

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION**

IN RE: BIOMET M2a MAGNUM HIP
IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION (MDL 2391)

Cause No. 3:12-MD-2391

This Document Relates to All Cases

**PLAINTIFFS' STEERING COMMITTEE'S MOTION
FOR INTERIM COMMON BENEFIT FEE AND EXPENSE FUNDS**

1. Plaintiffs, by and through Plaintiffs' Executive Committee and Plaintiffs' Steering Committee (collectively "PSC II"), hereby respectfully move the Court for an Interim Common Benefit Fund Order.
2. Due to the nature and current state of this litigation, and in light of the recent termination of the duties of the prior Plaintiffs' Executive Committee and Plaintiffs' Steering Committee (collectively "PSC I"), PSC II requests the entry of an Interim Common Benefit Fund Order. PSC II's proposed order is attached as Exhibit A.
3. This request is in accordance with this Court's prior Case Management Order No. 3, dated May 27, 2015, which states: "FUNDING FOR PSC II. I anticipate that a new common benefit fund order will need to be entered soon after PSC II is able to acquaint itself with the cases remaining in this docket. I invite PSC II to submit a proposed common fund order before September 1, 2015."
4. This Interim Order will maintain the existing percentages of fees and expenses that were previously ordered for PSC I. Additionally, PSC II has already spoken with Garretson

Resolution Group to implement a procedure for finalizing settlements covered by this Common Benefit Fund Order that is consistent with the procedures followed by PSC I.

5. Entry of this Interim Common Benefit Fund Order will assist during the leadership transition from PSC I to PSC II, and is necessary for maintaining the efficient handling of this litigation.
6. The requested Common Benefit Order is intended to be interim, and future changes or modifications may become necessary. PSC II reserves the right to request such changes or modifications at a later date.

Dated: August 27, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Navan Ward Jr.

Navan Ward Jr.
BEASLEY ALLEN CROW METHVIN
PORTIS & MILES, P.C.
218 Commerce Street
Montgomery, AL 36103
Telephone: (334) 269-2343
Fax: (334) 954-7555
Email: navan.ward@beasleyallen.com

/s/ Brenda S. Fulmer

Brenda S. Fulmer
SEARCY DENNEY SCAROLA BARNHART
& SHIPLEY, PA
2139 Palm Lakes Blvd.
West Palm Beach, FL 33409
Telephone: (561) 686-6300
Fax: (561) 383-9498
Email: bsf@searcylaw.com

Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel

Ahmed Diab
GOMEZ TRIAL ATTORNEYS
655 West Broadway, Suite 1700
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 237-3490
Fax: (619) 237-3496
Email: adiab@gomeztrialattorneys.com

Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel

Justin Presnal
FISHER BOYD JOHNSON & HUGUENARD LLP
2777 Allen Parkway, 14th Floor
Houston, TX 77019
Telephone: (713) 400-4000
Fax: (713) 400-4027
Email: justinp@fisherboyd.com

Plaintiffs' Executive Committee

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 27, 2015, the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which provided electronic service upon all counsel of record.

/s/ Navan Ward Jr.
Navan Ward Jr.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION**

IN RE: BIOMET M2a MAGNUM HIP
IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION (MDL 2391)

Cause No. 3:12-MD-2391

This Document Relates to All Cases

INTERIM CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER
GOVERNING COMMON BENEFIT FEE AND EXPENSE FUNDS

I. SCOPE OF ORDER

Due to the nature and current state of this particular litigation, and in light of the impending termination of the duties of Plaintiffs' Executive Committee 1 ("PEC 1") and Plaintiff's Steering Committee 1 ("PSC 1"), this Order is entered to provide for the fair and equitable sharing among plaintiffs, and their counsel, of the burden of services performed and expenses incurred by attorneys action for the common benefit of all plaintiffs in this complex litigation moving forward; i.e., the recently appointed Plaintiffs' Executive and Steering Committee 2 ("PEC 2" and "PSC 2", respectively).

The purpose of this Interim Case Management Order Governing Common Benefit Fee and Expense Funds (the "Interim Order") is to implement a temporary order concerning the common benefit fees and funds due from those cases resolved during the time frame following the termination of PSC 1 pursuant to the Master Settlement Agreement. The Interim Order shall be superseded by an Order to be implemented following the Case Management Conference scheduled for September 3rd, 2015.

