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OPERATOR: Ladies and gentlemen, hello and welcome to today's Ortho Evra product's liability litigation MDL 174 conference call. As a reminder, all your lines will be on listen-only mode, and there will be a Q and A session towards the end of the call. Should you require any assistance in the meantime, please press star zero and an operator will assist you.

At this time to start our conference, I would like to welcome the Honorable Judge David Katz. Go ahead, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mona. Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate that there are approximately 47 people on the line. I want to cover several things. This will not be long. This MDL case is now almost three years old, and it was -- there are many cases obviously much older than that in both state and federal courts. Much progress has been made through the extremely diligent efforts of the members of the PSC, other plaintiffs' counsel and defense counsel. But I point out that there remains much to be accomplished, and we need to remove -to move the remaining cases along. We basically have two remaining groups of pre-label cases. I'm going to address each of those, after which I'll open the lines and ask first for Janet Abaray and Bob Tucker to correct me if I have misspoken or misstated anything or if I have left
everything -- anything out, and I am sure they will not hesitate to do either of those.

There are about 33 or 34 cases, pre-label cases, where negotiations appear to be at a standstill or impasse. In those instances where that is true, plaintiffs' case specific expert reports on causation will be due on or before May 1, 2009, with defendants' due on or before July 1, 2009. Case selection will follow for trial and will be by the bellwether method with nomination for trials due as the six cases by plaintiff and six cases by defendant on or before May 18th. Then each side will be given three strikes to be exercised on or before May 27. We will, therefore, end up with six cases.

Daubert motions with respect to those cases will be due on or before August 1 with responses due on or before August 14th. Hearings on those motions, if necessary, and only if necessary, will begin on August 25.

The first trial will commence on September 15 with jury selection the previous Monday, which is September 14. Obviously in all bellwether cases selected venue must be waived. In instances where venue is not waived openly, we will conduct Daubert hearings, if necessary, consider Daubert motions, if filed, and then consider remand.
The other classification of pre-label cases
contains about 63 or 64 cases in which negotiations are ongoing. If those negotiations do not resolve the cases through settlement on or before March 31, 2009, in those cases remaining, plaintiffs' case specific expert reports on causation will be due by June 1, and defendants' will be due by August 1. We will then address trials, Daubert hearings, et cetera, in the same manner with, of course, different dates as I've previously outlined at a time selected after consultation with both the PSC and defense counsel.

Ladies and gentlemen, I may be preaching to the choir, but as you know, thousands of cases have been resolved within and outside the MDL. With respect to those remaining pre-label cases, I strongly urge counsel in those remaining MDL cases and frankly outside and in state cases, to speak with those attorneys around the country who have resolved cases similar to yours to seek their advice, particularly on valuation. Consider, as others have done, asking them to review records and even associate with them if you find that appropriate and/or necessary. Names of folks to talk to come to mind such as Steve Skikos in California, Mike Burg in Denver, Janet Abaray in Cincinnati, Ellen Relkin in New Jersey, Michael London in New York, Steve Collier in Toledo, just to mention a few whose names come to mind, as I said, as having resolved
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significant cases. I believe they can be of assistance to you in assisting you in resolving your cases. And I know, there are several others whose names you undoubtedly know who Janet knows, who Bob Tucker knows, who others know.

With respect to post-label cases, we will address those at our March 16 th conference in Palm Beach, but an order will go out this week or early next week requiring, in those cases, compliance with CMO4 and particularly the filing of plaintiffs' fact sheets within 60 days, so those of you on hook up who may have post-label cases be aware of that, and we will be addressing that and other matters on March 16th with regard to post-label cases.

Those attorneys who did not show for this telephone conference and who did not request to be excused will be subject to a show cause order and compelled by that order to appear in person in Toledo at 11:00 a.m. on March 27th. Those who have been excused will receive the orders I've outlined. You may rest assured that I have also today read the syllabus in Levine versus Wyeth and have purposefully avoided discussing it, the main opinion, I think, is 54 pages. And the dissent by Justice Alito is roughly another 30 pages. That decision appears to cut both ways, and you folks on both sides, plaintiff and defendant, will put your respective spin on it at the appropriate time. Enough said about the Wyeth case at this
time.

