1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MICHAEL C. ZELLERS (S.B. #146904) TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP 515 South Flower Street Forty-Second Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223 Telephone: 213.430.3400 Facsimile: 213.430.3409 CHARLES C. LIFLAND (S.B. #108950) O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP 400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899 Telephone: (213) 430-6000 Facsimile: (213) 430-6407		
9 10 11 12	Attorneys For Defendants DEPUY ORTHOPAEDICS, INC. and JOHNSON & JOHNSON		
13	UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT	
14		FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15			
16 17	MAURICE BRIGHAM, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No. 3:10-cv-03886-SI [PROPOSED] ORDER	
18	Plaintiffs,		
19	v.		
20	DEPUY ORTHOPAEDICS, INC., an		
21	DEPUY ORTHOPAEDICS, INC., an Indiana Corporation; JOHNSON & JOHNSON SERVICES, INC., a New Jersey Corporation; and DOES 1-100,		
22	inclusive,		
23	Defendants.		
24		1	
25			
26			
27			
28			

[PROPOSED] ORDER 3:10-CV-03886-SI

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Upon consideration of Plaintiff Maurice Brigham's *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order and for Order to Show Cause Re: Preliminary Injunction, brought before the Court on September 10, 2010, and for good cause shown, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1) Plaintiff's Application is DENIED.
- 2) At the hearing on September 10, 2010, the parties agreed to a stipulation and read the terms of that stipulation into the record as reflected in the hearing transcript attached hereto as Exhibit A at page 12, line 9, through page 15, line 1.
- 3) The Court hereby ORDERS the parties to comply with the terms of the stipulation as reflected in Exhibit A.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September <u>29</u>, 2010

SUSAN ILLSTON

United States District Judge

EXHIBIT A

Pages 1 - 16

United States District Court

Northern District of California

Before The Honorable Susan Illston

Maurice Brigham,)

Plaintiff,

vs. No. C10-3886 SI

DePuy Orthopaedics, Incorporated,

Defendant.

San Francisco, California Friday, September 10, 2010

Reporter's Transcript Of Proceedings

Appearances:

For Plaintiff: Lanier Law Firm, PC

2049 Century Park East, Suite 1940 Los Angeles, California 90067

By: Dana Bradley Taschner, Esquire

Lee Adam Cirsch, Esquire

For Defendant: Tucker Ellis & West, LLP

515 South Flower Street, 42nd Floor

Los Angeles, California 90071

By: Michael Carl Zellers, Esquire

(Appearances continued on next page.)

Reported By: Sahar McVickar, RPR, CSR No. 12963

Official Reporter, U.S. District Court For the Northern District of California

(Computerized Transcription By Eclipse)

1	<pre>Appearances, (cont'd.):</pre>	
2	For Defendant:	O'Melveny & Myers, LLP Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
3	By:	San Francisco, California 94111 Charles C. Lifland, Esquire
4		Matt Powers Esquire
5		
6		000
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
2)		

1	Friday, September 10, 2010 9:00 A.M.
2	PROCEEDINGS
3	THE CLERK: Calling civil 10-3886, Brigham versus
4	wait DePuy Ortho.
5	I was thinking something else, but, okay.
6	State your appearance, please.
7	MR. TASCHNER: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Dan
8	attach for the plaintiff.
9	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
10	MR. CIRSCH: Good afternoon.
11	Lee Cirsch, also on behalf of the plaintiff.
12	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
13	MR. ZELLERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
14	Michael Zellers on behalf of defendants.
15	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
16	MR. LEFLAND: Charles Lifland on behalf of
17	defendants.
18	MR. POWERS: And good afternoon, Your Honor.
19	Matt Powers, also on behalf of the defense.
20	THE CLERK: Counsel, if you are going to speak from
21	the table, could you make sure your mics are on? I think the
22	red lights means on. Tap on the mic.
23	THE COURT: Well, I got a deal for you: Why don't
24	they come to the podium and just address me there?
25	THE CLERK: But they have all their stuff.