A. Governing Principles – The Common Benefit Doctrine

The governing principles are derived from the United States Supreme Court's common benefit doctrine, as established in *Trustees v. Greenough*, 105 U.S. 527 (1881); refined in, *inter alia*, *Central Railroad & Banking Co. v. Pettus*, 113 U.S. 116 (1884); *Sprague v. Ticonic National Bank*, 307 U.S. 161 (1939); *Mills v. Electric Auto-Lite Co.*, 396 U.S. 375 (1970); *Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert*, 444 U.S. 472 (1980); and approved and implemented in the MDL context, in *inter alia*, *In re MGM Grand Hotel Fire Litigation*, 660 F.Supp. 522, 525-29 (D. Nev. 1987); and *In re Air Crash Disaster at Florida Everglades on December 29, 1972*, 549 F.2d 1006, 1019-21 (5th Cir. 1977).

B. Application

This Order applies to all cases now pending, later filed in, transferred to, or removed to, this Court and treated as part of the coordinated proceeding known as *In Re: Biomet M2a Magnum Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2391. This Order further applies to all cases settled after Funding Report #17 and applies to all plaintiffs' attorneys who represent clients, who have cases now pending in, or later filed in, transferred to, or removed to, this Court and state courts.

C. Participating Counsel

Participating Counsel include all members of Plaintiffs' Executive Committee 2 ("PEC 2"), PSC 2 and Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel as appointed in this Court's Appointment of Plaintiffs' Executive Committee and Liaison Counsel Order dated June 30, 2015, and Appointment of Jasper Ward to PSC 2 dated July 14, 2015. Participating Counsel further includes any other plaintiffs' attorneys who have Hip Implant cases pending against Biomet in the MDL and/or in state courts and who settle one or more cases pursuant to the Settlement

Agreement between Biomet, Inc. and PEC 2 for *In Re: Biomet M2a Magnum Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2391.

Participating Counsel are entitled to receive the “Common Benefit Work Product” as previously defined in the Case Management Order Regarding Management of Timekeeping, Cost Reimbursement and Related Common Benefit Issues, filed on July 18, 2013. “Common Benefit Work Product” does not include trial or hearing transcripts, deposition transcripts of defendants’ or third-party witnesses or exhibits attached thereto, nor does it include the actual documents/images of documents produced by defendants in response to discovery requests or the discovery requests themselves.

The Court recognizes the jurisdictional rights and obligations of the state courts to conduct their state court litigation as they so determine and that the state court litigations include counsel who are Participating Counsel. This Order shall not be cited by Participating Counsel in any other court in support of a position that adversely impacts the jurisdictional rights and obligations of the state courts and state court Participating Counsel.

II. PLAINTIFFS’ LITIGATION FEE AND EXPENSE FUNDS

A. Establishing the Fee and Cost Funds

By subsequent Order of this Court, and in light of the pending termination of PSC 1, the Court will appoint a qualified certified public accountant (the “CPA”) who is directed to establish two new interest-bearing accounts to receive and disburse funds as provided in this Order (the “Funds”). The first fund shall be designated the “Biomet Hip Common Benefit Attorneys’ Fee Fund” and the second shall be designated the “Biomet Hip Common Benefit Cost Fund.” These funds will be held subject to the direction of this Court.

The CPA shall serve as Escrow Agent over the Funds and keep detailed records of all deposits and withdrawals and to prepare tax returns and other tax filings in connection with the Funds. Such subsequent Order appointing the CPA shall specify the hourly rates to be charged by the CPA and for the CPA's assistants, who shall be utilized where appropriate to control costs. The CPA shall submit quarterly detailed bills to the Court and to Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel, Brenda Fulmer. Upon approval by the Court, the CPA's bills shall be paid from the Biomet Hip Common Benefit Expense Fund. Brenda Fulmer shall provide a copy of this Order to the CPA.

1. Gross Monetary Recovery

Gross monetary recovery includes any and all amounts paid to plaintiffs' counsel by Defendants through a settlement or pursuant to a judgment. In measuring the "gross monetary recovery," the parties are to (a) exclude court costs that are to be paid by the defendant; (b) include any payments to be made by the defendant on an intervention asserted by third-parties, such as to physicians, hospitals, and other healthcare providers in subrogation related to treatment of plaintiff and any governmental liens or obligations (e.g., Medicare/Medicaid); and (c) include the present value of any fixed and certain payments to be made in the future. The assessment shall apply to all of the cases of the Plaintiff's attorneys who are subject to this Order that are pending in the MDL or state court.

