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## PROCEEDINGS

(August 3, 2016)
THE COURT: Ca11 the case.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL 1657, In re Vioxx Products Liability Litigation.

THE COURT: Counse1 make their appearance for the record, please.

MR. MCCLAIN: On behalf of the plaintiffs, Kenneth McClain, Your Honor.

MR. BARNETT: Good morning, Your Honor. Ben Barnett on behalf of Merck.

THE COURT: First, I apologize for the inconvenience. We are rewiring my court. They have a number of bellwether cases coming up soon, so we have some new gismos and gadgets.

We are here today regarding a discovery issue in the Vioxx matter. I'm familiar with this matter because I have visited with it a time or two before. I put various documents under sea1. I felt that my first obligation was to the requirements of the Seventh Amendment, namely, giving parties an opportunity to have a fair and complete trial. I postponed, if you will, viewing the First Amendment, which is the public's right to know. That was what I tried to do in this particular case.

The documents involved are made available to people who are interested in looking at them in connection with
cases and trials and depositions that they have coming up. There are some requirements on it, but basically they have free access to the material.

We are here today because the plaintiff feels that it's timely to remove the restriction on the documents and expose them to the public in general outside of the courtroom. I will hear from the parties now.

MR. BARNETT: Your Honor, good morning. Ben Barnett on behalf of Merck. It's good to be before Your Honor again, albeit in a different courtroom.

Your Honor, Merck has two pending motions, both of them for a protective order, the first motion related to four specific documents which in our view remain confidential, and the basis for the confidentiality is plain on their face.

More importantly, Your Honor, we have now gotten a whole series of requests from plaintiff's counsel in the Levitt case, which as the Court knows is the last personal injury case in the MDL. She has asked, in sort of serial fashion, for potentially thousands of documents that are not under seal, they are actually just designated as confidential, and she has been free to use them in her case. She is asking that those be publicly disclosed.

Our view on that is, particularly in the current setting, that's completely inappropriate, unnecessary, and exactly the sort of oppressive burden that Rule 26(c) is
designed to prevent.
The affidavit from Ms. Levitt, attached to the plaintiff's opposition, makes it very clear there is no litigation purpose in this effort at all. She just wants to make al1 the documents public. As set out in both our original motions and our reply, under the controlling case law, documents produced in civil discovery under protective order are private. They are not public documents.

These are not documents that have been attached to a motion. These are not documents that have been admitted as exhibits at trial. In those instances -- as the Court is aware because we have been doing this for a decade now -- when the Court held bellwether trials and there were confidential documents that were used as exhibits, we removed the "confidential" designation after that trial.

PTO 13 was designed to accelerate efficient document production, to give Merck the comfort that they could produce confidential, sensitive documents with the understanding that they would only be used in this litigation. The design of this current effort is not litigation driven. It's not going to resolve any issues in this case. It's an effort to make all these documents, produced over a decade time, public.

There's a cost and there's a burden associated with that challenge. We know that because this is just yet
another challenge similar to the one the Court addressed in 2014 involving Dr. Egilman, who is also an affiant in the present motion. When he made his challenge in Kentucky for thousands of documents, we had to spend time first identifying the documents he was challenging, which was difficult, and then determining whether, in fact, those documents remained confidential. He had five separate requests, and the result of that is five separate charts over 300 pages long that detail what is confidential and what is not confidential.

We know that if this effort is permitted -which there's some indication they are starting now with thousands of documents, but they may eventually get to all documents -- it's going to cost Merck hundreds of thousands of dollars to do that. Not only to do the review, but if we have to produce documents, we are essentially going to have to rebuild a document review and production structure that has been shut down, effectively, since 2013 because, as the Court can appreciate, there have been fewer and fewer Vioxx cases. To the extent we have had to produce any documents, it's been on a case-specific basis, as we have done in the Levitt case.

