

Fcmlmtbc

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

3 In re MTBE 00-CV-1898 (SAS)

4 Telephone Conference

-----x

5 New York, N.Y.  
6 December 22, 2015  
7 3:06 p.m.

7 Before:

8 HON. SHIRA A. SCHEINDLIN,

9 District Judge

10 APPEARANCES  
11 (Via Telephone)

12 For Plaintiffs:

- 12 WILLIAM PETIT, ESQ.
- 13 MICHAEL AXLINE, ESQ.

14 For Defendants:

- 14 PETER LIGH, ESQ. (Vitol)
- 15 ROBERT WILSON, ESQ. (Idemitsu)
- 15 ADRIAN SANCHEZ, ESQ. (Peerless)
- 16 JAMES HARRIS, ESQ. (Petrobras)
- 16 DAVID SCHULTE, ESQ. (Petrobras)

17 Observing for Defendants:

- 18 ELAINE MALDONADO, ESQ. (Total)
- 18 ALBENIZ COURET FUENTES, ESQ. (Total)
- 19 JAMES PARDO, ESQ. (Liaison)
- 19 LISA GERSON, ESQ. (Liaison)

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Fcmlmtbc

1 THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is Judge Scheindlin.  
2 Is Mr. Petit on the phone?  
3 MR. PETIT: Yes, your Honor.  
4 THE COURT: And Mr. Axline?  
5 MR. AXLINE: Yes, your Honor.  
6 THE COURT: And now I'm going to call out the names of  
7 defense counsel. Mr. Ligh?  
8 MR. LIGH: Yes, your Honor.  
9 THE COURT: Mr. Wilson?  
10 MR. WILSON: Yes, your Honor. Good afternoon.  
11 THE COURT: And is it Ms. Sanchez?  
12 MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Sanchez.  
13 THE COURT: Oh, Mr. Sanchez. Mr. Harris?  
14 MR. HARRIS: Good afternoon.  
15 THE COURT: Mr. Schulte?  
16 MR. SCHULTE: Yes, your Honor. Good afternoon.  
17 THE COURT: Ms. Maldonado?  
18 MS. MALDONADO: Yes, your Honor.  
19 THE COURT: Mr. Fuentes?  
20 MR. FUENTES: Yes, your Honor. Good afternoon.  
21 THE COURT: Mr. Pardo?  
22 MR. PARDO: Good afternoon, your Honor.  
23 THE COURT: And Ms. Gerson.  
24 MS. GERSON: Yes, your Honor.  
25 THE COURT: Okay. I have two letters that I have

Fcmlmtbc

1 looked at. They're both dated December 18<sup>th</sup>. And I have one  
2 from defense counsel, Mr. Harris, and then I have one from  
3 Mr. Petit for the plaintiff. So I've read both these letters,  
4 and there must be some middle ground because if you read the  
5 plaintiff's letter, they basically present a list of horrors,  
6 saying that it would result in many, many complex motions,  
7 which no other defendants are being allowed to make at this  
8 time.

9 Do you know what that disturbance is? I can't think  
10 straight. What is that noise on this call? Does anybody know?  
11 I'm sorry. We can't do it. We can't do the call. We can't do  
12 the call unless -- hello?

13 MR. PETIT: Your Honor, this is Will Petit. I think  
14 that was Mr. Sanchez's line. He was the last to get on and  
15 that's when we started hearing it. He's in Peru, your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Oh, okay.

17 MR. SANCHEZ: Sorry.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Now I can continue, but it says  
19 basically that there would be endless enormous motions that  
20 would -- I think the phrase was shut down the court for years,  
21 although I for some reason can't find that phrase right now.  
22 Here it is. It says, "Quite apart from the impossible  
23 discovery timeline, the logistical nightmare such an approach  
24 would create, or the prejudice to the Commonwealth and even the  
25 other defendants, filing summary judgment motions on that many

Fcmlmtbc

1 sites would clog the Court's calendar for years." Now  
2 obviously my goal was not to have summary judgment motions on  
3 400 sites. I didn't think we were talking about discovery on  
4 400 sites. Because that's not the way we've been doing this  
5 case at all. Do the reinstated defendants anticipate  
6 site-specific discovery on 400 sites?

