US District Court Middle District of Florida
PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT
Exhibit Number:9
6:06-md-01769-ACC-DAB
In Re: Seroquel Products Liability Litigation
Date Identified:
Date Admitted:

Exhibit 9

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA ORLANDO DIVISION
3	
	Docket No.6:06-MD-1769-Orl-22DAB
4	IN RE: : SEROQUEL PRODUCTS LIABILITY :
5	LITIGATION : Orlando, Florida MDL DOCKET No. 1769 : May 22, 2007
6	: 4:00 p.m.
7	ALL CASES :
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PRETRIAL CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID A. BAKER AND ANNE C. CONWAY
10	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	For the Plaintiffs: Paul Pennock
14	Larry M. Roth
15	Scott Allen
16	Richard Laminack
17	F. Kenneth Bailey
18	For the Defendant
19	AstraZeneca: Fred Magaziner
20	Stephen J. McConnell
21	James Freebery
22	Court Reporter: Sandra K. Tremel
23	
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
25	produced by computer-aided transcription.

```
can proceed without it.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Right. Let me tell you, we have
 3
     only got about an hour for this hearing.
 4
               MR. PENNOCK: Yes.
 5
               THE COURT: And it is a status conference
 6
     hearing, so, go ahead.
 7
               MR. PENNOCK: I would like to address with the
 8
     Court, if that's acceptable, the issues regarding the
 9
     defendant discovery that we have been attempting to take
10
     to date. You know, as I'm sure Magistrate Judge Baker --
11
               THE COURT: I've read all of the transcripts of
12
     all of the status conferences.
13
               MR. PENNOCK: Okay. Essentially at this
14
     juncture, we have very serious concerns as to whether this
15
     discovery can proceed in the manner that --
16
                          Why don't you tell us what you have
               THE COURT:
17
     to date and what you expected to date and what you need.
18
               MR. PENNOCK: We have received to date 32 files
19
     for witnesses who were identified by the defendants as
20
     being important and relevant witnesses in this case.
21
          What we have -- we have also taken a number of
2.2.
     30(b)(6) depositions which were permitted by the Court.
     What we learned last week was that there are a large
2.3
2.4
     number of witnesses in two foreign -- at least two foreign
     entities, AstraZeneca UK and AstraZeneca AB in Sweden, who
25
```

```
those entities possess not only personnel but large
2
     volumes of documents that bear directly on all the issues
3
     in this case. And to our understanding, the defendants
4
     have not produced any of this.
5
         Moreover, to our understanding, not one of these
6
     witnesses that we now identified through the 30(b)(6)'s
7
     were on this list of 80 witnesses that they themselves
8
     created last fall.
9
         And if I may give two examples. One is -- I'm sorry.
10
     One example is SET, the senior executive team. We learned
11
     from a 30(b)(6) of their senior counsel here in the States
12
     that the SET, the senior executive team, as she put it in
13
     her words, controls everything. That they can do
14
     anything. And they have been running the various drug
15
     franchises for this company.
16
         And yet these individuals had not previously been
17
     identified to us, had not been on this list of 80. And
18
     why is that so important? Because these -- this list of
19
     80 has already comprised six and a half million
20
     documents -- sorry, six and a half million pages, and
21
     we're supposed to be plowing through all this discovery on
22
     these 80 people, whereas there may be 20 or 30 people who
     we really want that have been withheld from us.
23
24
          Now, in my presentation, which unfortunately I don't
25
     have up, you know, I put the word "deliberately" in there
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sorry, e-mails with respect to any individuals in those foreign entities, and we need to be able to start taking 30(b)(6)'s of individuals from those foreign entities. The witness I took specifically said, you will have to talk to somebody from those companies. So I don't think from the testimony we got last week there is any doubt that these foreign entities are wholly insinuated into this process. In fact, they're controlling it. And we have been unwittingly thwarted in getting this discovery over the last several months. The other category of issues -- we have the foreign discovery issue. The other category that we have been dealing with again and again, with some significant measure of frustration, is the nature of the document production that has occurred. And I'm sorry to say there really has not been tremendous improvement. There has been some improvement through the actions of the Court in terms of making and forcing things along. Forcing things along. But the fact of the matter is that the documents we have been getting, for example, include, as I put on the agenda, there are thousands and thousands and thousands of blank pages, and yet there seems to be underlying metadata or files that would suggest there is supposed to be data on those pages, but there's nothing there when we go to

