IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA CHARLESTON DIVISION

IN RE: AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING) MDL NO: 2:18-MN-2873

FOAMS PRODUCTS LIABILITY

LITIGATION) October 4, 2019

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. GERGEL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, presiding

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs: FRED THOMPSON, III, ESQ.

MICHAEL LONDON, ESQ.
SCOTT SUMMY, ESQ.
PAUL NAPOLI, ESQ.
ALAN KNAUF, ESQ.
MIHIR DESAI, ESQ.
GALE PEARSON, ESQ.
JOSH COHAN, ESQ.

ALEXANDER KIPPERMAN, ESQ.

TREY FRAZER, ESQ. TOPE LEYIMU, ESQ.

CARLA BURKE PICKREL, ESQ.

CHRISTINA COSSICH, ESQ.

PHIL COSSICH, ESQ. LOUISE R. CARO, ESQ. CHARLES SCHAFFER, ESQ. JUSTIN ARENAS, ESQ.

CHRISTIAN MARCUM, ESQ.

NANCY CHRISTENSEN, ESQ.

DAVID McDIVITT, ESQ.

DAVID HOYLE, ESQ. REBECCA NEWMAN, ESQ. GARY DOUGLAS, ESQ.

GREGORY CADE, ESQ.

KEVIN McKIE, ESQ.

GARY ANDERSON, ESQ.

DICK ORTEGA, ESQ.

JIM FERRARO, ESQ.

JAMES FERRARO, ESQ. JANPAUL PORTAL, ESQ.

ESTHER BEREZOFSKY, ESQ.

JOHN GILMOUR, ESQ.

For the Plaintiffs: BILL JACKSON, ESQ.

SHAWN BUNTING, ESQ.

STEPHEN T. SULLIVAN, JR., ESQ.

KEVIN HANNON, ESQ.

GABRIELLE SULPIZIO, ESQ. AMBER W. HERTLEIN, ESQ.

AMBER W. HERILEIN, MELISSA VALLE, ESQ. AMY KENDALL, ESQ. MARIE NAPOLI, ESQ. FRED LONGER, ESQ. VIOLA VETTER, ESQ. JOHN DAVIS, ESQ.

JASON JULIUS, ESQ. REBECCA FONSECA, ESQ. NICHOLAS RIGANO, ESQ.

MARY JANE BASS, ESQ. STEVE BISHOP, ESQ.

CHRISTOPHER AVERY, ESQ.

JOSEPH MAURICE, ESQ. WES BOWDEN, ESQ. SARAH HANSEL, ESQ.

CELESTE EVANGELISTI, ESQ. M. CRISTINA SANCHEZ, ESQ.

STACI J. OLSEN, ESQ. STEPHANIE BIENE, ESQ.

ROB BILOTT, ESQ. LARRY COHAN, ESQ. MATT PAWA, ESQ. BEN KRASS, ESQ. PHILIP BEIN, ESQ.

MATTHEW SINKMAN, ESQ. DANIEL HARRISON, ESQ.

DAVID REAP, ESQ. LANA ROWENKO, ESQ.

LEONARD Z. KAUFMANN, ESQ.

SCOTT E. KAUFF, ESQ.
JOHN K. DEMA, ESQ.
ALLAN KANNER, ESQ.
ALLISON BROUK, ESQ.
ERIN DICKINSON, ESQ.
TATE KUNKLE, ESQ.
JOHN CHILDS, ESQ.

For the Defendants: DAVID DUKES, ESQ.

BRIAN DUFFY, ESQ.

JOSEPH PETROSINELLI, ESQ.

MICHAEL OLSEN, ESQ. CHRISTINA FALK, ESQ.

DAN RING, ESQ.

ELIZABETH KNAUER, ESQ.

For the Defendants: MARA MURPHY, ESQ.

NICHOLAS MINO, ESQ.

LIAT ROME, ESQ.

LIAM MONTGOMERY, ESQ. AMANDA KITTS, ESQ. MOLLY CRAIG, ESQ.

MICHAEL CARPENTER, ESQ. MARSHALL WALKER, ESQ.

KEITH SMITH, ESQ.

JONATHAN HANDLER, ESQ.