7 MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, this is Jim Harris. May I  
8 respond?

9 THE COURT: Please.

10 MR. HARRIS: The answer is no, your Honor, and we were  
11 not anticipating any summary judgments on causation. What we  
12 had hoped to get from the plaintiffs -- and given the amount of  
13 time that's passed in this case, we thought it was not an  
14 unreasonable request -- was an identification of those sites  
15 that they believe we are connected to, and at this point we're  
16 not going to challenge that. We just want to know what sites  
17 are we connected to and as to those sites, tell us when you  
18 discovered MTBE. And it would be just as to the reinstated  
19 defendants, not as to any other defendants. I guess we'd take  
20 up that issue, your Honor, in Phase 2. It's just I think a  
21 recognition that we are in a different position than the other  
22 defendants given that we were brought in late and that we had  
23 been dismissed and were brought back into the case.

24 THE COURT: Right. But I think the point of  
25 plaintiff's counsel is that the other defendants are not

Fcmlmtbc

1 getting any so-called Phase 2 discovery. In other words, we  
2 did discovery on the Phase 1 sites, we had motions, and we're  
3 going to have a remand for trial. I guess their view is, why  
4 are you sort of getting ahead of the other Phase 2 defendants?

5 MR. HARRIS: And if I might respond again, your Honor.  
6 Because we're in a different position both temporally when we  
7 were brought in, the fact that we were out, that at least based  
8 on some discovery that Idemitsu did early on that was answered  
9 by the plaintiffs, the plaintiffs were able to identify I think  
10 just 16 sites to which they connected Idemitsu, which as many  
11 as 10 I think are out that the plaintiff, in those answers to  
12 interrogatories, say that MTBE was not at those sites before  
13 2006. And if the plaintiffs could do that with respect to  
14 Idemitsu, we felt that they certainly could do it with respect  
15 to the three other defendants who have a very narrow focus on  
16 limitations. And additionally, we have a laches argument, your  
17 Honor, that none of the other defendants have.

18 THE COURT: Right.

19 MR. HARRIS: We're just tagalong defendants, anyway.  
20 We're just in an entirely different posture.

21 THE COURT: No, I agree, I agree, and I am leaning  
22 toward the defendant's position on this, but I wanted to  
23 understand whether the plaintiff's letter is a realistic parade  
24 of horrors. I mean, obviously I'm not planning to have full  
25 site-specific discovery on 400 sites, full discovery, you know,

Fcmlmtbc

1 what substances are found and what the hydrogeologists say and  
2 all of that, and we're not doing site-specific discovery in  
3 full on those sites. And the plaintiff's letter would say,  
4 well, it's not fair even to the other defendants for these  
5 defendants to have site-specific discovery on 400 sites. But  
6 you've answered that. You said there's no way it's going to be  
7 400 sites. They should identify, as to Vitol, Peerless, and  
8 Petrobras, which sites we are talking about, and then the only  
9 question you'll want to know, or they'll want to know, or  
10 you'll want to know is, when is it alleged to have been known.  
11 That's it. So you're not going to find out about other  
12 contaminants or you're not going to have hydrogeologist experts  
13 and you're not going to be interested in direction of flow and  
14 all that kind of stuff. It's really as simple as, where do you  
15 think we are, where have you identified we are, and when did  
16 you know.

17 MR. HARRIS: That's correct, your Honor.

18 THE COURT: I don't think that's as burdensome as  
19 Mr. Petit's letter makes it sound. I think it was a "scare the  
20 judge" letter.

21 So, Mr. Petit.

22 MR. PETIT: Your Honor, if I may respond. This is  
23 Will Petit.

24 THE COURT: Yes.

25 MR. PETIT: In our conversations with Mr. Harris, it

Fcmlmtbc

1 was a statute of limitations motion on a site-specific basis.

2 THE COURT: Yes, but what's the realistic number of  
3 sites? In other words, if you sit down and give the kind of  
4 list you gave to Idemitsu and it turns out that you say that  
5 Vitol is at five sites or Peerless is at ten sites, I mean,  
6 we're not talking 400. We're talking a limited number of  
7 sites, probably not a big number, and then they'll want  
8 interrogatories or document requests or admissions that talk  
9 about when you knew what. Then they may be ready to make a  
10 summary judgment motion based on limitations or laches. I  
11 think that's --

12 MR. PETIT: And your Honor, I just think that that  
13 particular discovery is also premature, and I'll give you an  
14 example. Idemitsu issued us before the statute of limitations  
15 very general discovery, and it was in Phase 1, and we responded  
16 to that discovery by objecting that this wasn't limited to the  
17 trial sites. But we gave them, based on initial information,  
18 what we thought were the sites they were connected to.