I'm now going to, in a moment, ask Mona to open the lines permitting you to chime in with questions or observations and ask you please before doing so, to permit Janet Abaray first and then Bob Tucker to address as to whether or not $I$ have misstated or omitted something. Before addressing The Court, would you please identify yourselves for the benefit of the court reporter.

Mona, would you please open those lines?

OPERATOR: Certainly, sir, I will open the lines for Mr. Tucker and Ms. Abaray before $I$ give instructions to cue up for the $Q$ and $A$.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Tucker and
Ms. Abaray, go ahead.

MS. ABARAY: Thank you. Can everyone hear me?
Oh, I guess --
THE COURT: I can hear you right now.

MS. ABARAY: I forgot they can't answer. Thank you. Yes, this is Janet Abaray, and Your Honor, thank you for making time for everybody today and I'll try to be brief as well. I wanted to make sure everyone on the call is familiar with our kind of shorthand nomenclature here about pre-label cases and post label cases. This is a distinction that basically the defendants have made based upon whether your injury occurred prior to a label change
that occurred in the fall of 2005. So the cases that were current, were currently on the schedule, the Court put forth are cases with the injuries before that late 2005 time period. The post label change cases are those that arose after the label change in November 2005.

And then a couple other issues, in terms of preparing your expert reports, and I would assume this could include getting in touch with your treating doctors and getting reports from them. We have a substantial number of reports available on the MDL website that are of a generic nature on causation, whether it's stroke, heart attack, blood clots; we have epidemiology, pharmacology, so if you get to the point that you need to start working on reports, please make sure that you avail yourself of the information on the website.

Another point really quickly, I believe someone is on the phone from Mr. Gallagher's firm. We did have a case specific ruling last week in your case to give you 15 days to respond on a motion to compel, so I wanted to be sure that you're aware of that in case that you hadn't seen it. And then also just to kind of reiterate what The Court said, we're down to around, you know, between 50 to 75 of these pre-label change cases. And so our effort is to try to make sure people are aware that now's the time to get your case resolved, and I think that's all I wanted to add
right now, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, Janet. Bob?
MR. TUCKER: Your Honor, thank you. I think that Susan Sharko and I have probably talked to most if not everybody on the call about their cases, so I don't think there's any lack of clarity in terms of the pre-label change and the post label change event cases. But to the extent there may be some question about that, then just talk to either Susan or to me or to Julie Callsen about your cases and we'll clear that up. Otherwise, Judge, I really don't have anything else to add to your summary. We will, of course, continue our efforts to resolve cases as instructed by The Court.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Mona?
OPERATOR: Certainly. Ladies and gentlemen, if you would like to ask a question, please press 01 on your telephone key pad. Once again, that's 01 on your telephone key pad. Our first question is from Mr. Lowell W. Vincent. Go ahead, please.

MR. VINCENT: Your Honor, this is Lowell Vincent from Phillips and Associates. I just want to make sure that the record reflected that $I$ was present in the courtroom because I don't know that I said anything with regard to my law firm, and I think others might be in the same position; and not that we wouldn't want to come to

Ohio or Palm Beach or wherever it's going to be. I am here, that's all I had to say.

THE COURT: Certainly. Thank you.
OPERATOR: Our next question is from Mr. Bob
Davidson. Go ahead, sir.
MR. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, this is Bob Davidson, Little Rock, Davidson and Associates. I have been in contact with Ms. Sharko. I only have one case that's pending out of the Middle District of Tennessee, and she has agreed to mediate our case with The Court if The Court would be willing to do that.

THE COURT: That -- that is one of those cases, Susan, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that is one of the cases we were going to discuss on March 16th, am I correct?

MR. TUCKER: Your Honor, are you asking me?
THE COURT: No, I thought -- is Ms. Sharko
available by phone? Can she hear, Mona? Would it be Susan Sharko?

OPERATOR: Yes, she is indeed. Go ahead, ma'am.
MS. SHARKO: Hello.
THE COURT: Yeah, Susan?
MS. SHARKO: I'm talking but I don't think you can hear me.

THE COURT: I can now.

MS. SHARKO: You can hear me, yes?
THE COURT: Yes.

MS. SHARKO: Your Honor, we did not discuss that case specifically, but if you'd like to meet with us on that on March 16 or on a separate date, a separate day might make more sense, I'm happy to do that.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't we do this, why don't you and Mr. Davidson talk and then either after this -- or let me -- I'm trying to think.

