1 THE COURT: Good morning. MS. FULMER: Good morning. 2 3 This is Brenda Fulmer. 4 **THE COURT:** Okay. Let me set the stage, and then 5 I'll seek introductions here. This is our Cause Number 12MD2391, MDL Docket Number 6 7 2391, In Re: Biomet M2a-Magnum Hip Implant Products Liability 8 Litigation. 9 We are gathered by telephone, wisely not an in-person conference, as it turns out, given our weather here, and we are 10 11 gathered by phone for our periodic status conference. 12 Now, if I could ask you folks to state your 13 appearances for the record, please. 14 MS. FULMER: Brenda Fulmer, on behalf of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Fulmer. 16 17 MS. FULMER: Good morning. 18 THE COURT: Are you the only one? MR. DIAB: Ahmed Diab, on behalf of the Plaintiffs' 19 Steering Committee. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Diab. 21 22 Anybody else? 23 MS. HANIG: Erin Hanig and John LaDue, on behalf of 24 Defendants. 25 MR. WINTER: Good morning, Your Honor.

Page 1

John Winter, on behalf of Biomet. 1 2 THE COURT: Mr. Winter. 3 Do we anticipate anybody further for the Steering 4 Committee, other than Ms. Fulmer and Mr. Diab? MS. FULMER: I don't believe so, Your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: Okay. We don't have a very long agenda so I'll go ahead and start down through the copy that I have 7 8 and let you folks speak up. 9 (Telephone interruption.) THE COURT: Who has just joined? 10 11 (No response.) THE COURT: Hello. 12 13 (No response.) 14 **THE COURT:** Okay. The first item on the agenda is 15 active case count. 16 Ms. Hanig, you're usually the person who speaks to 17 that so let me start with you. 18 (Telephone interruption.) THE COURT: I think we may have fallen apart here on 19 the conference call. 20 21 Are you there, Ms. Hanig? 22 MS. HANIG: Can you hear me, Judge? 23 THE COURT: Yes, I can now. 24 MS. HANIG: You can hear me? Okay. 25 Okay. So the current number of cases that we have as

1	unsettled is right around 300. The exact number is 303 on my
2	list. However, we're close to resolving a fair number of those
3	so what we would do is propose to give you an updated and
4	complete pending list before the next case management
5	conference so you can see exactly what's left.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	MS. HANIG: The other thing is, I communicated with
8	Jen Darrah, in the Clerk's Office, yesterday, and, by her
9	count, the CM-ECF pending number is 443, so we're getting close
10	to reconciling the number of pending to the number actually on
11	the docket, so that's a good sign.
12	THE COURT: Okay. I think it was day before
13	yesterday, I think, quite a few dismissals made it to the
14	docket entry. I don't know if that 443 is before or after
15	those, but
16	MS. HANIG: It's after.
17	THE COURT: After?
18	MS. HANIG: It's after about 88 dismissals.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Do those numbers come reasonably
20	close to what the Plaintiffs figure, Ms. Fulmer or Mr. Diab?
21	MS. FULMER: Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Discovery update, who wants to
23	speak to that?
24	MS. HANIG: So, Your Honor, I'll take that one, from
25	the Defendant's side.
-	

	*
1	Just to give you an update, we are nearly complete
2	with all of Group 2 discovery. There are a handful, I would
3	say maybe 10, of Group 2 cases where physician depositions have
4	not been able to get scheduled before December 26th, in every
5	instance because of the lack of cooperation from a physician's
6	office, so we have informally agreed to extend the Group 2
7	deadline in those cases for the sole purpose of completing
8	those depositions. Some of those physicians are going to have
9	to be under subpoena. We anticipate they will all be completed
10	by mid-January.
11	And my question to you is: Would you like us to file
12	a formal motion for extension in those cases or are you okay
13	with us operating under the understanding, in those cases, that
14	both parties are okay with the extension for that sole purpose?
15	THE COURT: My thought would be that, given the fact
16	that we've got a lot of Plaintiffs' attorneys out there who are
17	keeping up I know Ms. Fulmer is doing her best to keep
18	everybody updated, but given the fact that we also have some
19	checking the dockets periodically, it might be helpful to if
20	you want to submit a stipulation, obviously I'll be happy to
21	approve it, but it would probably be a good thing to get on
22	record.
23	MS. HANIG: Okay. So we'll do that in the individual
24	cases that need extensions.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Group 3 case list is next on the