19 THE COURT: Well, good. Do that for these defendants.

20 MR. PETIT: Well, for purposes of Idemitsu, it's a  
21 little bit easier scenario than it is, for example, for Vitol  
22 and Petrobras, and I'll give an example. (Unintelligible) and  
23 409 million gallons of MTBE gases were provided to a number of  
24 different parties on the island, one of which is  
25 (unintelligible) but also others. Huge discovery question.

Fcmlmtbc

1 Those are questions for discovery that we're going to want to  
2 take against them and against other parties in Phase 2. So for  
3 us to be able to tell Vitol where their gasoline landed is  
4 premature. I don't think we can make that determination as we  
5 could for Idemitsu. The reason why we could for Idemitsu just  
6 preliminarily was because Idemitsu was a supplier to GPR in  
7 each location by themselves. They kind of had a dedicated  
8 supply chain. That's not the case for either Vitol,  
9 Petrobras -- Peerless, which is a terminal operator, their  
10 gasoline went to various places throughout the island, and we  
11 haven't had a chance to conduct that discovery, and according  
12 to Mr. Harris, they believe that this is a one-way discovery  
13 train.

14 THE COURT: Well, I was going to speak to that, but I  
15 wanted to focus on the second page of the defendant's letter,  
16 which says, "Reinstated defendants were middlemen that sold or  
17 directed gasoline from one sophisticated party to another  
18 sophisticated party, most of whom in turn resold to others,  
19 including retailers." And I think we've already ruled in  
20 another decision on the sophisticated party issue --

21 MR. HARRIS: Right.

22 THE COURT: -- so the fact that they -- who said  
23 right?

24 MR. HARRIS: Jim Harris. I'm sorry, your Honor.

25 THE COURT: So that's one point. Then they said they

Fcmlmtbc

1 know of no release sites which they directly sold. I think you  
2 would maybe agree with that, Mr. Petit. I'm not sure. Then  
3 they say they never owned any storage tanks. And --

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Underground for Peerless.  
5 Sorry, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Right. I see. I know. I know. The  
7 parentheses says other than Peerless, which are above-ground.  
8 And there's no other gasoline that defendants directed to  
9 sophisticated parties for each specific release site and for  
10 each storage tank, etc. for each site.

11 So with all of that, I thought there was some merit on  
12 defendant's position that they are in a different position than  
13 other defendants and that they were out, they were brought back  
14 in, they haven't had any initial discovery because they were  
15 out, and they may be entitled to at least get started.

16 On the other hand, I certainly, reading these letters,  
17 agree with the plaintiff that I'm not having full site  
18 discovery on 400 sites. But I think that was put in there, as  
19 I said, as a scare tactic. I don't think defendants think that  
20 either. They're not asking for full discovery on 400 sites.  
21 The real dispute seems to be that you're saying that these  
22 were -- some of these defendants were big suppliers and it  
23 would require product tracing to figure out where all their  
24 gallons went.

25 MR. PETIT: Well, not just that. It's just going to

Fcmlmtbc

1 require discovery on other defendants besides them. I think  
2 the four bullet points that Mr. Harris identified in his  
3 letter -- first, (unintelligible) There are certainly other  
4 product suppliers that are in this case. (Unintelligible) They  
5 would fall under those same categories.

6 The second issue is that it just reiterates the fact  
7 that we would have to take discovery on other parties. If they  
8 were limited to a group of stations, I think that that would be  
9 an easy thing, an easier thing. Peerless, for example, if you  
10 were limited to stations --

11 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I couldn't make you out  
12 because of the disturbance on the line again. If they were  
13 limited to what?

14 MR. PETIT: If they were limited to particular  
15 stations more readily, like if they were owners and operators,  
16 I think we would be able to have that analysis more easily.

17 THE COURT: But they're not. They're not owners and  
18 operators, right? They're middlemen. They're suppliers.

19 MR. PETIT: We don't necessarily agree. I don't want  
20 to appear we're agreeing. The fact that they are product  
21 suppliers means that there's other discovery involved with  
22 other defendants.