MS. SHARKO: I can speak with Mr. Davidson, and we'll get back to Kathy.

THE COURT: Yeah. Let me know. Very good.
Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Davidson. We'll take care of it.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you.
OPERATOR: Your Honor, our next question is from Mr. Matthew D. Lundy.

MR. LUNDY: Judge, this is Matt Lundy, I have a housekeeping matter just like Mr. Davidson in that I'm co-counsel with Justin Witkin with Aylstock, Witkin, Kreis \& Overholtz on several cases, three that remain unsettled. He received official notice but couldn't attend today so I'm here in his place, and $I$ just want to make sure that he doesn't receive a show cause order to appear before, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you very much, Mr. Lundy.

MR. LUNDY: Thank you.
OPERATOR: Our next question is from Ms. Jill
Owens.
MS. OWENS: Good afternoon, Judge Katz. Can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yes, I can. Thank you very much.
MS. OWENS: Very good. Yes, my name is new to the file but my firm is not. I just wanted to identify myself and make a comment. Jill Owens, Meiselman, Denlea, Packman, Carton \& Eberz. We were on the list for today's call, so I want to make sure we don't get a show cause order because I am present.

I also wanted to let The Court know that we are in a slightly different position because the case that we filed, which is called Izzy (phonetic) versus Johnson \& Johnson and others is a consumer fraud class action, not a personal injury case. That being said, I really had some discussions with Susan Sharko, and my client has authorized me to engage in some discussions with defendant's counsel about the possibility of resolving the case on an individual basis. And if, you know, and in connection with that, we've agreed to have Ms. Izzy provide the plaintiff fact sheet and medical records, and she's working on those
now. And I believe Ms. Sharko and I will, you know, I don't think we have a dispute that it may take a little bit longer than a couple days for her to get those things done, but we are providing them and we will have those
discussions. I think March 31st may be a little soon for us to finish the negotiations but we'll do our best. And if those do not bear fruit, then we would intend to proceed with our case as a -- as a class action.

THE COURT: I understand. All right. All right. And I'm sure that you and Susan Sharko will keep me posted on the progress being made.

MS. OWENS: Thank you very much, Judge Katz.
THE COURT: You're welcome.
OPERATOR: Again, as a reminder, ladies and gentlemen, if you'd like to ask a question, please press 01 on your telephone key pad. Next we have Ms. Sharko.

MS. SHARKO: Yes, just on Ms. Owens' case, I want to make it clear that it's my understanding her client made personal injury claims and a certificated consumer fraud act claim, and I have told Ms. Owen, and I want there to be no mistake about this, that our client will not resolve consumer fraud class claims. I don't think there's a basis for that, so there's discussions about resolution on her personal injury claim.

THE COURT: That's what I understood from

Ms. Owen. Also, I -- I'm not certain of the propriety of the, quote, class action consumer fraud, unquote, matter being involved in the MDL. Next question? Does that satisfy you, Ms. Sharko.

MS. SHARKO: Pardon me?
OPERATOR: Do you have any other questions?
MS. SHARKO: No. If the personal injury claim is resolved, that takes care of them. We don't need to get to any other issues.

THE COURT: That's my understanding. Thank you. OPERATOR: Thank you. Our next question is from Mr. Karl Lautz.

MR. LAUTZ: Good afternoon, Judge. Karl Lautz from Tuscon, Arizona. The case is Ferris V. Johnson \& Johnson, and I'm appearing as co-counsel for the plaintiff. My other counsel is Mr. Haralson from Haralson, Miller, Pitt, Feldman and McAnally, who I believe would be the counsel in the law firm of record on the case. I similarly wanted to make sure that there wasn't a show cause order issued for Mr. Haralson who is -- or who was not available today, and just wanted to make sure the record reflected my appearance on behalf of the plaintiff and on behalf of co-counsel, Mr. Haralson.

THE COURT: I appreciate that Mr. Lautz, and I would expect that you and others similarly situated who are
appearing on behalf of themselves and co-counsel will advise co-counsel of the content of our discussion here, and that they will be expected to comply with the orders which come forth as a result of this conference.