1 agenda. MR. WINTER: Your Honor, John Winter. 2 3 After this Group 3 list was submitted to you, it was 4 brought to the attention of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and Biomet that there were two cases which initially were 5 entered into the parties' respective systems as spoliation 6 7 cases, and it turns out an amended fact sheet had been served 8 indicating where an explanted device was --9 THE COURT: Uh-huh. MR. WINTER: -- and that was the reason those two 10 11 cases had not made Group 3, so it is the consensus of the 12 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and Biomet that those two cases 13 that are on the agenda really should be part of Group 3. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Fulmer, Mr. Diab, anything to 15 add on that one? MS. FULMER: No. That is correct, Your Honor. 16 We 17 would like these two cases added to the Group 3 list. 18 THE COURT: Okay. I think I can do that, just including it in the order summarizing today's conference, 19 rather than do anything separate, since we've got the cause 20 21 numbers, so I'll go ahead and include that here. 22 The next one --23 Thank you, Your Honor. MS. FULMER: 24 THE COURT: The next one is one that I want to throw something out, too, but I want to hear from you folks, first. 25

The Lone Pine order did go out yesterday for the
pro se litigants. And I think everybody knows, but let me
state for the record, it was slowed down some by us trying to
figure out how exactly to do an order for the pro se Plaintiffs
and the metal-on-polyethylene Plaintiffs, and, finally, we
split it. The order that went out yesterday was just for the
pro ses because it was very hard to do an explanation as to why
we were doing it for the represented Plaintiffs in the MOP
cases. So that's still out there as to what we're going to do.
What I was going to throw out as a question to you
folks it appears we've got five of them. It appears that
four of them were direct files. The fifth came out of
South Carolina, was transferred here by the Panel in
Conditional Transfer Order Number 93. The Panel did not
formally expand the scope of this docket to include anything
other than metal-on-metal.
I know, when I was on the Panel, I was concerned
about the unintended expansion of the scope of dockets by
unopposed CTOs because those things can happen for any reason,
and I guess my question to you folks is whether these cases
really belong in our docket. If they do, that's fine; I'm
happy to keep them. But, if not, whether it would be better to
enter an order inviting everybody to show cause why I shouldn't
suggest remand to the Panel and then send them off, either
where they would have been filed originally or back to South

Carolina.
I guess, since the Defendant probably filed the or
probably notified the Panel maybe not. I don't know how it
got into the CTO. But does anybody wish to speak to that or
have better ideas? This isn't anything I'm wedded to. I guess
I'll start with the Plaintiff.
Ms. Fulmer.
MS. FULMER: Your Honor, I think yes, Your Honor.
The Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, I believe we've argued in
past hearings that we really needed to keep this MDL limited to
the cases for which we're actually seeking active discovery, so
the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee would be very much in
support of these cases being remanded back because we believe
they really should not have been included in the MDL from the
inception.
THE COURT: Okay. What's Biomet's view?
MR. WINTER: Your Honor, when we did the master
settlement in this MDL two years ago, there were, I'm going to
guess, Your Honor, about a hundred metal-on-poly cases
THE COURT: Oh.
MR. WINTER: that was specifically covered by the
Master Settlement Agreement. So for people to have filed
cases, got them to the MDL, gotten the benefits of that
resolution, for those who filed before, whether direct filing
or that one case from South Carolina, to, at this point, say,

-	
1	"Okay. Remand our cases," when we're at a point where we think
2	we can efficiently deal with these five cases, rather than have
3	five individual cases, you know, it's we think now this is
4	gamesmanship as to what people do in an end game in an MDL. I
5	mean, my colleagues on the other side always want an MDL for
6	certain reasons. Then there's efficiency that kicks in, and
7	everyone understands that there's a benefit to the system for
8	having you efficiently deal with all the cases that were filed.
9	And for them now to say, "Okay. Remand them," which makes this
10	inefficient for us, meaning Biomet, we think the Lone Pine
11	order that actually everyone had agreed to up until, you know,
12	three minutes ago, Your Honor, is what you should enter.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Well, I want to clarify. It's not
14	the Plaintiffs in the MOP cases that are proposing remand.
15	That was me.
16	MR. WINTER: No, no. I understand that, Your Honor.
17	I apologize.
18	THE COURT: I think I was afraid I was misunderstood
19	because you thought it might be gamesmanship, and I can
20	understand that position, but I don't think we've heard
21	anything from them, much less any attempt to gain the system.
22	Okay. Well, the cases on you folks put the case
23	on the agenda. Was there anything you were going to propose or
24	simply want to raise the status of the Lone Pine order with
25	respect to those?