2. Provisional Assessment Amounts

(a) Assessment – The assessment amounts shall be a provisional assessment of a total of six percent (6%) of a plaintiff's gross settlement value, which includes a provisional assessment of one percent (1%) for common benefit costs and a provisional assessment of five percent (5%) for common benefit attorneys' fees.

(b) Common Benefit Costs – The funds in the Biomet Hip Cost Fund shall be used solely to reimburse common benefit expenses that meet the requirements of this Court’s governing Case Management Order Regarding Management of Timekeeping, Cost Reimbursement and Related Common Benefit Issues entered on July 18, 2013. After all qualifying expenses are reimbursed from this Cost Fund pursuant to the applicable provisions of this Order and the July 18, 2013 Order, any monies remaining in the Cost Fund shall be returned to each settling Claimant’s primary counsel of record in proportion to that Claimant’s provisional assessed contribution to the Cost Fund. It shall be the obligation of each Claimant’s counsel in that event to ensure that those rebated monies are further distributed to the respective Claimant in accordance with the applicable state’s laws and ethics rules governing the proper handling of litigation costs/expenses.¹

(c) Common Benefit Attorneys’ Fees – The Funds in the Biomet Hip Fees Fund shall be used solely to compensate those attorneys who performed qualifying Common Benefit work, as specified further in this Court’s current, governing Case Management Order Regarding Management of Timekeeping, Cost Reimbursement and Related Common Benefit Issues entered on July 18, 2013.

Recognizing that this Interim Order is temporary in nature, the total Common Benefit Attorneys’ Fees to be paid by the Fund for qualifying Common Benefit work shall not exceed five percent (5%) of the total gross payments ultimately made by the Defendant pursuant to the

¹ In a small number of states, Claimant’s counsel may be obligated by applicable laws and/or ethics rules to take any litigation expenses/costs “off the top” of a Claimant’s gross recovery; the counsel’s contingent fee percentage is then applied to the remainder of the recovery. In those states, the initial cost assessment under this Order is therefore being borne both by the Claimant and his/her counsel, and an appropriate portion of the rebated Cost Fund assessment may therefore be properly distributed to Claimant’s counsel.

Master Settlement Agreement.

3. Parties' Obligations

Until a subsequent Case Management Order Governing Common Benefit Fees and Expense Funds is entered, Plaintiffs and their counsel shall provide the Court, quarterly, with a list setting forth (a) the names of the law firms representing the plaintiff and the names of all attorneys on the pleadings or appearing as counsel of record in all properly served Biomet Hip Implant cases in state and federal courts in the United states; and (b) whether the case is pending in federal or state court (and if it is pending in state court, Plaintiffs and their counsel shall identify the state).

The Defendants shall provide, at least quarterly, a list to the Court or its designee and to PEC 2 the names and docket numbers of the cases for which it has agreed to make a settlement payment since the last such report, as well as the amount of that settlement payment.

III. COURT APPROVAL AND FEE COMMITTEE

A. Court Approval

The amounts deposited in the Biomet Hip Common Benefit Attorneys' Fee and Common Benefit Costs Funds shall be available for distribution to Participating Counsel who have performed professional services or incurred expenses for the common benefit. No amounts will be disbursed without review and approval by the Court or such other mechanism as the Court may order. Specifically, such sums shall be distributed only upon Order of the Court in MDL 2391.

Each Participating Counsel who does common benefit work and has complied with this Court's Case Management Order Regarding Management of Timekeeping, Cost Reimbursement and Related Common Benefit Issues has the right to present their claim(s) for

compensation prior to any recommendation to the Court. Upon order of the Court, payments may be made from the Fund to Participating Counsel who provide services or incur expenses for the joint and common benefit of plaintiffs in addition to their own client or clients. Attorneys eligible are limited to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee, Steering Committee, Liaison Counsel, and other Participating Counsel called on to assist in performing their responsibilities, and other Participating Counsel performing similar responsibilities in state court actions.