MR. LAUTZ: Absolutely, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. LAUTZ: Thank you.
OPERATOR: Our next question is from Mr. Stuart Kitchner.

MR. KITCHNER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Stuart Kitchner from New York, law firm of Edelman, Krasin \& Jaye, a repeated administrative manner that I'm appearing in this conference for Mr. Larry Krasin. I am an associate with the firm. Mr. Krasin is unavailable at this moment, and for the purpose of having -- for purpose of not having a no show cause order applied to our firm and our client, Corissa Steinburg, I am appearing for him for the record, for Mr. Krasin.

THE COURT: Thank you.
OPERATOR: Our next question is Mr. Justin Goodman.

MR. GOODMAN: Good afternoon, Judge Katz. Justin
Goodman for Heard, Robins, Clous, Greenwood \& Lubel in Houston. I, like several of the other callers, am appearing for Mr. Dunham Heard (phonetic) who is in the
process of getting ready for trial, so I wanted it to be clear on the record that our law firm who represents Hope Dunnaway in this manner, we only have one remaining case and that's -- we are appearing, so --

THE COURT: Very good. I appreciate that.
OPERATOR: Thank you. Our next question is from Ms. Nancy Gardner.

MS. GARDNER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This
is Nancy Gardner from Los Angeles, California. I am appearing on behalf of Khorrami, Pollard \& Abir. Like others, Your Honor, I want to make certain that you know that I've been on the call on behalf of the firm during the entirety of the conference this afternoon. Sean Khorrami is unavailable and unable to attend the conference call, and I just wanted to make sure that you know that we have been here.

THE COURT: Thank you. That will be noted.
OPERATOR: Our next question is from Ms. Janet Abaray.

MS. ABARAY: Hi, Your Honor. I thought it might be helpful if I just read out to everyone the firms who did not contact us for the dial-in information because they're listed as not participating at the moment. And if anyone is on from one of those firms, maybe they got the dial up information from someone else. I thought it might help
clarify. There's about five firms. I have the Goforth, Lewis \& Stanford firm; Alan Kirshner; the Law Offices of Joseph M. Lichtenstein; Barry Siskin, Esquire; The Singleton Law Firm, and there's a pro se litigant that I don't know how to get ahold of him frankly, Stuart Weischsel. Those are the ones that did not contact us for a number.

OPERATOR: Is anyone on this conference call representing any of those just named by Ms. Abaray? If you are one of those attorneys or counsel, please press star zero on your telephone key pad. We have several. Let's see. I have Marcus Stephenson. Go ahead, sir. I'm sorry we'll go with Ms. Susan -- well, my operators are intercepting them because that's the way to call the operator, but they will release them momentarily.

THE COURT: Thank you.
OPERATOR: In the meantime, would you like to take a question from Mr. John David Hart?

THE COURT: Certainly. Go ahead, please.
MR. HART: Good afternoon, Judge. This is John David Hart in Fort Worth, Texas. Judge, I have four cases that are pending, and I've had, over the last several months, ongoing discussions with Julie Callsen and Bob Tucker regarding resolving those cases. Those cases are, as of today, not yet resolved. My question, Judge, is will
there be a process for submitting these cases for mediation? I understand we have a shorter time frame, and as a note, I have had some conversations with Janet Abaray, and she's been very helpful in those discussions. I know I could have placed that call, but I didn't want to miss this opportunity and ask The Court that question.

THE COURT: My feeling is as follows, if there are cases at the end of the day, and by the end of the day I mean March 31, which have not been resolved but which counsel for both parties, plaintiff and defendant, feel would benefit from mediation, we will address those in an order which we'll determine, and those will be addressed through mediation.

MR. HART: Will that be -- I'm sorry, Judge. THE COURT: Go ahead, please.

MR. HART: Thank you, Your Honor. Will that be then we'll have an opportunity soon following the 31st, if necessary, to submit that to The Court?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HART: Thank you, Your Honor, I appreciate it very much.

THE COURT: My pleasure. Next we will have Mr. Mark Stevens who was in the process of not -- Marcus Stephenson, who was in the process of answering the question earlier. Go ahead, sir.

MR. STEPHENSON: Can you hear me, Your Honor?
THE COURT: That's all right. Good afternoon.
MR. STEPHENSON: This is Marcus Stephenson calling from Houston. I'm calling on behalf of the Law Firm of Goforth, Lewis and Sanford. It's listed as Stanford. We have one case that remains, and so I'm calling in on behalf of that case.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. It will be noted.