MR. WINTER: Your Honor, John Winter.
I think we put it on the agenda just to make sure
that, you know, it was discussed. We thought we had an
agreement with the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee as to the
Lone Pine order for the pro ses and for the metal-on-poly
cases.
THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me go back over what's
been proposed then. And if I don't have agreement from you
folks, then I think it might be inappropriate to go to a
suggested remanded at this point. I'll try to get out the Lone
Pine order handling it separately. The reason I broke it off
is I was afraid I was going to confuse people representing
themselves as to who these other people were and that sort of
thing, so I'll try to put together a separate order for the MOP
Plaintiffs and get that out in the next few days.
MS. FULMER: Your Honor, may I speak, just to clarify
the PSC's position, with respect to this particular issue?
THE COURT: Sure, please.
MS. FULMER: We engaged in good-faith discussions
with Biomet, and we are not you know, if the Court chooses
to go down the path of a Lone Pine order for the metal-on-poly
cases, then we have not, in any way, backed off from the
agreement that we've already reached with Biomet.
Today, though, for the first time, since you threw
out the option of remand, certainly I feel it's our obligation

to say, you know, we believe that that is, perhaps, a better
solution than a Lone Pine order, but we have not, in any way,
changed our position with regard to the agreement that we
reached with Biomet with regard to the language of the Lone
Pine order on the metal-on-poly cases.
THE COURT: Okay. And that's how I understood it.
Thank you for the clarification.
For the last few weeks, I've been struggling with how
to do this in such a way that it wouldn't confuse pro se
Plaintiffs who are already getting something they might have
trouble understanding any way, and then started wondering
whether the MOP cases belong here. I had forgotten that we had
a bunch of them to start with and so I'm happy to continue with
what you folks had agreed to, except breaking them into two
orders.
Pending motions. I know we have the motion to
enforce settlement agreement. I think Mr. Ward had indicated,
at our last conference, that he was going to look into
withdrawing that and approaching it differently.
Does anybody know Ms. Fulmer or Mr. Diab, are you
able to speak to that?
MR. DIAB: Your Honor, Ahmed Diab.
I'm not able to speak to that, but I believe Alex
Davis, from Mr. Ward's office, may be on the line.
THE COURT: Speak up, if you are.

Page 11

1	(No response.)
2	THE COURT: Okay. Well
3	LAW CLERK POTTS: I don't think he can, Judge.
4	MR. DIAB: Your Honor, let me do this: I'm just
5	going to open up the lines, just to see, because he may be
б	muted, so bear with me one second here.
7	(Discussion held off the record.)
8	MR. DAVIS: Good morning, Your Honor.
9	This is Alex Davis.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Davis.
11	MR. DAVIS: Good morning.
12	We continue to work with we continue to work with
13	both doctors involved in that motion to obtain proposed dates
14	for the depositions, and we're making progress.
15	(Discussion held off the record.)
16	THE COURT: Sir, Mr. Davis, hold on just a moment.
17	There was some background noise. Let me ask you to start over.
18	MR. DAVIS: Sure, no problem.
19	On behalf of the Plaintiff in question, the Harris
20	Plaintiff, we are continuing to work with both doctors in
21	Germany and Hawaii to obtain dates.
22	And I just e-mailed with Erin and other counsel for
23	Biomet yesterday on this topic, so we're moving forward slowly.
24	There is a language issue in Germany, but we're making
25	progress, and we will update the Court accordingly.
1	

1	THE COURT: Okay. It may be a different case
2	MS. HANIG: Judge, this
3	THE COURT: Let me just inquire of Mr. Davis.
4	MS. HANIG: Yes.
5	THE COURT: We show it as the Hix case. 14CV619 is
6	the one we talked about at the last conference that Mr. Ward
7	was going to look into withdrawing the motion to enforce
8	settlement agreement, so I think you may be talking about one
9	of the Group 2 cases.
10	Do you know anything about that?
11	MR. DAVIS: Oh, I'm sorry.
12	THE COURT: That's okay.
13	Do you know anything about the Hix case?
14	MR. DAVIS: I do not, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then, depending on how
16	far down the road we set our next conference, I may enter an
17	order to Mr. Ward to indicate whether he intends to continue
18	with that motion, just so we know and can handle it, one way or
19	another.
20	But thank you, Mr. Davis. I appreciate your
21	willingness to clarify.
22	MR. DAVIS: Sure.
23	I don't think the Hix case is our case.
24	THE COURT: You don't think so? Well, maybe Mr. Ward
25	was going to be checking with the Plaintiff in that case.
-	