B. Fee Committee

At the appropriate time, this Court shall appoint a new Fee Committee to make recommendations to this Court on the issues of how any money in the Biomet Hip Fee and Expense Funds shall be distributed among Participating Counsel (the "Fee Committee"). The Fee Committee shall determine on its own the most fair and efficient manner by which to evaluate all of the time and expense submissions in making its recommendation to this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

APPROVED: _____

Judge, United States District Court of
Northern District of Indiana.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION

IN RE: BIOMET M2a MAGNUM HIP)	
IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY)	CAUSE NO. 3:12-MD-2391
LITIGATION (MDL 2391))	
)	
)	
_____)	
This Document Relates to All Cases)	
_____)	

CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER NO. 3

A status conference was held on May 18. While much was discussed, the matters admitting of rulings today fall into two categories: Biomet’s settlement strategy and practices under the Master Settlement Agreement, and the segue from one Plaintiff’s Steering Committee to another. I begin with the settlement issues.

I. BIOMET’S SETTLEMENT STRATEGY

Attorney Gregg Borri of the Borri Law Offices in New York City, represents the plaintiff in a case in this centralized docket. Mr. Borri wrote to me on April 24, expressing concern about how Biomet was handling settlement discussions and mediation under the Master Settlement Agreement. Mr. Borri reported having been told that in every case in which a plaintiff sought an enhanced award through mediation under the Master Settlement Agreement, Biomet had sought a reduced award, and refused to alter its positions in mediation. Mr. Borri said Biomet and the Plaintiff’s Steering Committee should report on the accuracy of what he had

heard. I entered an order inviting Mr. Borri to attend the May 18 status conference in South Bend, and he did so. Attorney Jeff Lowe of Carey Danis & Lowe in St. Louis, sent me a letter sharing Mr. Borri's understanding. Mr. Lowe has settled ten cases in this docket, and has ten cases remaining. Mr. Lowe, too, attended the May 18 conference.

The Plaintiffs' Steering Committee responded to Mr. Borri's letter, opining that Mr. Borri had misapprehended the Master Settlement Agreement, and that the information he sought went well beyond his case. Biomet responded to Mr. Borri and to Mr. Lowe. Biomet reported that it had engaged in pre-mediation discussions with Mr. Borri, who, once he concluded that Biomet was going to stand firm, decided not to mediate. Biomet also responded to Mr. Lowe's letter, saying it had reached out to Mr. Lowe because of dealings with him in other litigation, and that Mr. Lowe hadn't responded to its communication in a timely manner.

Several other attorneys (some of whom had settled their cases) wrote me, echoing Mr. Borri's concerns. Those attorneys included John Dow of Concord, MA, Scott Perlmutter of Cleveland, Wendell Tong of New York City, and Terrence Smith of Teaneck, New Jersey. Attorney David Riggs of Tulsa also echoed Mr. Borri's concerns, and added that during his mediation, the mediator (after asking Biomet's counsel to leave the room) told him that Biomet never budes in the mediations (his letter also reported that he settled his case for 150 percent more

than what Biomet offered when the mediation opened, for whatever that might be worth).

Plaintiffs' co-lead counsel, Thomas Anapol, and Biomet's lead counsel, John Winter, explained the parties' understanding of how the Master Settlement Agreement was supposed to work. Various situations were assigned a presumptive settlement value. A plaintiff who thought herself entitled to a higher award could seek an enhancement in mediation; if Biomet thought a plaintiff was entitled to a lower award, Biomet could seek a reduction in mediation. For the most part, given the number of cases and plaintiffs, Biomet wouldn't go behind the presumptive numbers to factors such as obesity, smoking, or statutes of limitations, when a plaintiff agreed to the presumptive number without seeking an enhancement. But when a plaintiff sought an enhancement, Biomet would open the file and see things that Biomet thought justified a lower award.

Biomet agreed that it has sought a reduction in every case in which the plaintiff has sought an enhancement.

Of course, the attorneys' explanation of their intent in drafting the proposed Master Settlement Agreement counts for nothing if the Master Settlement Agreement itself provides something different. But while the Master Settlement Agreement doesn't articulate the principle that if a plaintiff seeks an enhancement, Biomet can assert whatever it otherwise would have overlooked, nothing in the Master Settlement Agreement is inconsistent with that practice. The Master Settlement Agreement allows Biomet to seek a reduced award for any

good cause, and gives examples of reasons Biomet might have. Nothing in the Master Settlement Agreement allows a plaintiff to use the presumed award as a floor while the plaintiff seeks an enhancement, just as nothing allows Biomet to use the presumed award as a ceiling while it seeks a reduction.