OPERATOR: As a reminder, ladies and gentlemen, if you are representing any of the individuals The Judge mentions, please press star zero.

Next we have Ms. Susan Sharko. Go ahead, please.
MS. SHARKO: Your Honor, Mr. Weichsel called me right before the call, $I$ gave him the call-in number. I don't know if he's on the call, but I did hear from him.

THE COURT: All right. So he will not be marked as absent if he is on the call. If he is not, is there any reason that he should not be?

MS. SHARKO: Leave to Your Honor's discretion.
THE COURT: I mean, but he did have the number from you?

MS. SHARKO: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. If you are, Mr. Weichsel, on the call, please dial in now.

OPERATOR: He is indeed, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Good. Mr. Weichsel, please go ahead.

MR. WEICHSEL: Hi, this is Stuart Weichsel, I just wanted to confirm that, yes, I'm on the call, got the information from Ms. Sharko this afternoon.

THE COURT: I'm very pleased. Thank you very much. The less number of orders that go out, the happier we Judges are. Thank you, sir.

MR. WEICHSEL: I assume it would be appropriate to follow up on this matter individually after the call?

THE COURT: Fine.
OPERATOR: Next we have Mr. Mark Conchin
(phonetic), go ahead, sir. Mr. Conchin, please unmute yourself.

MR. CAPATIC: Your Honor, it's Brian Capatic (phonetic) appearing. My associate, Mark Conchin started the call and I just came in five minutes late so $I$ just wanted my appearance noted.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.
MR. CAPATIC: Thank you, Your Honor.
OPERATOR: Again, if you are representing or are counsel for any of the individuals mentioned by Judge Katz, please press star zero.

In the meantime, sir, would you like to take more
questions?
THE COURT: Yes, that's fine.
OPERATOR: Next we have Mr. Jason Webster.
MR. WEBSTER: No question, Your Honor. It was answered. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Webster. I have Mr. Alan Kirshner.

MR. KIRSHNER: Good afternoon, Your Honor, and I'm calling from beautiful Toledo, Ohio where it's 24 degrees, it's windy, and while I'm with you by telephone, I wish I were with you in Florida.

THE COURT: I don't think today you would want to be here. There has been nothing but darkness all day.

MR. KIRSHNER: Well, enjoy your time there, sir.
THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Kirshner.
OPERATOR: As a quick reminder, ladies and gentlemen, 01 on your telephone key pad if you have a question. Once again, 01 on your telephone key pads if you have a question.

Sir, I do not believe there is anyone else seeking on behalf of any individuals you mentioned, and it looks like we have no further questions at this time.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, I wanted to thank you for taking the time on short notice to attend this conference call. I appreciate it. I wish for
you that it bears fruit, and that these matters will be resolved. And if not, we will move forward as I've outlined, and I'm sure we'll be in touch again.

Janet, if you need to talk afterwards, please call me, and the same with Bob and Susan or Julie.

Thanks very much all. This ends the call, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for joining us in this conference today. Have a great evening. OPERATOR: Your Honor, we are clear.
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|  |  | 3/6 17/17 20/2 |
|  | ladies [9] 3/1 3/11 5/11 9/15 13/14 19/10 | mechanical [1] $2 / 22$ |
|  | 21/16 21/23 22/6 | mediate [1] 10/10 |
|  | Larry [2] 1/19 15/13 | mediation [3] 18/2 18/11 18/13 |
|  | last [2] 8/18 17/22 | medical [1] 12/25 |
|  | late [2] 8/3 20/18 | 11/4 1 |
|  | Lautz [4] 1/21 14/12 14/13 14/24 | [1] 12/11 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Leave [1] 19/20 |  |
|  | Lee [1] 1/23 | ntioned [2] 20/23 21/21 |