Page 13 DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF DECEMBER 15, 2016 HEARING Okay. Well, we'll just leave it there for the moment. 1 2 Somebody was about to speak, and I wanted to rephrase 3 my question to Mr. Davis. 4 Ms. Hanig, were you trying to say something? MS. HANIG: Yes, Judge, it was me, and I was just 5 going to clarify that the Hix case is Navan Ward's case. 6 And Alex Davis is from a different firm, and he and I 7 8 and Ryan Edwards have talked about scheduling the depositions 9 in Harris, and that's moving. And I think you're correct, that in order to get an 10 11 answer about **Hix**, we need feedback from Mr. Navan Ward's firm. 12 THE COURT: All right. Then we'll see what we can 13 do. The other items are that there are nine 14 statute-of-limitations, motion-for-summary-judgment, and six 15 spoliation motions. I think they're all ripe, except there's a 16 17 pending motion for leave to file a second amended complaint in the Miles case out of Florida, which is one of the 18 statute-of-limitations cases. But I think they're ripe, and 19 we're working on them, and my hope would be to have a ruling 20 out before our next conference in all of those cases. 21 22 Normally, I would invite oral argument, but I think 23 it might be pretty awkward to have oral argument in 15 cases, 24 so my plan is to just try to get rulings out as quickly as

25 possible and, hopefully, have them all resolved by the time we

are together next. 1 2 Is that acceptable to the Plaintiffs or do you have a 3 different proposal? 4 MS. FULMER: Your Honor, that's acceptable to the Plaintiffs. 5 THE COURT: Okay. And for Biomet? 6 7 MR. WINTER: Acceptable to Biomet, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Other than picking a date for our 9 next conference, it looks like we're through this agenda. Did anybody have anything further that didn't get on 10 11 the agenda that we need to talk about? 12 MS. FULMER: Nothing, on behalf of the Plaintiffs, 13 Your Honor. 14 **THE COURT:** Okay. I was looking for a date six or seven weeks down the road. Number one, I don't want you to 15 fight your way into weather like this. I think Mr. LaDue and 16 17 Ms. Hanig can tell you that this is not a good day to be traveling around in South Bend so far. But then I noticed that 18 February 27th, on the current deadline, we are to confer 19 regarding management of the remaining cases, and so I guess I 20 would propose a conference on the morning of February 27th to 21 address that and also to see where the dust fell after the 22 23 rulings come out on the statute-of-limitations and spoliation 24 motions. 25 Would that date work for everybody?

 Ms. Fulmer and Mr. Diab? Ms. FULMER: It's acceptable for the Plaintiffs, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. And for the Defense, Mr. Winter, Ms. Hanig, Mr. LaDue? MR. WINTER: Works for us, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. We'll show a status conference at 9:30, and we can do our pre-conference meeting at 9:00. I think that covers everything that I've got. Anything further for the Steering Committee? Ms. FULMER: No, Your Honor. 	
 Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. And for the Defense, Mr. Winter, Ms. Hanig, Mr. LaDue? MR. WINTER: Works for us, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. We'll show a status conference a 9:30, and we can do our pre-conference meeting at 9:00. I think that covers everything that I've got. Anything further for the Steering Committee? 	
 THE COURT: Okay. And for the Defense, Mr. Winter, Ms. Hanig, Mr. LaDue? MR. WINTER: Works for us, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. We'll show a status conference a 9:30, and we can do our pre-conference meeting at 9:00. I think that covers everything that I've got. Anything further for the Steering Committee? 	
5 Ms. Hanig, Mr. LaDue? 6 MR. WINTER: Works for us, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. We'll show a status conference at 9:30, and we can do our pre-conference meeting at 9:00. 9 I think that covers everything that I've got. 10 Anything further for the Steering Committee?	
 6 MR. WINTER: Works for us, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. We'll show a status conference a 8 9:30, and we can do our pre-conference meeting at 9:00. 9 I think that covers everything that I've got. 10 Anything further for the Steering Committee? 	
7 THE COURT: Okay. We'll show a status conference a 8 9:30, and we can do our pre-conference meeting at 9:00. 9 I think that covers everything that I've got. 10 Anything further for the Steering Committee?	
 8 9:30, and we can do our pre-conference meeting at 9:00. 9 I think that covers everything that I've got. 10 Anything further for the Steering Committee? 	
9 I think that covers everything that I've got. 10 Anything further for the Steering Committee?	ιt
10 Anything further for the Steering Committee?	
11 MS. FULMER: No, Your Honor.	
12 THE COURT: Or for Biomet?	
13 MR. WINTER: No, Your Honor.	
14 Happy holidays.	
15 THE COURT: And to you. Stay warm.	
16 Thank you, folks.	
17 (Proceedings concluded.)	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	