motion practice, etc.

17 If we have a view that says a special master or
18 magistrate judge might be helpful, then I think there's plenty
19 of time to let the court know that. But we don't think so at
20 the present time.

21 THE COURT: I will think about it. I think my
22 inclination is that at some point it would be appropriate to
23 have somebody else in the room and you guys can, perhaps
24 mindful of that observation, begin talking about: A. when that
25 time would be; and B. who it should be. There are three

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 options: Appointment of a special master, the referral to
2 Judge Cott who, as I said, does this for a living and does it
3 quite well; or a third is the appointment of a private mediator
4 by the parties. So you can think about it.

5 But I think the point is well taken and I think at
6 some point it would probably be appropriate to do. And whether
7 I think, Mr. Hilliard, you should involve yourself in those
8 conversations, I take Mr. Godfrey's point it sounds like, and
9 that's part of the reason that I haven't pressed the point,
10 that New GM is sort of making progress without an outsider
11 being involved. But to the extent that somebody could
12 potentially facilitate settling cases on both sides of the
13 spectrum here, then I think it would be helpful.

14 MR. HILLIARD: On behalf of the personal injury and
15 death cases, Judge, that are still in the MDL and are not part
16 of the settlement, what I found -- and I disagree with
17 Mr. Godfrey in that there are two court-appointed special
18 masters who are both trusted and respected by both sides and
19 they have done a lot of assistance to make sure that we meet in
20 the middle, so to speak, in regards to outstanding issues. If
21 there are -- we're doing a survey now on the remaining cases,
22 which goes back to what the court said before about whether or
23 not there should be more bellwethers or should be some
24 replacements given that everyday there's more cases being filed
25 into the MDL.

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 So if there are lawyers who have more than one case,
2 then there's an aggregate issue where you are going to need the
3 assistance of someone to decide who gets what and how much and
4 not the lawyer representing more than one client.

5 There are two folks who are already working in earnest
6 everyday on this. And so I think what I'm going to reach out
7 to GM and say is it's time now to have the court appoint
8 someone to more generally help and assist with personal injury
9 and death settlements with the remaining docket as GM and those
10 plaintiffs see fit rather than wait until later. And I
11 understand Mr. Godfrey right now doesn't agree, but I think
12 ultimately they will need to be appointed because most lawyers
13 have more than one case and it seems like since we both have
14 worked well with these fellows down in Louisiana, that they are
15 probably at the top of the list, just to give you a heads-up as
16 to what probably is going to happen.

17 THE COURT: You can continue to discuss that.

18 Can you speak in open court about what the status is
19 with respect to that process or is that something that we
20 shouldn't do here?

21 MR. HILLIARD: We can generally say that it is moving
22 along, and there are specific dates that have been met and will
23 be met. And other than that, the rest is still confidential.

24 THE COURT: Ms. Bloom, anything that you want to add
25 to that?

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 MS. BLOOM: That sounds right to me.

2 THE COURT: Why don't you continue to think and
3 discuss these issues, mindful of my comments, but I do think
4 that these are things that I'd be interested in pushing and
5 pushing reasonably but aggressively on. So I will certainly
6 return to them in the next conference and on other occasions.

7 That leaves the schedule for additional status
8 conferences. We obviously have the final pretrial conference
9 with respect to bellwether trial No. 2 on March 9 beginning at
10 9 a.m. We will, as I did last time, interrupt that when there
11 is a jury that I can address with respect to the questionnaire.
12 But that's when I will see at least some of you next.

13 In terms of more general status conferences, mindful
14 of your suggestion that we can go to an every six weeks kind of
15 schedule, I was going to propose the following dates for the
16 next two conferences; the first of Friday April 15 -- we can
17 celebrate tax day together; and then second is Friday June 3.
18 Anyone have any problems with either of those dates?

19 MR. GODFREY: I think those dates will work for us,
20 your Honor. Thank you.

21 THE COURT: All right. Speak now or hold your peace.

22 MR. HILLIARD: Then they will work.

23 THE COURT: Very good. Let me just emphasize a couple
24 upcoming deadlines and then I will address the counsel issues
25 that I adverted to in my endorsement.

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 The motion to dismiss with respect to the third
2 amended consolidated complaint is due on Wednesday. And
3 opposition is due April 9. Reply is due April 30. Hang on one
4 second.

5 (Pause)

6 Ms. -- well actually she's no longer Ms. Barnes she's
7 Mrs. Smallman has helpfully pointed out that I will be
8 naturalizing citizens on Friday, June 3. So that date does not
9 actually work for me. One moment.