23 MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, Jim Harris. If I may  
24 respond. What you quoted in the letter accurately  
25 characterizes this. We directed materials to ports of Puerto

Fcmlmtbc

1 Rico. It goes off the ship, no longer ours, it goes to others  
2 that resell to the retail operators in Puerto Rico. And the  
3 plaintiffs have had going on nine years now in an effort to  
4 identify them. We were brought in late. I don't think it's  
5 unreasonable to say, just tell us which sites we're connected  
6 to. I guess if they say all 400 sites, that puts us in a  
7 different position, but at this point we don't have a response  
8 to what sites are we connected to. We're not going to take  
9 issue with it to say we're connected to that site. But also,  
10 if we're connected to a site, what the date was that you  
11 discovered. I think those are simple requests that may allow  
12 these reinstated defendants to get out of all or most of the  
13 case.

14 THE COURT: The only thing is, they're saying, we  
15 can't answer it so directly, we don't know which sites until we  
16 do product tracing, because if you sold to another party who  
17 then sold to the retailer, they have to trace where that  
18 defendant sold before they can tell you where they think you're  
19 responsible. That's why Mr. Petit says it would require  
20 discovery from other defendants.

21 MR. PETIT: Your Honor, even if we were able to  
22 provide the information that Mr. Harris is requesting on this  
23 call, if we were to provide that and provide him a list, I  
24 don't think they're going to necessarily agree with when the  
25 Commonwealth says it knew of the contamination. If we're in

Fcmlmtbc

1 Phase 2 --

2 THE COURT: Well, it may get us to a denial of summary  
3 judgment if there's a disputed issue of fact that people can  
4 point to as to when the Commonwealth knew, but to do that, you  
5 have to have some evidence to prove the issue of fact in  
6 dispute. You can't just say --

7 MR. PETIT: Can we make a determination on when the  
8 Commonwealth knew of MTBE contamination. (Unintelligible)  
9 We're certainly going to want to take discovery on what the  
10 site files say.

11 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear that. You  
12 want to take discovery as to what?

13 MR. PETIT: As to what their site files say. It's  
14 more of a complicated issue than Mr. Harris, the reinstated  
15 defendants make it out to be, and I'm not sure it gets us  
16 anywhere in the long run.

17 MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, this is Jim Harris. What I  
18 suggest is sort of a middle ground approach which is, let's  
19 start out by taking a look at whether they can identify  
20 specific sites and what the date that they claim are. There  
21 may be a number of sites that immediately drop out because the  
22 Commonwealth has a date prior to 2006. As to those sites where  
23 the date is after 2006, it may be necessary to do some  
24 additional limited discovery on how the Commonwealth came to  
25 that particular date, but perhaps we cross that bridge when we

Fcmlmtbc

1 come to it.

2 THE COURT: It sounds easy when you say it, but I  
3 don't know if they can identify the sites at which they say  
4 you're liable and commit themselves to that until they have  
5 discovery of other defendants, right? That's what Mr. Petit  
6 says.

7 MR. HARRIS: I guess, your Honor, but I won't know  
8 until I ask, and again, it's a little bit frustrating having us  
9 brought into the case late to be told even nine years into the  
10 case that they still don't have enough information to do the  
11 tracing. I wasn't involved --

12 THE COURT: But that's because we haven't had Phase 2  
13 discovery. We've been focusing on the trial sites. So the  
14 plaintiffs are in the odd position of being accused of, after  
15 nine years, not having the information, but I haven't allowed  
16 that discovery to go forward.

17 MR. HARRIS: They may have some discovery. Your  
18 Honor, I guess the question is, what do they know now? We  
19 don't even know.

20 THE COURT: Okay. But to be committed to say, here's  
21 a list of the sites at which we claim you're liable but we're  
22 telling you now that we're not committed to this being all of  
23 them, you're going to accept that answer? If they say, we will  
24 identify 15 sites but we're not committing ourselves to those  
25 15, it could turn out to be 315 but right now these are the

Fcmlmtbc

1 only 15 that we can identify, what would you think of that  
2 answer?

3 MR. HARRIS: I would view that as moving in a positive  
4 direction for my client, your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Even though it wouldn't be definitive  
6 until they get discovery of other defendants.

7 MR. HARRIS: If that's the case, again, the proof will  
8 be in the pudding as they're responding to the requests for  
9 information.