| M Case: 1:06-cv-40000-DAK ${ }^{\text {Q }}$ | NC \#: 354 Filed: 03/13/09 27 | фбv2e[1] PageID \#: <br> Overholtz [1] 11/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|lll} \hline \text { mentions [1] 19/12 } \\ \text { method [1] } 4 / 9 \\ \text { Michael [4] 1/16 } & 1 / 18 & 2 / 13 \\ 5 / 23 \end{array}$ | name [1] 12/9 <br> named [1] 17/9 <br> names [3] 5/20 5/25 6/3 | Owen [2] 13/20 14/1 Owens [3] 2/1 12/5 12/11 Owens' [1] 13/17 |
| Michael [4] 1/16 1/18 2/13 5/23 Middle [1] 10/9 | names [3] 5/20 5/25 6/3 |  |
| might [4] $9 / 2411 / 616 / 2016 / 25 ~$ | $\text { nature [1] } 8 / 11$ | P |
| Mike [1] 5/22 | necessary [5] 4/17 4/17 4/23 5/20 18/18 | Packman [1] 12/12 |
| Miller [1] 14/16 | need [4] 3/20 8/13 14/8 22/4 | pad [5] 9/17 9/18 13/16 17/11 21/17 |
| mind [2] 5/21 5/25 | negotiations [4] 4/4 5/1 5/2 13/6 | pads [1] 21/18 |
| Minikin [1] 1/14 | new [4] 5/23 5/24 12/9 15/11 | pages [2] 6/21 6/22 |
| minutes [1] 20/18 | next [15] 6/7 10/4 11/16 12/4 13/16 14/3 | Palm [2] 6/6 10/1 |
| miss [1] 18/5 | 14/11 15/8 15/20 16/6 16/18 18/22 19/13 | Pardon [1] 14/5 |
| misstated [2] 3/25 7/6 | Nixon [3] 2/19 23/6 23/8 |  |
| mistake [1] 13/21 |  | parties [1] 18/10 |
| Mitch [1] 1/20 | 21/22 | pending [2] 10/9 17/22 |
| mode [1] 3/4 | nom | people [2] 3/13 8/24 |
| moment [3] 7/2 15/14 16/23 | nomination [1] 4/9 | period [1] 8/4 |
| momentarily [1] 17/15 | NORTHERN [1] 1/1 | permit [1] 7/4 |
| Mona [5] 3/117/2 $7 / 9$ 9/14 10/18 |  | permitting [1] 7/3 |
| months [1] 17/23 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { noted [3] } & 16 / 17 \\ \text { 19/9 20/19 }\end{array}$ |  |
| more [2] 11/6 20/25 | notereading [1] 2/23 | pharmacology [1] 8/12 |
| most [1] 9/4 | nothing [1] 21/13 | Philippa [1] 1/18 |
| motion [1] 8/19 | notice [2] 11/22 21/24 | Phillips [1] 9/21 |
| motions ${ }^{2}$ [3] 4/14 4/2 move [2] | $\text { November } 2005 \text { [1] 8/5 }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phone [4] 1/6 1/9 8/17 10/18 } \\ & \text { phonetic [4]_12/17 15/25 20/14 } 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mr. [33] | now [7] 3/14 7/2 7/17 9/1 10/25 13/1 19/25 | Pitt [1] 14/17 |
| Mr. Alan [1] 21/7 | now's [1] 8/24 | place [1] 11/23 |
| Mr. Bob [1] 10/4 | number [5] 8/10 17/7 19/15 19/21 20/8 | placed [1] 18/5 |
| Mr. Conchin [1] 20/14 | O | plaintiff [6] 4/10 6/23 12/24 14/15 14/22 |
|  |  |  |
| Mr. Dunham [1] 15/25 | observations [1] | Plaintiffs [2] 1/4 1/13 |
| Mr. Gallagher's [1] $8 / 17$ | ob | plaintiffs' [4] 3/184/5 |
| Mr. Haralson [3] 14/16 14/20 14/23 | occurred [2] $7 / 258 / 1$ | 3/671477 |
| Mr. John [1] 17/18 | Official [1] 11/22 | 13/15 20/14 20/24 22/4 20/2 19/13 |