Mr. Anapol told all of us at the status conference that the Steering Committee tried to make it clear to all plaintiffs' attorneys that Biomet would seek a reduction if a plaintiff sought an enhancement. There have been a lot of plaintiffs' attorneys of record during the life of this docket, and it may well be that some attorneys didn't receive or fully appreciate that information. But the success of the communication, in the final analysis, serves more as reassurance than as an indication of Biomet's good faith or bad faith in performing under the Master Settlement Agreement. What Biomet was accused of having done — what Biomet concedes it did — was permissible under the Master Settlement Agreement and was no surprise to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee with which it was negotiated. There is no basis for me to say Biomet has acted in bad faith.

After being invited to speak at the status conference, Mr. Borri filed a motion for award of damages for breach of settlement agreement in Ms. Chadwick's case. That motion isn't yet ripe, and might present case-specific facts that would justify the motion; nothing in this ruling addresses the merit of that motion, except to the extent the motion might be grounded in part in the bad faith allegations just discussed. Mr. Borri also filed a set of interrogatories to be answered by the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and Biomet. Those interrogatories

seem designed to discover what Biomet told everyone at the status conference: that when a plaintiff has sought enhancement, Biomet has sought reduction. Little more seems to be gained from requiring responses to the interrogatories. More fundamentally, the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee isn't a party, and so isn't subject to discovery by interrogatory. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33. While Biomet is a party, I have stayed all discovery, except that conducted by the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee or by Biomet. *See* Feb. 15, 2013 Case Management Order, Sec. VII(A) [Doc. No. 242]. Accordingly, I will schedule a hearing on the Chadwick motion once it becomes ripe, but I won't require either the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee or Biomet to respond to the interrogatories that accompanied that motion [Doc. Nos. 132 and 133 in 3:12-CV-614][Doc. Nos. 2887 and 2889 in 3:12-MD-2391].

II. PLAINTIFFS' STEERING COMMITTEES

Most of the rest of the May 18 status conference consisted of discussion about the future of this or another Plaintiffs' Steering Committee. The Multi-District Litigation docket, formed in 2012, has reached an unusual stage. The docket has fallen from nearly 2,500 case to what is predicted to be about 230 cases once the dust settles on settlements now in the pipeline. While this docket will no longer be among the nation's largest, it still will be larger than the average MDL docket, requiring use of many of the techniques discussed in the Manual for Complex Litigation 4th, including the use of a plaintiffs' steering committee.

Of the 22 attorneys named to PSC I, most will have no cases left once the Master Settlement Agreement runs its course. I agree with the PSC I and Biomet that the current members of PSC I without cases of their own shouldn't be required to continue their work for the common benefit of cases filed by others. So not only do we need a steering committee, we need a new steering committee.

Anticipating this, I solicited applications for membership on what would become PSC II. No applications were filed. Two attorneys - - PSC I member Navan Ward of Montgomery, Alabama, and non-PSC I member John Fiske of San Diego, California - - submitted expressions of interest and appeared at the April 20 status conference to discuss their concerns. Both sought information about the remaining cases - - *e.g.*, what issues they present, why they didn't settle - - before committing to participate on the PSC II. Some of the information they seek is available from PSC I, other information would require disclosure of what Biomet believes is its work product.

On May 14, PSC I moved to disband the current leadership structure, to be succeeded by what I have been calling PSC II.

In the weeks between the April 20 conference and the May 18 conference, I received three applications for PSC II. The first was from Ms. Amber Pang Parra of Justinian PLLC with primary offices near Austin, Texas [Doc. No. 2872]. The next two came from attorneys J. Kyle Bachus and Lauren Bronson, both of the firm of Bachus & Shanker, LLC, in Denver, Colorado [Doc. Nos. 2896 and 2899].

Attorney Ahmed Diab¹ of Mr. Fiske's firm attended the May 18 conference in furtherance of the firm's "provisional application" to serve on PSC II [Doc. No. 2898]. Finally, attorney Justin Presnal of the Houston, Texas law firm of Fisher, Boyd, Johnson & Huguenard filed a hybrid application, asking to replace his partner Wayne Fisher on PSC I and to continue onto PSC II [Doc. No. 2895].