10 THE COURT: Apparently you're not listening exactly  
11 what I said. What if they say to you, here's a list of 15  
12 where we definitely say you're responsible, but we're leaving  
13 it open, we're not committed to that list, we're not saying it  
14 won't change, and then a year or two later, they say, oh, and  
15 it's 100 more sites. You don't think you would say, boy, were  
16 we misled?

17 MR. HARRIS: Well --

18 MR. PETIT: One way to look at this is what position  
19 would the reinstated defendants have been in had they not been  
20 out of the case earlier. They wouldn't have been in a  
21 different position. They wouldn't have been entitled to the  
22 discovery anyway.

23 MR. HARRIS: I would disagree with that, your Honor.  
24 Your order on Trammo, Peerless and Trammo, was in July '13.  
25 The fact discovery ended in October of '13, and we know that

Fcmlmtbc

1 they had responded to the Idemitsu request for sites and dates,  
2 and if we had had the ruling that we currently have with  
3 respect to needing to show the date of injury, there would have  
4 been sufficient time to ask those questions and to find out  
5 what the Court wanted to --

6 THE COURT: Other Phase 2 defendants who aren't in the  
7 Phase 1 sites at all, have they gotten the minimum level of  
8 discovery that you're asking for, the identification of sites?

9 MR. HARRIS: I don't know that they asked, your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Well, because maybe they believe the Court  
11 ruled that no discovery was going forward on Phase 2 until we  
12 finished Phase 1. So when you say they didn't ask, maybe they  
13 were told they couldn't, and that's what Mr. Petit is saying  
14 is, if you'd never been let out and you'd been there all along,  
15 discovery would essentially have been stayed if you weren't in  
16 Phase 1.

17 MR. HARRIS: Well, I would add, your Honor, that I  
18 think the complexion of the limitations issue changed very  
19 dramatically when the Court issued its decision in Peerless and  
20 Trammo in July of '13. At that point it was clear that to the  
21 extent you could prove knowledge of your involvement with  
22 gasoline trade in Puerto Rico and a date of injury, you can get  
23 out of the case at that point in time and not have to wait  
24 until trial. And I would submit to the Court that in that  
25 circumstance, asking those general questions such as the ones

Fcmlmtbc

1 we're asking now would have been most appropriate, and I would  
2 urge the Court to allow us to proceed on that basis at that  
3 time.

4 THE COURT: Right. But how many defendants have been  
5 able to take advantage of that?

6 MR. HARRIS: Other than -- all I know of is --

7 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

8 MR. HARRIS: I guess Idemitsu did, your Honor, and the  
9 other three reinstated defendants are asking to be able to do  
10 the same.

11 THE COURT: I know, but other than Idemitsu, there are  
12 many defendants. Who else has had that opportunity?

13 MR. HARRIS: None that I know of, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Right. So that's the question. Why are  
15 these three defendants entitled to special treatment, so to  
16 speak?

17 MR. HARRIS: Well, your Honor, if I might respond.  
18 The other way to take a look at it is, is this an appropriate  
19 opportunity to allow, on the very limited issue of the  
20 limitations, all the defendants to have that opportunity while  
21 we await the outcome of the trial of the focus sites in Puerto  
22 Rico. There is going to be a significant amount of down time  
23 between now and when those cases are tried, and is this an  
24 opportunity, on the very limited issue of limitations, which  
25 could be outcome determinative for a whole bunch of sites, to

Fcmlmtbc

1 have that discovery done now, and not limited to the four  
2 reinstated defendants.

3 THE COURT: Right. So Mr. Pardo, you represent as  
4 liaison everyone else. How many defendants are we talking  
5 about?

6 MR. PARDO: Your Honor, Jim Pardo. I don't have the  
7 exact number. I'm sorry. I didn't anticipate that question.  
8 I guess I should have. But I believe there must be somewhere  
9 between 12 and 15 defendants, your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Including the four reinstated or  
11 excluding?

12 MR. PARDO: Excluding.

13 THE COURT: Oh, my gosh. So you think it could be as  
14 many as 16 to 20.

15 MR. PARDO: That's correct, your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Well --

17 MR. HARRIS: But the question, your Honor, is going to  
18 be the same for that entire pool.

19 THE COURT: Right. No, I understand that. The  
20 question is, how much work is that for the plaintiff? How many  
21 hours, months, weeks will that take? Because I agree with you.  
22 I think this is getting to be a terribly old case and it should  
23 move forward even as they're awaiting the remand period, the  
24 scheduling of the trial, the build-up to trial, the actual  
25 trial. I mean, to stay everything for two more years or three

Fcmlmtbc

1 I don't think makes any sense. I think this discovery, what  
2 you call this very limited discovery, should go forward as to  
3 all defendants, because I can't really justify why these four  
4 differ from everybody else.