KENNETH BAUM, ESQ. RICH BULGER, ESQ. COURTNEY ENLOE, ESQ.

ROBERT SHAUGHNESSY, ESQ.

TIM MACIOLEK, ESQ. CRAIG WOODS, ESQ. KAT HACKER, ESQ. LUCY DINKINS, ESQ.

TALLY PARHAM CASEY, ESQ.

SARA DHANJI, ESQ. WES MORAN, ESQ. PRIYA DESAI, ESQ. KEN REILLY, ESQ.

MARY KATE CAMPBELL, ESQ.

DAVE ERICKSON, ESQ. ADDIE RIES, ESQ.

Court Reporter: KAREN E. MARTIN, RMR, CRR

PO Box 835

Charleston, SC 29402

864.201.8411

Karen_E_Martin@scd.uscourts.gov

Proceedings reported by stenographic court reporter. Transcript produced with computer-aided transcription software.

Friday, October 4, 2019

(WHEREUPON, court was called to order at 9:02 a.m.)

THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.

I think we've attracted a crowd. Is it the good weather in Charleston?

You know, seeing counsel sitting in the jury box reminds me of a story which I tell in Unexampled Courage in which Judge Waring, who used this courtroom, summoned all the members of the democratic party's executive committee who had defied an earlier order to allow African-Americans to vote in the democratic primary. He summoned them to this courtroom for an emergency hearing and they were in here. And, boy, it was so crowded lawyers were sitting in the jury box. And he told them, he says, You know, a federal judge faced with contempt has two choices. He can impose a fine or incarceration. He said, If you violate my orders anymore, there will be no fines. (Laughter) Pretty powerful message, I think. It worked.

Well, folks, we're going to do -- our agenda here today is we're going to do -- we'll do our normal monthly status conference. And then we will just immediately, I don't think there are too many weighty issues, unless something surprises me, and then we will proceed right on with our Science Day. And I'll talk a

1 little bit more about the format for Science Day just 2 confirming our understanding about things when we get to 3 that. 4 So first of all, could counsel identify who will 5 be speaking today, identify themselves for the record 6 beginning with plaintiff's counsel? 7 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, my name's Fred 8 Thompson from Motley Rice, plaintiff's liaison counsel. 9 MR. NAPOLI: Good morning, Your Honor. 10 Napoli. 11 MR. LONDON: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael 12 London. 13 MR. SUMMY: Good morning, Your Honor. Scott 14 Summy. 15 THE COURT: Good to see my Plaintiff's Executive 16 Committee all here bright and alert. 17 Yes, sir, Mr. Petrosinelli? 18 MR. PETROSINELLI: Good morning, Your Honor. 19 Joe Petrosinelli of Williams and Connolly, one of the 20 defendant co-leads. 21 MR. OLSEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael 22 Olsen, Mayer Brown, one of the defense co-leads. 23 MR. DUFFY: Good morning, Your Honor. Brian 24 Duffy here from Duffy and Young, liaison counsel, 25 co-liaison.

1 Good morning, Your Honor. MR. DUKES: David 2 Dukes, Nelson Mullins, co-liaison counsel. 3 THE COURT: I saw you hiding back there but I 4 didn't miss you. 5 MR. LONDON: Excuse me. Your Honor. We have two 6 others that might be presenting. 7 MR. DOUGLAS: My name's Gary Douglas for 8 plaintiffs at Douglas London. 9 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Douglas. 10 MS. COSSICH: Christina Cossich for plaintiffs. 11 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 12 Okay. First of all, let me talk about the 13 schedule for future monthly status conferences because I 14 think our schedule went through this month. Our next 15 monthly conference will be in the fall, November 1. 16 trying to maintain the Friday's here. November 1. 17 And the next one I have scheduled is 18 December 13. And I understood that there were some 19 counsel who had a potential conflict for that day. The 20 only problem with my only alternative date is December 20, 21 and I don't want my lawyers traveling on the Friday before 22 Christmas. I just think that's crazy. So if some can't 23 be here, we'll just have to deal with that. I just think 24 the alternative is just not -- and then -- it's just not 25 acceptable.

And then what I will do is we will issue after today an order that takes us through September 2020. And again, counsel, if there's some date that just creates a huge problem for people, let's talk about it and we'll try to do everything we can. I think the Fridays work pretty well. Is that right?