```
look at it. That's number one.
2
         Number two, there are instances where for each
3
     rolling aspect of this production, they change the way
4
     they're identifying documents. So every time we go to
     upload it and try to match things up, and I do have my
5
6
     director of IT on the phone if you have any questions
7
     specifically, or if Magistrate Baker does on these IT
8
     issues, but essentially when we try to match this data up,
9
     it's not matching up because they change the way they're
10
     phrasing the Bates number, literally putting a slash
11
     instead of a dash, putting a comma or a semicolon instead
12
     of something else.
13
         There are different things they're doing with these
14
     Bates number, we don't know why they're doing it, but
15
     they're being done, and it's creating a lot of difficulty
16
     that is completely unnecessary and avoidable in the first
17
     instance.
18
              MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, could I just --
19
              MR. PENNOCK: May I just finish outlining the
20
     problem.
21
         In addition to that, Your Honor, we have learned that
22
     these documents were all TIF'ed since December, so we're
     kind of at a loss as to why, if they've had these
23
     documents in the electronic TIF format since December, why
24
25
     do we not have them all now? As the Court, as
```

```
Magistrate Baker said at one of the earlier conferences,
2
     this stuff, this is not terrible rocket science. (If you
     have it and it's electronic, deliver it.
3
4
         Well, we learned only recently in a communication
5
     from them that they have actually had it in TIF since
6
     December. So where is it? Why don't we have it?
7
          And a fourth category of problem is the continuing
8
     problem of page breaks. As Your Honor may have gleaned
9
     from an earlier conference, we have this issue where,
10
     let's say 500 e-mails for a given individual are produced,
11
     but it's essentially one rolling page without a break.
12
         And if you had page breaks in that, in that big
13
     electronic document, it would be 1,000 pages. In one
14
     instance 22,000 pages.
15
         So it's this big long rolling document, and when you
16
     electronically try to search for terms within that, it's
17
     essentially impossible. I mean the smaller it is, the
18
     easier it is to sort through it. But the larger it is, it
19
     becomes effectively impossible.
20
          Now, one other thing we learned that has made this
21
     even more of a problem, that we just learned, is that the
2.2.
     program that AZ has been using -- and by the way, I say we
2.3
     learned, we have been told, I don't know this for a fact.
24
          But we have been told that the program AZ used to
25
     maintain these documents is called Intracept, I believe.
```

2.2.

2.3

these are the things that we must take care of. We must get our arms around all this and get this discovery done in order for this MDL to be concluded within the timeframes that we're all trying to get it concluded within.

And certainly this discovery needs to be done before we can even think about moving on to the next phase of a litigation like this, which is the discovery that the defendants are insisting upon foisting upon this litigation.

As was -- you know, I'll conclude with this, Your Honor, with respect to the defendant's proposals regarding discovery. We would suggest to you that it really is, when you look at it, simply a plan that will result in this Court and all of us being thrown into a quicksand of litigation. It will draw us all into dealing with thousands and thousands of individualized issues to no purpose. Because the defendants have not agreed to try cases in this courtroom.

The defendants understand that they're just — that they're just taking 300 cases that they suggested doing this massive amount of discovery, much of which may have to be redone when we get to trial to the remand court several years from now.

So all it is doing is creating this guicksand, this

seen or heard about until now. 1 2 MR. MCCONNELL: I think there are some witnesses 3 that are overseas. I think there are probably some 4 documents. But I think that the vast -- not just the 5 majority, the overwhelming majority of materials is in the 6 United States. 7 And we have said all along, and Your Honor's provided 8 in the order, if they want to add witnesses, they want to 9 ask for more documents, they can do that. And we're ready 10 to respond to that. 11 But right now there's nothing to respond to except a 12 vaque complaint. But we have more than met our 13 obligations, Your Honors. And with respect to the technical issue, Mr. Pennock 14 15 is right. I mean that shouldn't be the case. You 16 shouldn't have blank pages. You shouldn't have pages 17 without page breaks. 18 And what we have said, and Mr. Freebery can address this, time and time again, we have asked to meet and 19 20 confer, put the lawyers and the techie people together and 21 let's fix these problems. These are susceptible to a 2.2. technological fix, and it shouldn't have taken this long, 2.3 but we need to be able to get together and do it.

complain, TIF'ing of documents is the first step, it's not

In terms of the TIF'ing, as Mr. Freebery can

24

25

the last step. The fact that documents were TIF'ed in 2 December just is the beginning of the process, and there 3 are a lot of things that have to be done that can be 4 explained by Mr. Freebery in terms of review, privileges, 5 Bates stamping, putting them in the format that the 6 plaintiffs themselves said that they wanted in January. 7 And then finally, I would just say the thing that the 8 plaintiffs talked about in their motion, that they 9 complained about, is that we added extra documents for the 10 first date. 11 Your Honors, as I read Federal Rule of Civil 12 Procedure 26(e), that's what we're supposed to do. make the best effort you can to find the documents and to 13 14 produce them. If you find more, you're supposed to supplement. If you need to complete the record, that's 15 16 what you do. I think that's what we're supposed to be 17 doing. 18 And the last point, and I'll leave this to Mr. Magaziner to address if Your Honors get to it, 19 20 Mr. Pennock said we need to get all this discovery done, 21 including all the discovery in Sweden and England, before 2.2. we can even think about plaintiffs' specific discovery. 2.3 And I'll just remind Your Honor, Judge Baker, you 24 yourself said discovery is supposed to be a two-way 25 street. That's what Rule 26(d) says, too.