THE COURT: It will work. 1 THE CLERK: Okay. 2 This is plaintiff's motion --THE COURT: 3 application for a temporary restraining order, and I'm not 4 inclined to grant it, so 5 Are you the plaintiff? 6 MR. TASCHNER: Yes. 7 THE COURT: I've read your papers, but if there is 8 anything you want to add. 9 MR. TASCHNER: There is. 10 Shall I come to the podium? 11 THE COURT: I think that would be better. Thank 12 13 you. MR. TASCHNER: Very grateful for your taking the 1.4 time, and defendants, also. 15 We prepared these papers eight days ago, and the 16 landscape has shifted. And I've also reviewed defendant's 17 papers, so my comments are with regard to what they have 18 submitted. 19 We asked for, basically, a litigation hold on 20 communicating with potential class members when we submitted 21 this a week ago. We have received their papers, and -- I'll go 2.2 directly to it: In paragraph 18 of the affidavit or 2.3 declaration submitted by Mr. Cutshall, he states that they're 24 not only communicating with potential class plaintiffs, but 25

securing the actual devices themselves and sending them out to unknown third parties to do some type of testing. And in the last 24 hours, we have received letters from our engaged clients that they have received from their doctors asking them to give the devices.

2.3

So, fortunately, they've asked us, and we have said no. But at a minimum today, we would like to get an order on that. So that's biggest fundamental change from the time that we submitted the papers a week ago to today, is reading and yesterday and today learning that our actual clients, and more broadly, prospective class members, are being asked to turn over their devices. They are being tested by an unknown third party. We don't know if it's being recorded. We don't know if they are going to be preserved.

And from our experience in the 2001 Sulzer hip implant case, the number of defendants grows very quickly. In that case, it was the residue lubricant that caused the device to not hold on the bone. So if there is testing done and that lubricant's removed, we may not have a potential defendant, may not be able to test it. We would like to be able to film it, participate in that process.

In a more global sense, what's happened in the last eight days, when we filed our complaint -- this was assigned to a magistrate judge, and shortly thereafter we filed a motion with the MDL panel to coordinate all the cases in New Jersey

before a judge --

THE COURT: Oh, so this case is likely to go to New Jersey?

MR. TASCHNER: No -- well, at that time it wasn't assigned to Your Honor. We didn't even have a judge at that time. We asked initially for a judge who had a similar case because we thought that would help expedite the case, but the briefing that's before Your Honor Your Honor and that will likely come, you may no more about this case very quickly than another judge. I mention that because --

THE COURT: Oh, well, I don't think you need to jump to any such quick conclusions.

MR. TASCHNER: Okay. I just want to bring to the Court's attention the landscape of where we are.

Also in the last eight days, we have been contacted by over a dozen law firms, we are evaluating over a hundred cases. So the issue -- and I read this in their papers -- they don't think this is going to be certified. We would like to get that keyed up as soon as possible; that would dispense with a lot of these issues.

So we haven't had a chance to discuss any pre-trial orders or any other issues, but from our perspective, this is a ripe opportunity to address these other issues. And from our point of view, our biggest concern is the testing of those devices. And we are happy to engage in a discussion about

protocol with defendants, and so on, we just haven't had time.

And this is it is the first opportunity we've met.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

MR. ZELLERS: Your Honor, Michael Zellers.

If plaintiff is now requesting new or different relief with respect to a TRO, then we would request an opportunity to respond. We do believe, though, that any issue with respect to obtaining the ex-planted devices, if, in fact, those devices are sent to the testing lab, that that is very similar to the medical records.

Our issue here is --

THE COURT: Well, it's different because there is physical evidence that could be altered or inadvertently destroyed. Even nonconstructive testing could inadvertently involve soap and water, or something.

MR. ZELLERS: The important thing, Your Honor, is that these devices be preserved. Right now, plaintiff's counsel represents one plaintiff; there are many other as yet unidentified patients that have this device. To the extent that these devices do, you know, become available, then it's important that someone make sure that the devices are preserved.