In addition to Mr. Presnal, three other members of PSC I will have cases remaining when the outstanding i's are dotted and the t's crossed: Ms. Brenda Fulmer of Searcy, Denney, Scarola, Barnhart & Shipley in West Palm Beach, Florida (who joined PSC I after its first year of existence), Mr. Lawrence Jones, II of Jones Ward in Louisville, Kentucky, and Mr. Navan Ward of Beasley, Allen, Crow, Methvin, Partis & Miles in Montgomery, Alabama. Ms. Fulmer, Mr. Ward, and Mr. Presnal attended the May 18 conference and expressed concerns similar to those that Mr. Ward and Mr. Fiske had expressed at the previous conference. They also reported that they had been trying to contact the attorneys on the remaining cases to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the cases, and had spoken to the attorneys in about half of those cases. They indicated that if enough information could be collected about the remaining cases, other attorneys might apply to serve on PSC II. Ms. Fulmer proposed that I enter a census order requiring all remaining plaintiffs to come forth with some basic information, to

¹ Unable to read my notes, I called Mr. Diab "Mr. Diaz" during the May 20 conference, and apologize profusely for having done so. It's important to me to pronounce names correctly, and I failed miserably with Mr. Diab's name.

allow those thinking about a leadership position to evaluate how viable an economic model might be devised for the PSC II to work effectively.

Plaintiffs' co-lead counsel, Mark Lanier, on behalf of PSC I, said a census order would be helpful to PSC II (but not to PSC I). Mr. Winter, for Biomet, offered no opinion on the census order suggested, but thought it might be time for a "Lone Pine" order. *See Lore v. Lone Pine Corp.*, No. L-33606-85, 1986 WL 637507 (Sup. Ct. N.J. Nov. 18, 1986).

Under the Master Settlement Agreement, Biomet agreed to fund PSC I's common benefit work. We discussed the possibility of any remainder from that sum being used to help fund PSC II, but Mr. Lanier and Mr. Winter both indicated that too little of the Biomet money will remain to help fund a new PSC. Biomet also objected, arguing that it's contractual obligation to contribute to the Common Benefit Fund was limited to the PSC I's work. We also discussed the concern that prospective PSC II attorneys have about the scheduling order that will follow appointment of the new PSC II.

Nobody addressed how large PSC II should be, but an excellent nucleus either has stepped forward or was on PSC I and still has cases. Those attorneys are Mr. Ward, Ms. Fulmer, Mr. Jones, Mr. Presnal, Mr. Bachus, and Ms. Parra. I very much appreciate Ms. Bronson's willingness to serve, but she is too new to the profession to serve in a steering committee capacity. In addition to those six I listed, four more are logical and reasonable selections: Mr. Fiske and Mr. Diab (who have shown enough interest to travel to South Bend for the spring status

conferences), Altom Maglio (whose firm has the third highest number of remaining cases), and William Jordan (whose firm has the fifth highest number of remaining cases). Those ten excellent attorneys can serve as the members of a PSC II. Mr. Lowe's firm has the second highest number of cases remaining in the docket (well behind Mr. Ward, who leads this category), but Mr. Winter's response to Mr. Lowe's letter leaves me uncertain that placing him in a leadership position would foster advancement of this litigation.

Because Mr. Ward and Ms. Fulmer have been on PSC I the longest (save Mr. Jones, who attended neither of the most recent status conferences in person) — Mr. Ward since the beginning and Ms. Fulmer for a year and a half — and are very experienced in mass tort litigation and multi-district litigation, it also seems logical to appoint them co-lead counsel for the plaintiffs. My only hesitation in appointing two attorneys from the same firm — Mr. Fiske and Mr. Diab — is the risk of duplication of effort. That risk can be reduced by having one of them serve as liaison counsel, and I'll leave it to them to notify me which will do so. Having liaison counsel in San Diego when the MDL docket is in northern Indiana is less than ideal, but the same can be said about the circumstances under which I am appointing PSC II. In an age of electronic filing, liaison counsel's primary task lies in communication among the plaintiffs' attorneys.

Those ten PSC II members might wish to encourage other attorneys who represent plaintiffs in this docket to apply for appointment to PSC II. To facilitate their doing so, I will order Biomet to provide PSC II with any plaintiff's fact sheets

that PSC II can't get from the PSC I. I expect that those fact sheets will cover all but the most recently filed or centralized cases in this docket. I will also authorize PSC II to make the information from the plaintiffs' fact sheets available to attorneys interested in appointment to PSC II, though the information must be shared in such a way that medical records, diagnoses, and medical conditions can't be linked to a particular patient. If, after reviewing those plaintiffs' fact sheets, PSC II still thinks a census order would be helpful, I will happily consider a motion for such an order, accompanied by the proposed order.