| Mr. Justin [1] 15/20 | Oh [1] 7/16 | pleased [1] 20/7 |
| Mr. Karl [1] 14/12 | OHIO[5] 1/1 1/4 2/20 10/1 21/9 | pleasure [1] 18/22 |
| Mr. Kirshner [1] 21/15 | Okay [2] 19/24 20/2 | Plymale [1] 2/2 |
| Mr. Krasin [2] 15/14 15/18 | old [1] 3/15 | point [3] 3/19 8/13 8/16 |
| Mr. Larry [1] 15/13 | older [1] 3/16 | Pollard [1] 16/10 |
| Mr. Lautz [1] 14/24 | omitted [1] 7/6 | position [2] 9/25 12/16 |
| Mr. Lowell [1] 9/18 | on [69] | possibility [1] 12/22 |
| Mr. Lundy [1] 12/2 | Once [2] 9/17 21/18 | post [6] 6/5 6/10 6/12 7/23 8/4 9/7 |
| Mr. Mark [2] 18/23 20/13 | one [7] 10/8 10/12 10/13 16/3 16/24 17/10 | post-label [3] 6/5 6/10 6/12 |
| Mr. Matthew [1] 11/17 |  | posted [1] 13/10 |
| Mr. Stuart [1] 15/8 | ones [1] 17/6 | pre [7] 3/22 4/3 4/25 5/14 7/23 8/23 9/6 |
| Mr. Tucker [2] 7/117/13 | ongoing [2] 5/2 17/23 only [4] 3/4 4/17 10/8 16/3 | pre-label [7] $9 / 6$ 3/22 4/3 4/25 5/14 7/23 8/2 |
| Mr. Weichsel [3] 19/14 19/25 20/2 | open [4] 3/23 7/2 7/9 7/10 | preaching [1] 5/11 |
| Ms. [18] 7/11 7/14 10/8 10/17 12/4 12/24 | openly [1] 4/22 | preparing [1] 8/7 |
| 13/1 13/16 13/17 13/20 14/1 14/4 16/7 | operator [2] 3/7 17/15 | present [2] 9/22 12/14 |
| 16/18 17/9 17/13 19/13 20/6 | operators [1] 17/13 | press [6] 3/6 9/16 13/15 17/10 19/12 20/24 |
| Ms. Abaray [3] 7/11 7/14 17/9 | opinion [1] 6/20 | previous [1] 4/19 |
| Ms. Izzy [1] $12 / 24$ Ms. Janet [1] 16/18 | opportunity [2] 18/6 18/17 or [27] | previously [1] 5/8 prior [1] $7 / 25$ |
| Ms. Jill [1] 12/4 | order [8] 6/7 6/15 6/16 11/24 12/14 14/19 | pro [1] 17/4 |
| Ms. Nancy [1] 16/7 | 15/16 18/12 | probably [1] 9/4 |
| Ms. Owen [2] 13/20 14/1 | orders [3] 6/18 15/3 20/8 | proceed [1] $13 / 7$ |
| Ms. Owens' [1] 13/17 | ORTHO [2] 1/3 3/2 | proceedings [2] 2/22 23/4 |
| Ms. Sharko [6] 10/8 10/17 13/1 13/16 14/4 20/6 | other [8] 3/18 4/25 6/11 8/6 14/6 14/9 14/16 15/24 | process [4] 16/1 18/1 18/23 18/24 produced [1] 2/23 |
| Ms. Susan [2] 17/13 19/13 | others [7] 5/18 6/3 6/4 9/24 12/18 14/25 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { product's [1] } & 3 / 2 \\ \text { product }\end{array}$ |
| much [13] $3 / 153 / 163 / 209 / 29 / 14$ 12/1 | 16/11 | progress [2] 3/17 13/11 |
| 12/8 13/12 18/21 19/8 20/8 21/6 22/6 | Otherwise [1] 9/10 | propriety [1] 14/1 |
| Muhlstock [1] 2/3 must [1] 4/21 | our [22] 3/8 6/6 7/22 8/23 9/12 9/18 10/4 10/10 11/16 12/4 13/6 13/8 13/21 14/11 | provide [1] 12/24 providing [1] 13/4 |
| my [14] 9/24 12/9 12/10 12/20 13/1814/10 | 15/2 15/8 15/16 15/16 15/20 16/2 16/6 | PSC [2] 3/18 5/9 |
| 14/16 14/21 17/13 17/25 18/7 18/22 20/17 20/19 <br> myself [1] 12/11 | 16/18 <br> out [6] 3/19 4/1 6/7 10/9 16/21 20/8 | purpose [2] 15/15 15/15 purposefully [1] 6/20 [2] $6 / 248 / 2$ |