In our view, the Court has clear authority under Rule 26(c) to grant both motions for protective order. We think that's the right outcome in this case. We would ask the Court also to bar future challenges as well because given where this case is -- as I understand it, there's motions to be
argued later in this month. Given where the case is, given where the MDL sits, there's literally no litigation purpose served by this request, and it ought to be denied because of the cost and burden to Merck. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Let me hear from the plaintiff.
MR. MCCLAIN: Kenneth McClain on behalf of Ms. Levitt.

Judge, I was struck today -- I was coming over here and I picked up my news feed and read that Judge Curie1, out in California, had unsealed all of the records regarding Trump University because there was a public interest, not a litigation interest, for the public to know about the matters that were under litigation in that case.

We would suggest to the Court -- and the Court has recognized this and said repeatedly that it is no less important to the general public the way in which drugs get approved for use in this country and the ways in which the mechanisms of our medical professionals are utilized to gain access to markets and to spread drugs of various types throughout the American public.

The Court was very clear that the tension between the Seventh Amendment and the First Amendment is something that you're always wrestling with and that at some point in time the Court would come back to the First Amendment
issues after the Seventh Amendment issues had been resolved, in your view, and now we are down to the very last case. You invited us to come at some point and to bring a motion if we believed that, in fact, there was a legitimate First Amendment issue to be addressed by the Court in regard to these documents.

CMO 13 lays out a very clear procedure by which, if there is a legitimate business interest or trade secret interest or some interest that can be articulated by Merck, that they can keep these documents privileged or under seal, however, you want to look at them. You laid out the procedure whereas when they are challenged, come forward, and you even suggested an expedited way in the hearing that we had on the telephone with you, you know, "At least give me a log, something I can deal with, so I can see why you are claiming that these documents are still privileged."

We11, other than on the four documents that he mentioned, there has been no attempt by Merck to even identify what they are claiming about these documents. We certainly can't discern why it would be that documents relating to a drug that is no longer on the market, hasn't been on the market for 12 years, involving matters sometimes even a decade beforehand, before it was taken off the market, still would be somehow relevant.

Are the individuals that are mentioned in here
still witnesses for them? Are they consultants? What is the basis that they are claiming these documents still have to be maintained as confidential or it will do some great damage to their business?

THE COURT: The one thing that they are concerned about -- and I think it's a legitimate concern -- is the cost. I'm going to shift the cost. So it looks like that one way of handling this, if they are distributed, is to require the party to at least post a bond of, say, half a million dollars because it's going to be in that category.

There are 9 million documents in this particular case. The plaintiffs have spent, in preparation for the case, $\$ 41$ million to collect those documents and collect the discovery. One thing that I'm concerned about and the elephant in the room here that we are not talking about is this case is now about 20 years old. It's been off the market almost 15 years. The case started in 2005, February 16, 2005. We are finished 50,000 claims. There are 26 class actions, in addition to that about 10,000 consumer cases, and this is the last particular case.

Merck takes the position that it's harassment, that it's going to not only be harassing to them but also expensive to them. I'm trying to figure out why you need the documents for the Levitt case. You have access to them. You can see them. You know what they are. Your experts can review
them, whatever document you are concerned about. You want to go forward with that, and I think the elephant in the courtroom is that there may be some other reason for doing that.

MR. MCCLAIN: No, there's no question. We say it very clearly in our papers. Two points. One, Ms. Levitt, as you know -- and we have discussed this off the record, and I don't want to go into some of these details that I have shared with the Court about her mindset in regard to this litigation -- believes that the public has a right to know about what happened in regard to Vioxx because she believes it ruined her life. She doesn't think that the lawsuit is ever going to compensate her for what she lost, but she would like to prevent this from happening to anybody else.

So the defendants place this all on Dr. Egilman and say it's all Dr. Egilman. I wouldn't be standing here if my client really wasn't interested in having these documents released because she truly believes that an injustice was done here to her that will never be compensated. She lost a business that was worth $\$ 20 \mathrm{million}$ and they are paupers now. They have lost their home. She truly believes that this ruined her life and does believe that she has an obligation to the public to let them know about the way the drugs are approved in this country and what Merck did to circumvent that process. The Court is aware of the evidence on both sides of that issue. I won't debate that right now, but that's what she believes.