The time hasn't come for a *Lone Pine* order. This docket has moved rapidly through a shake-out period in which nine out of ten cases pending barely a year ago were resolved, either by settlement or by dismissal. New leadership is stepping up for the plaintiffs, and deserves an opportunity to get their bearings. A census order, if PSC II persuades me to issue one, might provide much of the same information as a *Lone Pine* order might produce. For now, though, I consider a *Lone Pine* order inappropriate.

The plaintiffs' new leadership, and others who might seek to join the new leadership, have expressed concern about the pace of the scheduling order to be entered for the balance of the proceeding. I will invite proposals from PSC II and Biomet before resuming and modifying the earlier scheduling order. I intend, of course, to be reasonable in what I order, but it won't be leisurely. This MDL docket is three-and-a-half years old (with no blame to be assigned) and some plaintiffs

might have been concerned about the Biomet product for five years. We have an obligation to do this right, but we also have an obligation to get it done.

The appointment of the new PSC II will take effect June 1, 2015. Effective that date, all members of PSC I who aren't members of PSC II will be relieved of their duties in this docket (recognizing that Mr. Anapol and Mr. Dassow have pledged to help PSC II get up and running). I will entertain any request from PSC II for a census order, accompanied by a proposed order specifying precisely what information will be sought. A telephonic hearing will be scheduled on the motion in *Chadwick* when the motion becomes ripe; I will assume that PSC II doesn't wish to participate in that hearing unless it informs me otherwise. We will gather in early September to discuss the scheduling order. I urge lead counsel to confer and agree on the matters in the scheduling order as well as they can, and to file their proposals with me at least a week before that conference, including brief statements of reasons why agreement couldn't be reached.

III. FUNDING FOR PSC II

I anticipate that a new common benefit fund order will need to be entered soon after PSC II is able to acquaint itself with the cases remaining in this docket. I invite PSC II to submit a proposed common fund order before September 1, 2015.

Given the number of *pro se* cases among the cases remaining in this docket, I also anticipate the need to appoint a *pro se* liaison counsel. I invite the eventual input of PSC II.

IV. ORDER

The motion to substitute Justin Presnal as a member of the Plaintiff's Steering Committee in lieu of Wayne Fisher [Doc. No. 2895] is GRANTED.

The motion to terminate the existing Plaintiffs' Steering Committee [Doc. No. 2890] is GRANTED, effective June 1, 2015.

I appoint the following attorneys to PSC II, effective June 1, 2015:

Brenda Fulmer of Searcy, Denney, Scarola, Barnhart & Shipley
Navan Ward of Beasley, Allen, Crow, Methvin, Partis & Miles PC
J. Kyle Bachus of Bachus & Shanker, LLC
Ahmed Diab of Gomez Trial Attorneys
John Fiske of Gomez Trial Attorneys
Lawrence Jones of Jones, Ward
William Jordan of Law Offices of William Jordan
Altom Maglio of Maglio Christopher & Toale PA
Amber Pang Parra of Justinian PLLC
Justin Presnal of Fisher, Boyd, Johnson & Huguernard

Ms. Fulmer and Mr. Ward will serve as Lead Counsel for PSC II. Mr. Diab or Mr. Fiske shall serve as Liaison Counsel, and shall inform me, the PSC II, and Biomet's Lead Counsel by June 15 which of them will serve in that capacity.

The appointments to PSC II are of a personal nature. Today's appointees can't be substituted by other attorneys, including members of the appointee's law firm, to perform the PSC II's exclusive functions, such as committee meetings and

court appearances, except with my prior approval. The appointments to PSC II are for nineteen months, until January 1, 2017. Appointees may apply to be reappointed when their term expires. If or when they reapply, their application should contain references to the nature and scope of their work on the PSC including the time and resources expended during the past term.

Co-Lead Counsel of PSC II will have the same responsibilities as Lead Counsel of PSC I (*see* [Doc. No. 127]).

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: May 27, 2015

/s/ Robert L. Miller, Jr.
Judge, United States District Court
Northern District of Indiana