The recall protocol that the defendants have put together, one element of that recall protocol is for the ex-planted device to go to an independent laboratory. There is

not to be any destructive testing. "Testing" is really the wrong word, it's an inspection of the device. So there's no testing that's done. The device will be inspected. It will be analyzed. It then will be preserved and be available, to the extent in the course of litigation and discovery it needs to be turned over.

The's testing that is done in terms of what's written and the analysis will be available for treating physicians. To the extent that a treating physician requests that the ex-planted device be returned, then it will be returned. And I can assure Your Honor that our client, DePuy, understands the need to preserve this evidence in the course of litigation.

I'd be glad --

2.4

THE COURT: Have you spoken to one another about any of these issues?

MR. ZELLERS: We have not spoken about any inspection protocol.

THE COURT: Because that's one thing that plaintiff pointed out this afternoon as being of concern to him, based on the information that you have supplied in your papers. And it occurs to me that perhaps you could resolve that. It doesn't sound to me like a really hard issue to resolve.

I think plaintiff is right, and you just said it, those things need to be preserved and preserved intact and

unaltered so that they can be inspected. Surely, this has happened before in the course of litigation in this country, and you can probably figure out a way to do that.

So with respect to that particular issue, my suggestion to you -- I'm here all afternoon -- is that you speak to one another about that and see if you can resolve something about that.

Now, did you -- did you want to add anything about any of the other relief that you had previously requested?

MR. TASCHNER: Yes, I would.

We do not object to notice going out. And, in fact, we applaud the defendant, because in Sulzer, they didn't have protocol where people could get emergency funds for --

THE COURT: If what are you about to say is that you don't object to the balance of it, you can just tell me that.

MR. TASCHNER: I would like, in addition to any notice they are providing that their legal rights may be impacted, ideally, I would like to have them list that there is a lawsuit filed in which they may be involved.

But our client, and I can give you the letter, we represent -- we are investigating a hundred of these, but one who is not in a case now who is part of the prospective class action gave us a letter this morning asking for those medical records. And he didn't realized that if he signed it he may be impacting his illegal rights in some way.

MR. ZELLERS: I can assure you, Your Honor, that anyone who executes this authorization is not waving any legal rights whatsoever. MR. TASCHNER: But it says they do on the face. can read it if you like. It says that "your federal privacy rights may be impacted if you sign this." That's in the top paragraph of the release. THE COURT: Oh, like HIPAA. MR. ZELLERS: Right. THE COURT: And, of course, that's true because HIPAA would say that you can't release it. MR. ZELLERS: My reference are as to any litigation Absolutely no rights are waived by any patient who executes the authorization. THE COURT: Well, let me tell you, then, what I'm thinking, and perhaps we can get right to the bottom of this. I was not persuaded by your papers that I should interfere with the communications back and forth between your prospective clients and their doctors. I think they probably 19 need to know that these matters are subject to recall, or 20 subject to reinspection. And I think -- so I'm not inclined to 21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.2

2.3

24

25

It had been my understanding from the papers that I read that no legal rights concerning releases, for example, of liability, would be impacted by the things that defendant was

interfere in any way with that.

proposing to send out. So I was prepared, on the face of it, to just deny the motion and say we are going to go forward. I wasn't going to grant the spoliation motion because there is no evidence of spoliation.

2.2

But I was going to expect to receive from you, and I think I would receive from you a representation that you know your responsibilities and litigation has been commenced and that you will do what you have to do. So that's kind of where I started.

But what I think would be useful now -- and, as I say, I'm here all afternoon, I have conferences, but I'm here -- is for you folks to talk to each other and see if you can come to an agreement concerning the devices themselves and how some -- you may want to have a longer protocol on it later, but for today's purposes, anyway, something about how those things will be preserved so that plaintiffs aren't worried that they've been altered or destroyed and you are not worried that you can't test them in order to improve the product.