MR. NAPOLI: Absolutely.

THE COURT: I know folks are coming in a little early. It seems to be a system that's working. I don't want to disrupt it unless we have to.

Okay. On discovery, who wants to report first from the plaintiffs and then the defendants on where we are? Because I want discovery moving here and I know y'all are working. So tell me whose here.

MR. LONDON: Your Honor, Michael London.

There's not much to report on discovery, although it is moving. We have got -- the PFC has propounded master discovery demands on the defendants.

THE COURT: What a surprise.

MR. LONDON: What a surprise, right? We've started to get initial responses from the defendants. I think they've been rolling in in the last week to ten days. Certain other defendants, as alluded to or set forth in the joint status report, have asked for and the PFC has given, second extensions. I think there may be a

typo in there involving DuPont as well as National Foam, and Buckeye defendants were given until October 14th -- or 16th, excuse me, to provide their initial responses.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LONDON: The documents have been coming in from prior productions. We expect the more responsive documents to start flowing from -- to start flowing towards the plaintiffs from the defendants in the coming weeks. We hope at the November conference to have a more robust answer to this question, where we are on the discovery responses. We have meet and confers set up, I believe, with all of the defendants concerning their responses and potential objections we may have.

THE COURT: Mr. London, here's what I want is if there's a snag, I, obviously, want the lawyers to meet and confer and do their very best to resolve matters. If you cannot, I want to promptly address it at the next status conference. I don't want our discovery held up while y'all spend several months talking about an issue. I want it resolved. I want y'all to make your best efforts. I don't mind making a decision. Okay? So I want to go ahead and keep discovery moving.

I know there's a voluminous amount of discovery to be done in this case. And I'm sure that as the plaintiffs receive large amounts of information, which are

invariably coming -- and you're going to have to manage it, too, which I know has its own challenges and process it. But we need to keep this process moving because we need to get beyond the production stage, the initial production stage to move on.

I've mentioned before, I want to deal with the -- as soon as we can reasonably gather the information necessary, I want to be able to deal with these immunity issues, both governmental and governmental contractor.

The governmental contractor in particular seems to be very discovery intensive. I mean, this is going to be a big job, not only documents but depositions and so forth.

MR. LONDON: Right.

THE COURT: And the longer we spend chasing documents, the longer it'll be before we address those issues. So it's important to me that part of -- I use these monthly conferences to push y'all along. And where there is conflict, I want to promptly address these things. That's my goal.

So y'all also were working on a privilege log. What's going on with that?

MR. LONDON: And Your Honor, we appreciate those comments. And behind the scenes, I'll just add, we have put together, there's a team of folks here and some who haven't traveled to Charleston who have got the PFCs, the

plaintiff's group, infrastructure to receive these documents up and ready. So there is no -- there should be and there will be no lag time on our end to receive these documents, upload them into the platforms, whereby plaintiff lawyers representing the various plaintiffs in this litigation can start reviewing. So we certainly appreciate Your Honor's comments and we intend to move forward quickly.

THE COURT: And how about on the privilege log?

MR. LONDON: The privilege log, the plaintiff's group and defense groups have been meeting. I believe we are very close to an agreement. And I hope to have an agreement on the disputed issues. I was hoping today but I think, Your Honor, we can probably have it to the Court within two weeks.

THE COURT: Good. I just -- you know, it's just one of those mechanics that we need to take care of here.

MR. LONDON: And that's why keeping a shorter leash, rather than the next status conference, would be great.