5 So seems to me the defense should get together for all  
6 16 to 20 and make their requests so that it's identical for  
7 each of the defendants and then enough time has to be allowed  
8 for plaintiffs to produce that kind of information. But it is  
9 limited to which sites and when did the Commonwealth know.  
10 That's all. Not full site discovery, as I started out saying  
11 earlier in this conference, just the issue of which sites and  
12 when.

13 MR. PETIT: Your Honor, this is Will Petit. It sounds  
14 like what you're suggesting is a conversation we'll be having  
15 with defense counsel as a whole and defendant's liaison counsel  
16 as part of the Phase 2.

17 THE COURT: Right. I am saying that. I'm saying it  
18 should be done for everybody because once you start doing one  
19 thing for one group, another thing for another group, it's  
20 chaotic, and I don't see why this group is in a special  
21 position. Yes, they can point back three years ago and say,  
22 well, Idemitsu got its interrogatories answered and got out and  
23 all that. I don't know. I don't recall how that anomaly  
24 occurred, but it's one out of 20. That's history. Now I have  
25 to deal with the reality today, and I don't see why that

Fcmlmtbc

1 limited portion of the Phase 2 discovery shouldn't proceed. I  
2 think it should proceed as to everybody because this remand and  
3 trial never goes very fast. One thinks it could happen  
4 tomorrow. It won't. It will be two years before that trial is  
5 over.

6 MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, Jim Harris. I think we have  
7 an opportunity to do that. The defendants could easily get  
8 together and craft a very focused set of interrogatories and  
9 make productive use of the time when a whole bunch of the  
10 defendants are not involved in the trial sites in Puerto Rico.

11 THE COURT: Well, whether everybody likes it or not,  
12 that's really where I am too. I think that should be done.  
13 And so go ahead and have your meeting, go ahead and craft the  
14 joint discovery demands. I'm sure when plaintiff sees it,  
15 they'll write letters and they'll bring it up in a monthly  
16 conference and all of that, but I think that's the only way to  
17 proceed at this time. So it's not quite a schedule, but I  
18 think that that's where you should start. Craft the demands as  
19 a group for everybody and we'll take it from there, step by  
20 step.

21 MR. PARDO: Your Honor, this is Jim Pardo. May I have  
22 an opportunity to speak to that?

23 THE COURT: Yes.

24 MR. PARDO: Thank you. I hear you. I will take that  
25 message back to the other defendants who are not newly added

Fcmlmtbc

1 here or newly added back in. I guess I'd like -- I didn't  
2 anticipate this directive. I do appreciate it. I understand  
3 it. I may have some folks on my side who want the opportunity  
4 to be heard on this.

5 THE COURT: Well, I don't know how a defendant can  
6 oppose being given the right to get discovery. So anybody who  
7 doesn't want it can drop out of the group for that purpose and  
8 say, this is on behalf of everybody except Shell or except  
9 Exxon. If that's what you want, fine with me. But basically  
10 I'm saying it goes forward as to everybody. If somebody  
11 doesn't want to get discovery, that's up to them. They don't  
12 have a right to be heard. That's my ruling. You're liaison  
13 counsel, so they were heard through your representation. It's  
14 everybody or nobody. And anybody who doesn't want any  
15 discovery, fine, they can exclude themselves from the group.  
16 But they won't be in a great position to ask for it later  
17 either, since they decided to forgo the opportunity to get it  
18 when I offered it.

19 So why don't you meet with your group, and I'm sure  
20 you'll get back to me.

21 Do we have a meeting scheduled in January?

22 MR. PARDO: We do, your Honor. January 13<sup>th</sup> right  
23 now.

24 THE COURT: Good. Maybe you can get the request  
25 together or be heard further then. Not that I want to revisit

Fcmlmtbc

1 this. This is what I think we have to do. But I'll see you  
2 all then.

3 MR. PARDO: All right. Thank you, your Honor.

4 ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, your Honor.

5 o0o

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25