So why don't you go talk about that and let me know when, if ever, you want to talk to me again about that, okay?

MR. ZELLERS: Will do.

MR. TASCHNER: Okay.

THE COURT: As I say, I'm here. There is an attorney conference room next door, if you want to use that.

It's small and has no windows. On the 18th floor, there is the

1	attorney's lounge, which is sumptuous and does have windows.	
2	And you can go there, if you like.	
3	Just let me know if you want to talk to me again	
4	today.	
5	MR. ZELLERS: Thank you, Your Honor.	
6	MR. TASCHNER: Thank you, Your Honor.	
7	(Proceedings recess for conferring between	
8	the parties/reconvene at 3:42 p.m.:)	
9	THE CLERK: Calling civil 10-3886, Brigham versus	
10	DePuy.	
11	THE COURT: Was there something you wanted to put on	
12	the record?	
13	MR. TASCHNER: Yes, Your Honor.	
14	THE COURT: Oh, good.	
15	MR. ZELLERS: Your Honor, it is Michael Zellers for	
16	the defendant.	
17	It is our understanding that no devices have been	
18	returned or inspected since the recall.	
19	Before anything is done with a recall device, DePuy	
20	will prepare a description of the process of inspection,	
21	including a planned start date, which will not be less than 15	
22	days from the time the description is provided to Mr. Brigham's	
23	counsel.	
24	THE COURT: And that is satisfactory to you?	
25	MR. TASCHNER: That is satisfactory.	

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TASCHNER: We agree to that.

The only thing we would ask of the Court is to approve that. And it's our understanding that in that 15-day window, if we are not going to be invited to observe, or something, or whatever the protocol is they have, that we'll have adequate time to come to Your Honor to ask to participate for whatever relief may be warranted.

THE COURT: That's the reason for the window?

MR. ZELLERS: Yes.

THE COURT: I think that makes perfectly good sense.

And I am pleased you were able to do that.

What do you want to do with this, do you want to memorialize this in a document that you will file? Want to just have the court reporter's transcript of it be the agreement?

MR. TASCHNER: We didn't discuss that. We would prefer to have it memorialized, just so we are absolutely sure we have 15 days, and more critically, if we don't have an agreement that we have adequate time to come brief what we would like to have occur if it's not included in whatever they propose.

MR. ZELLERS: Your Honor, we believe our representation on the record and before you is sufficient, you know, on this issue.

1	THE COURT: Well, I'm going to order you to do what
2	you just said you would do. And your representation is
3	sufficient for me. And I'm ordering you to do it based on
4	that. But since it's an order, it might be good to get a piece
5	of paper that represents exactly what the order was. So I
6	don't care if you wanted to just order a transcript from Sahar
7	and use the transcript with counsel's statement, and then I'll
8	just so order it. That would be fine.
9	MR. TASCHNER: That's fine.
10	THE COURT: Or if you want to, just draft something
11	up and submit it to me. Either way would work for me.
12	MR. ZELLERS: Your Honor, we believe we can just use
13	the statement from the court reporter.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. TASCHNER: That's acceptable. Thank you.
16	THE COURT: All right, so somebody needs to get it,
17	then. And once it's gotten, I'll just put a cover sheet on it
18	that says "so ordered"; how is that?
19	MR. ZELLERS: That sounds fine, Your Honor. And
20	then it's our understanding that with this representation that
21	today's motion is denied?
22	THE COURT: Correct.
23	MR. ZELLERS: Thank you, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Thank you.
25	MR. TASCHNER: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: You're welcome.
2	(Proceedings adjourned at 3:48 p.m.)
3	
4	00
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Sahar McVickar, Official Court Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a certified shorthand reporter, and were thereafter transcribed under my direction into typewriting; that the foregoing is a full, complete and true record of said proceedings as bound by me at the time of filing. The validity of the reporter's certification of said transcript may be void upon disassembly and/or removal from the court file.

/s/ Sahar McVickar

Sahar McVickar, RPR, CSR No. 12963 Friday, September 17, 2010