THE COURT: That'd be great. And by the way, in addition, and this may become more relevant say we're sitting in a deposition or something. If I'm not tied up in court, you can call in. And if you've got, you know, something that would be helpful to resolve it right then,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
you can call in. Now, what I may well do is say, you
know, be at ease for 30 minutes or focus on another issue
at the deposition, let me think about it a bit. I'm not
real big on just sort of spontaneously responding to
something. These issues are complicated. But one of my
goals here is not to have the litigation slow up because
of discovery disputes that don't get brought to the Court
and/or the Court doesn't resolve them promptly. I think
that's my -- part of my role is to do that. Okay?
         MR. LONDON: Great.
          THE COURT: Very good.
         How about the Federal Government discovery?
Where is that going?
         MR. LONDON: I should probably --
         MS. FALK: Yes, Your Honor. We've been
producing documents --
         THE COURT: Could you state your name for the
record, please?
         MS. FALK: Oh, I'm sorry. Christina Falk on
behalf of the United States of America.
          THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
         MS. FALK: Your Honor, we've already begun our
production in addition to the original disclosures we've
      We produced some documents to the manufacturing
defendants and are getting ready to respond to some of the
```

1 plaintiff's discovery requests. 2 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 3 MR. OLSEN: Your Honor, only thing I would add 4 to that is we just received the Government's objections to 5 the discovery we issued. So we will be meet and conferring with them. And if we have issues, we'll try to 6 7 get that on the next go round. 8 THE COURT: Good. I'm delighted to do that. I 9 know that the Government is going to have documents that 10 are unique to the Government. Nobody else would possibly 11 have them. And this is important litigation and I want to 12 work with everyone to get them. I think the voluntary 13 production is a far better way to do it. But if we don't 14 get there, I'm ready to address some of those issues. And 15 I understand what they are. 16 Who is going to speak for the defense in terms 17 of their sort of view on discovery? 18 MR. OLSEN: The only thing I would add, Your 19 Honor, is we received the first plaintiff fact sheet this 20 We anticipate that those will start to role in in 21 But as Mr. London said, we are working through 22 issues and producing lots of documents. And to the extent 23 we can't work stuff out, we'll bring it to your attention. 24 THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Olsen. 25 Okay. There was a -- I received a proposed

```
1
     order on service of process. Who wants to address that?
 2
               MR. LONDON: Your, Michael London for the
 3
     plaintiff's group. It's a proposed order to address the
 4
     timely and efficient service of summons and complaints.
 5
               THE COURT: I didn't have any issues with it.
     Looked fine to me. Anybody want to say anymore about
 6
 7
     that?
 8
               MR. LONDON:
                            No.
 9
               THE COURT:
                           I'll sign that today.
10
               MR. LONDON: It's by consent by all the parties.
11
               THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.
12
               Okay. Talk to me about tolling the statute of
13
     limitations. I know y'all are working among yourselves on
14
     that. And you've asked me to sign an order sort of on the
15
     ancillary issue of certain responses that are due for
16
               Tell me where we are on the tolling agreement.
     parties.
17
               MR. LONDON: Your Honor, Michael London.
18
     address this as well. This is a tolling agreement with
19
     respect to certain defendants in certain actions that are
20
     coming here. And it's, I guess, the best way to say it is
21
     boots and suspenders to address the leave to amend that
22
     could have been impacted by CMO 3.B. But there is no --
23
               THE COURT:
                           There's no global --
24
               MR. LONDON: This is no universal tolling. This
25
     is for discrete cases -- a discrete set of defendants --
```

or, excuse me, discrete cases for discrete defendants.

THE COURT: I want to say, and I've said it before, I do think it's in everybody's interests not to have thousands of plaintiffs filing lawsuits and people responding to that, which I think will be a great distraction to all the parties. But I do not have the authority to toll the statute of limitations sua sponte. And it's up to the parties to do it. And if -- it's the defendant's prerogative. If they don't want to do it, that's their right not to do it. And we'll manage it.

But I do, you know, urge defense counsel to give some careful thought to this issue because it's kind of like the tire -- the dog who catches the tire. What are you going to do with all those tens of thousands of potential plaintiffs who show up here and how are you going to manage all that?

And in my view of this, and I've been candid about it, I think the individual party claims are probably towards the end of this process, that I see the water district claims, for instance, being an earlier kind of threshold issue. I've said before, if the water districts can't survive, can't produce claims that survive, I don't see how the individual plaintiffs would. They don't have as many issues.

So burdening us with things that are kind of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

down the road, I think it just takes everyone some reflection of what's the best way to manage it. But I'm going to leave it to the good -- the offices of all counsel here to address that issue. The CMO 3.C proposal is fine. I'm going to sign that. There was also a discussion about a procedure for filing -- there was a filing statement on affirmative defenses. Who wants to address that issue? Mr. Petrosinelli? MR. PETROSINELLI: Yes, Your Honor. This one, again, is on consent. We had to have a mechanism for when new cases come to the MDL having a deadline for the type of affirmative defenses that have already been filed in the existing cases. So the parties --THE COURT: I presume they're going to essentially cut and paste yours, your responses? MR. PETROSINELLI: That might be a fair assumption. So I think we came up with this 30-day mechanism. It seemed like it was fine. I think that sounds perfectly fine. THE COURT: I understood that some of the non-manufacturing defendants wanted to talk about a potential defense subgroup? Come on forward. MR. REILLY: Good morning, Your Honor.