10 (Pause)

11 Can we do Thursday, June 2?

12 MR. HILLIARD: Is this another speak now?

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 MR. HILLIARD: That's fine with us, Judge.

15 THE COURT: Mr. Godfrey.

16 MR. GODFREY: I'm sorry, your Honor. I didn't hear
17 the question.

18 THE COURT: If we can change the June conference to
19 June 2 instead of June 3.

20 MR. GODFREY: Absolutely, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Very good.

22 So the motion to dismiss on the economic loss front is
23 due Wednesday. Opposition April 9. And reply April 30.

24 The Yingling briefing starts on the 26th with the OSI
25 disclosures and, excuse me, submission and on the 4th with

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 dispositive motions and Daubert motions. And I'm assuming that
2 you are mindful of the upcoming deadlines, and there are
3 several, in the Barthelemy and Spain trial.

4 One reminder with respect to trial exhibits. Each
5 side should submit one hard drive with all of their exhibits
6 and a hyperlinked exhibit list. I think you did that the last
7 go around although there may have been some -- in any event
8 that's what you should do.

9 Anything else to discuss from your end? Otherwise
10 I'll turn to the counsel issues that I have adverted to.

11 Mr. Brock.

12 MR. BROCK: I have one issue and I can certainly do it
13 last. But it just relates to the courtroom in which we will
14 try the next case. I had the impression -- I hope there hadn't
15 been an order on this that I missed -- but I had the impression
16 from some of your comments during trial No. 1, I think you were
17 speaking about the utility of the vehicle being in the
18 courtroom at the time; that your preference might be to have
19 the trial in this courtroom. And so I just was going to see if
20 that's the case and so we could be thinking about that from a
21 technology standpoint.

22 THE COURT: I'm pretty sure you did miss an order on
23 this.

24 MR. BROCK: I'm sorry. I apologize.

25 THE COURT: I can't offhand remember which order it

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 was precisely. I'm guessing -- well, in any event, I did
2 indicate that I would hold the trial in this courtroom and
3 though I would make an overflow courtroom available and would
4 consider doing jury selection and possibly openings and
5 closings in the larger courtroom. I haven't resolved how to --
6 whether to do that. There are issues -- technical issues and
7 the like. But the bottomline is I had indicated, and I think I
8 gave you a deadline to object if you had any problem with it,
9 that I was going to hold trial in this courtroom and nobody did
10 object. So that is the plan.

11 Mr. Jackson.

12 MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, we saw that order. We also
13 thought that with regards to the issue that the court left
14 open, this would be our opportunity to speak to the court on
15 our preference. Of course this courtroom makes sense to us, as
16 the court has already ruled, for the trial.

17 We would ask the court if it is technologically
18 feasible to do jury selection and jury addresses in the larger
19 courtroom. It might -- I think that this case is likely to
20 have a greater attendance on those days and in my experience
21 when the courtroom is packed for an opening statement it can be
22 something of a distraction to the jurors. Also I think that
23 it's a bit more difficult to conduct jury selection with a
24 large group of potential jurors in a smaller courtroom, just
25 our ability to see everyone I think is a little bit easier in

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 the larger courtroom so that would be our request.

2 THE COURT: Although the lighting is better in here
3 than in the other courtroom. I'll take that under advisement.
4 It was order No. 94 for the record.

5 MR. BROCK: Thank you, your Honor. And apologies for
6 that.

7 THE COURT: No worries. I will consider that and also
8 the technical issues, because there are some, given the
9 existence of an overflow and your desire to use, as I imagine
10 you have, the media for purposes of openings and the like.
11 Probably easier to do jury selection in another courtroom
12 because it doesn't involve the use of technology and maybe I'll
13 do that and then do opening here with an overflow elsewhere,
14 but I'll think about it.

15 Yes, Mr. Brock.

16 MR. BROCK: In the time that we had to spend with
17 jurors at the conclusion of the Scheuer case, we did hear from
18 a couple that they had difficulty hearing at times. I know
19 that was an issue about getting to a microphone and getting
20 away from it. But I think, obviously, them being able to hear
21 what's occurring is what we're all here for. And we'd be fine
22 with this courtroom for the openings.

23 THE COURT: Well it is definitely desirable for the
24 jury to be able to hear. The acoustics in this courthouse are
25 not great, but one of the considerations that I had was that a

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 smaller courtroom would probably be better on that than a
2 larger. But I will consider the issues and let you know how I
3 intend to proceed at the final pretrial conference.