```
have here because there's no page breaks. So it would say
 1
 2
     page 1 -- and I'm not making this up -- through page
 3
     150,000. And then I have to go to the box to try to find
 4
     out those documents.
 5
         So when we say these are technical issues, they're
6
     not technical. They're substantive. I can't get to the
7
     documents.
 8
          And then we say we have blank pages. It's not a
 9
     minor thing. It says, okay, assume we have page breaks,
10
     and this is the only word that the computer people told
11
     me. It's a hook file. Well, if you had page breaks,
12
     which we don't, and we did have Scott Allen's box and we
13
     find Scott Allen's box, and you punch on the button, it's
14
     blank.
         And I don't know the technical reasons why. And it's
15
16
     not our responsibility. We did meet and confer on this.
     Mr. Pyrtle talked to me. He talked to them in
17
18
     Philadelphia.
         It's their job to give us usable production. I mean
19
20
     what else can I do? Please give me the hook files.
     Please give me page breaks. Please do it. I could meet
21
22
     and confer on that all day. They know what the problem
     is. They're supposed to produce it.
23
24
          And so these are substantive issue. They're not
25
     technical. They're not imperfections. I can't get to
```

```
So, you know, there is no doubt that the defendants
 1
2
     are producing large volumes of material, much of which, as
    we have said, is fairly unusable. But the question is, is
3
4
    it what we need and what we think we want to prosecute
5
     these claims, because we're not just engaging in a
6
     document production and review. We are litigators,
7
    lawyers, trial lawyers trying to investigate and discover
8
    a case that we could take to trial.
 9
              MAGISTRATE JUDGE BAKER: Mr. Pennock, what do
10
    you want from me?
11
              MR. MAGAZINER: Your Honor, I would like the
12
     opportunity to serve discovery demands on them.
13
              MAGISTRATE JUDGE BAKER: Go ahead.
14
              MR. PENNOCK: I'd like the opportunity to serve
15
     discovery notices for these foreign witnesses.
16
               MAGISTRATE JUDGE BAKER: Go ahead.
17
              MR. PENNOCK: And I'd like the opportunity to
18
    not be saddled with the 80 witnesses they've picked just
19
    yet.
20
              MAGISTRATE JUDGE BAKER: Go ahead.
21
              MR. ALLEN: By the way -- thank you. And we
2.2.
     will do that, and we don't -- we're also prepared, and I
2.3
     think we've got -- I'm prepared to do away with all this
24
     custodial production. They can stop it right now.
25
     Because I don't need any more blank pages. I don't need
```

```
any more --
 1
 2
               MAGISTRATE JUDGE BAKER: Do I need to have an
     evidentiary hearing with your technical people to find out
 3
 4
     what the problem is with the slashes and the hyphens and
 5
     the blank pages and the difficulties which you call
 6
     technical and what Mr. Allen has called making it
 7
     impossible to read?
 8
               MR. FREEBERY: From my perspective, no.
 9
     willing to sit down tomorrow.
10
               MAGISTRATE JUDGE BAKER: Why aren't the problems
11
     being solved? I mean I read your papers that you've got
12
     the best outfit in the country working on this, and I'm
13
     not getting any results, so that says to me, okay, it's
14
     impossible. So what's the solution?
15
               MR. FREEBERY: What our people are telling us,
16
     Your Honor, we're putting this all in this TIF format as
     laid out in the CMO. We're giving it to them. It's their
17
18
     system that's not reading it right or doing something
19
     incorrectly. We need their people there as well because
20
     they have a different system than we use.
21
          We're all playing on the same level field, or we're
2.2.
     playing on the same field, a level field, when it comes to
2.3
     page breaks. Whatever we have is the same thing they
24
     have.
25
          But the system, when it comes to the way it converts,
```