```
1
                           If you'd come to the podium here.
               THE COURT:
 2
               THE COURT REPORTER: Would you give me your
     name, please?
 3
 4
                           State your name for the record.
               THE COURT:
 5
               MR. REILLY: Sure. I'm Ken Reilly from Shook
 6
     Hardy and Bacon. And I represent Chemours and DuPont.
 7
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you, sir, for being here. I
 8
     met you last evening. Welcome to the litigation.
 9
               MR. REILLY: Thank you, Your Honor, I think.
10
     I'm not sure. I look around the room and I'm just not
11
     sure.
12
               THE COURT: Everyone else has a smile on their
13
     face.
14
               MR. REILLY: Right. So what we're asking Your
15
     Honor is we're not manufacturers of AFFF. We're not
16
     sellers of AFFF. There are a few of us, Chemours, DuPont,
17
     I think that Dynax, Sulvey, and --
18
               How do you pronounce the other one?
19
               Dycon -- I'm sorry, I don't know them -- all
20
     fall into this same category.
                                    And --
21
               THE COURT: They are making products that are
22
     ultimately used in the foam but are not manufactured by
23
     your clients; is that right?
24
               MR. REILLY: Exactly, for some people's, some
25
     people's foam products but it's --
```

1 THE COURT: It's a discrete group. 2 MR. REILLY: It's a very discrete group. 3 don't have a seat on the steering committee or the defense 4 committee. And I understand, I've had this conversation 5 with the executive committee of that committee, and I understand there's no objection to us being added as a 6 7 special group with a seat on the committee if that would 8 be --9 THE COURT: I think that's fine. I've been 10 big -- and counsel can tell you this -- on supporting the 11 leadership of both the plaintiff and defense committees 12 because I think it's hard to manage it without it, but to 13 add you as a subgroup and to be part of the executive 14 committee. 15 Mr. Petrosinelli, I take it you don't have any 16 objection to this? 17 MR. PETROSINELLI: No. Mr. Reilly made the 18 request to be added to this group, to the Defense Coordination Committee, and discussed it with Mr. Olsen. 19 20 We don't have any objection. 21 THE COURT: So done. 22 MR. REILLY: Thank you, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Okay. Are there any other issues for the Court 24 25 to address for the status conference before we proceed to

1 Science Day? 2 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, I do believe that 3 they reached an agreement. MR. LONDON: That's what we were just 4 5 mentioning. 6 Your Honor, the issue is the Pennsylvania State Court cases on the agenda. Just simply, at the venue last 7 8 night, I'm happy to report it was successful having the 9 parties together. And an agreement was reached that the 10 outstanding 700 or so individual plaintiffs will be filing 11 suit in short order in the coming four months in an 12 orderly fashion in coming to --13 THE COURT: It's 700 individual plaintiffs, but 14 there are not as many suits in Pennsylvania. Some of them 15 are collective actions. 16 MR. LONDON: That's correct. 17 THE COURT: But they will now be individual 18 claims. 19 MR. LONDON: Correct. 20 THE COURT: Very good. Good work. Thank you 21 very much. 22 MR. LONDON: I think the backdrop of the last 23 evening helped. THE COURT: A few drinks never hurt anyone in 24 25 the negotiating process. (Laughter)

```
1
                Okay. Let's proceed then, if we might, to
 2
     Science Day.
 3
           (End of status conference transcript.)
                                  * * *
 4
 5
     I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
 6
     the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
 7
         s/Karen E. Martin
                                                  10/11/2019
 8
     Karen E. Martin, RMR, CRR
                                         Date
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```