THE COURT: Is she willing to pay for the cost?
MR. MCCLAIN: You know, Judge, it will depend. Let's talk about that just for a moment.

The issue is Merck claims to have gone through and made a finding, in regard to each of these documents, that they were confidential. There has to be a log somewhere. There has to be something that was done and saved. Even in my little law firm of 20 lawyers, we save stuff because people leave all the time. We don't let people -- or we try not to -create work product and then leave and then we are in the lurch to have to re-create it.

I don't understand. I don't understand that argument that a firm such as Williams \& Connolly did not save the work that they did in regard to making the determination on these documents. I would believe, absent a showing to the contrary, that in fact the information that we are seeking regarding these documents exists to determine if there is any continuing privilege in regard to them. We can do it pretty expeditiously, Judge.

So I was thinking about this because in my experience with you, you are always looking for a practical solution to difficult problems that lawyers create and cut through it. Why wouldn't it make sense to sit down with these documents and present them to a master of some type and make an argument yes, no, yes, no about these documents? I think most
of the arguments would go away, and most of them would be producible at that point, and Merck may remove most of the designations and then we wouldn't have a fight about anything. Yeah, I would be willing to pay for half of the cost of something like that.

THE COURT: I don't know about half of the cost. You would pay for the whole cost. The masters generally cost between $\$ 300$ and $\$ 500$ an hour. You can at least talk to your client about that.

MR. MCCLAIN: Okay.
THE COURT: I understand the issue. I'11 take it under consideration. Whatever I do, a cost is going to be forthcoming on somebody. You're asking for material that has nothing to do with your litigation. You have access to all of the material, and you have access to it in the use of the litigation. Your experts can review all of the material in preparation for the litigation. Your client feels, in addition to that, she owes the public in general the right to have everything looked at or everything available. That's commendable on her part, but also there's a cost involved in these things, and I have to look at that.

MR. MCCLAIN: I understand the Court's position. We are willing to consider that.

THE COURT: Al1 right.
MR. BARNETT: Your Honor, if I could just very
briefly. Just for the sake of clarification and perhaps to defend the honor of Williams \& Connolly, there's no question that the log exists. The log that I was referencing to before was attached as an exhibit to some of the correspondence from Ms. Levitt's counse1. The log exists. Nobody has lost the log.

The point of the log is we have already invested hundreds of thousands of dollars to do this. The logs tell them what documents we no longer claim are confidential. Those can be disclosed. Whether by Ms. Levitt or published by Dr. Egilman, it doesn't matter. The point is if we have to go through all of the rest of them, that's where the cost gets incurred by Merck, and that's clearly something we don't think is necessary. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thanks very much, both of you all. I appreciate it.

Also, in this particular case, we have a couple of other motions. I'm getting to the point where I really have to think in terms of sending them back for trial. I'm going to be talking to the judge in that area so that -- well, this is a Missouri case. It looks like that the case needs to be tried, so that's where it will go back to.

MS. HORN: Elaine Horn from Williams \& Connolly for Merck.

We have the open issue concerning the dates in
place after the August 17 hearing on the summary judgment motion and the Daubert motions, the motions in limine, and so forth. There was a joint proposed order entered into the record but hasn't been acted upon.

THE COURT: No, I wil1. If it's the joint order that I have seen, I will enter that.

MS. HORN: So we can assume those dates are in effect?

THE COURT: Yes.
MS. HORN: Thank you.
THE COURT: I assumed it was good for everybody.
MS. HORN: Yes.
MR. BARNETT: Yes, it is.
THE COURT: If you need to do it by phone, we can hook you up by phone. I don't want you to incur any expenses if you don't need to.

MR. BARNETT: For the August 17 hearing?
THE COURT: Yes. Give it some thought. It doesn't matter one way or the other to me.

MR. BARNETT: I appreciate it. Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Let's take a couple minutes and then come back and hear the other argument. Thanks.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: A11 rise.
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