4 MR. BROCK: We may have an exemplar vehicle that we
5 will want to use in trial No. 3, the Yingling case. We'll
6 bring that up at another time, whether it can be accommodated
7 in this courtroom.

8 THE COURT: All right. You'll have to persuade me
9 that it is appropriate and necessary and discuss it with
10 Mr. Pribanic.

11 Anything else to discuss before my last remarks?

12 Yes.

13 MR. HILLIARD: In regard to the IT of this courtroom.
14 I was speaking to Ms. Barnes about this podium to our left.

15 THE COURT: That's Ms. Smallman.

16 MR. HILLIARD: I apologize. Work on that.

17 THE COURT: As am I. As is she, I imagine.

18 MR. HILLIARD: And he as well.

19 So the podium to our left, I'm told that it is
20 non-moveable but it is really the one that has the touchscreen
21 and the ability to use the ELMO, and there would be another
22 podium here. I'm seeking the court's permission to explore if
23 it can be moved over so that there would be one really good
24 technologically up-to-date podium that we could use for witness
25 examination. I'm not sure it's possible. But I understand

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 that it's pretty much in place right now and we could get with
2 the gentleman that we met last night and see if there's a way,
3 without disruption or anything bad happening to your carpet,
4 much less than a vehicle, to see if it can be permanently put
5 in a place where we can address a witness from one podium.

6 THE COURT: You are more than welcome to explore it
7 and if you find out anything that would be interesting let me
8 know. My understanding is that it's not doable but maybe it's
9 doable to add another screen over there. Obviously you showed
10 your ability to be creative on this front in trial No. 1 and if
11 you can come up with anything that's not disruptive or
12 unreasonable I'm certainly open to it. So talk to the
13 gentleman that you spoke to and if you can figure out something
14 go ahead.

15 MR. HILLIARD: Thank you, Judge.

16 THE COURT: I'll address this at the final pretrial
17 conference also, but to the extent that you can get me whatever
18 orders you need for purposes of Courtroom Connect or anything
19 of that sort, obviously that was a little bit of an issue in
20 the last trial, the sooner the better would probably be
21 helpful.

22 The last thing I wanted to say, as I said, I have a
23 few things I want to raise with respect to counsel that were
24 prompted by the briefing on Mr. Cooper's motions, although I
25 have already made clear my views on those motions and the

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 merits thereof.

2 First, I am a little bit concerned and familiar about
3 the representations that Mr. Shadowen made to Judge Breyer with
4 respect to your role in the MDL; that is, he represented that
5 the Scheuer trial, "Concludes your involvement in the
6 bellwether cases for GM." That is docket number 2243 at page
7 10. And I'm a little puzzled by that representation, given my
8 understanding that you are counsel in four of the remaining
9 five bellwether cases, not to mention lead counsel with primary
10 responsibility for personal injury/wrongful death cases. And
11 although you've reached a tentative settlement with respect to
12 most of your cases; number one, that is not a consummated
13 settlement just yet; and number two, there remain approximately
14 1700 personal injury and wrongful death cases above and beyond
15 those cases. All that is to say that while I am pleased with
16 the amount of progress we have made in the MDL, I think it's
17 fair to say that a substantial amount of work remains. I'm a
18 little bit concerned by that representation. I don't know what
19 extent Mr. Shadowen got out a little bit ahead of himself or
20 whether he was authorized to say it. I did want to raise that
21 concern.

22 MR. HILLIARD: And I appreciate it too, Judge. He
23 misspoke. I had told Mr. Shadowen that the next two trials I
24 was going to play more of a supporting role, not lead trial
25 lawyer role. I'm here to say, I hope the court has seen that I

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 intend to work just the same as I had up to this date through
2 the end of this litigation. I don't intend to go anywhere
3 unless there's a direction pointed by someone that I should.

4 I apologize for that. But I spoke for Mr. Shadowen.
5 That was not an instruction I gave him, nor the intent that I
6 wanted him to convey.

7 There are multiple chances to be in MDLs and be able
8 to work simultaneously, which is what I hoped he would have
9 conveyed, and that would have only been my purpose. I would
10 not have neglected this MDL for that one.

11 THE COURT: I'm pleased to hear that, but did want to
12 raise the issue.

13 More broadly, I hope I made it clear that I did not
14 think that there was any merit to Mr. Cooper's motion to remove
15 you as counsel; and that is to say, that there is no basis to
16 remove you. I do want to just say that I think it would make
17 sense to think about whether assuming that the settlement with
18 respect to the 1400 or so cases goes through and the vast
19 majority of your cases are resolved, whether at that juncture
20 it might make sense to think about appointing either another
21 lawyer in addition to you or having another lawyer take the
22 lead with respect to personal injury and wrongful death cases,
23 that is to say somebody with a larger critical mass of cases
24 remaining in the MDL. I want to be clear I'm not suggesting
25 any -- I just wanted to raise that as an issue for you to think

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 about and lead counsel generally to think about and it may make
2 sense to revisit it at some point. I don't think the time has
3 come to do that and it may not be necessary because, as I think
4 I made clear in the opinion, I think that you have generally
5 done a terrific job in your capacity as lead counsel but I did
6 want to just float the thought.

7 Anything you want to say on that?

8 MR. HILLIARD: Judge, to put this to rest the
9 settlement that I entered into with GM has absolutely nothing
10 to do with my commitment or my time or my energy that I'm
11 willing to maintain in this MDL to the very end. I enjoy it.
12 I was honored by the appointment. I don't want to, after this
13 settlement is completed and it will be successfully completed
14 in the next couple of months, it does not in any way adjust my
15 personal or professional drive to help this court successfully
16 finish this MDL in a very positive way. But I take your words
17 and I'll consider those.

18 THE COURT: And to be clear I was not suggesting
19 anything to the contrary. And I have no doubt that those would
20 be -- that would be how you would continue to perform in the
21 MDL in this role.

22 Second, on a related subject, I know that Ms. Cabraser
23 was appointed lead counsel in the VW MDL and Mr. Berman was
24 appointed to I guess the steering committee or the executive
25 committee in that MDL. I congratulate both of you on those

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 appointments. I do want to make sure that that is not going to
2 pose an issue for us either. You're obviously here and I have
3 no doubt that you will continue to do what you need to do with
4 respect to this MDL but, needless to say, the amount of work
5 for this MDL alone is pretty substantial. I'm not sure what,
6 if anything, to do about it other than to just raise the issue
7 and indicate that I want to make sure that there is no
8 interference with what we need to do.

9 Ms. Cabraser.

10 MS. CABRASER: Yes, your Honor. I appreciate that as
11 well. I thought very long and hard about whether to apply for
12 a role in the Volkswagen MDL in the first place and to accept
13 the appointment as lead counsel in the second place because I
14 recognize my ongoing commitment to this court and it's a
15 commitment that I take very seriously. I concluded that I
16 could and certainly would spend all the time and effort and
17 resources necessary to perform both roles. I'm very fortunate
18 in the Volkswagen case to have a large and very talented and
19 well resourced PSC, including Mr. Berman. And we're also very
20 fortunate in this MDL to have a very strong executive committee
21 and so as both cases go on we'll work together within each
22 leadership structure to make absolutely sure that we are here
23 for this court; that we are here for the court in San Francisco
24 and everything else in my professional and personal life, to
25 the extent I have one, is secondary to those commitments and

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 the appointment here came first.

2 THE COURT: Well I don't want to deprive you of a life
3 outside of these two MDLs but I do want to make sure that
4 everybody is doing what they need to do in fulfilling their
5 respective roles and, again, trust that you will continue to do
6 so as you have.

7 The last thing I wanted to say is that just to
8 underscore and reemphasize that per the language of order
9 No. 8, the leadership appointments that I made were personal to
10 the appointee; that is to say, I did not appoint firms to lead
11 counsel or to the executive committee. I appointed the
12 individual applicants. At various points in the briefing,
13 Mr. Cooper's motions, for example, there were references --
14 just this is by way of example, it's not the only one -- to
15 Boies, Schiller being a member of the executive committee.
16 Boies, Schiller is not a member of the executive committee.
17 Mr. Boies is a member of the executive committee. And I don't
18 want anybody to misunderstand or have any mistake about this,
19 that members of the executive committee can certainly avail
20 themselves of the resources of their firm as I made clear I
21 expect that they would do in order No. 8. But when push comes
22 to shove, the individual leadership appointees are responsible
23 for ensuring that they fulfill the roles that they were
24 appointed to and I don't want anybody to misunderstand that.
25 So I just wanted to make that clear and was concerned by some

(212) 805-0300

G2N9GMC

1 of the references in the briefing.

2 All right. That concludes what I had to discuss
3 today. Anything else before we adjourn?

4 All right. If not I will see you on March 9 and I
5 will look for your order memorializing what we've done today in
6 a couple days. Thank you very much.

7 (Adjourned)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(212) 805-0300

