Pages 1 - 18

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

### BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER

## TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

## **APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiffs:

LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN LLP

Embarcadero Center West 275 Battery Street

29th Floor

San Francisco, California 94111

BY: ELIZABETH J. CABRASER, ESQ.

KELLY K. McNABB, ESQ.

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP

Post Montgomery Center One Montgomery Street

Suite 1800

San Francisco, California 94104

BY: AELISH M. BAIG, ESQ.

MARTZELL BICKFORD and CENTOLA

338 Lafayette Street

New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

BY: SCOTT R. BICKFORD, ESQ.

### (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

# Reported By: Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR

Official Reporter - US District Court Computerized Transcription By Eclipse APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)

For Plaintiffs: THE DUGAN LAW FIRM APLC

269 South Third Street

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

BY: TERRIANNE BENEDETTO, ESQ.

BRYANT LAW CENTER 601 Washington Street Paducah, Kentucky 42003

BY: EMILY W. ROARK, ESQ.

MEHRI & SKALET PLLC 1300 19th Street, N.W.

Suite 400

Washington, DC 20036

BY: CYRUS MEHRI, ESQ.

SONOSKY CHAMBERS SACHSE ENDRESON &

PERRY LLP

725 East Fireweed Lane

Suite 420

Anchorage, Alaska 99503

BY: WHITNEY A. LEONARD, ESQ.

For Plaintiffs Michigan, Indiana and Kentucky Local Governments:

GRABHORN LAW OFFICE PLLC 2525 Nelson Miller Parkway.

Suite 107

Louisville, Kentucky 40223

BY: MICHAEL D. GRABHORN, ESQ.

For the McKinsey Defendants:

CLARENCE DYER & COHEN LLP

899 Ellis Street

San Francisco, California 94109

BY: JOSH A. COHEN, ESQ.

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)

For the McKinsey Defendants:

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

180 Maiden Lane

New York, New York 10038

BY: DAVID M. CHEIFETZ, ESQ.

MORRISON FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94101

BY: MARK DAVID MCPHERSON, ESQ.

\_ \_ \_ .

# 1 Thursday - September 2, 2021 9:00 a.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: Calling Civil Action C21-MD-02996, In Re 4 5 McKinsey and Company, Inc. National Prescription Opiate 6 Consultant Litigation. 7 Counsel, please state your appearances for the record. MS. CABRASER: Good morning, Your Honor. Elizabeth 8 Cabraser, Lieff Cabraser Heimann and Bernstein, plaintiffs' 9 lead counsel for the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee. 10 11 MS. McNabB: Good morning, Your Honor. Kelly McNabb from Lieff Cabraser Heimann and Bernstein for the plaintiffs. 12 13 Thank you. MS. BAIG: Good morning, Your Honor. Aelish Baig 14 15 with Robbins Geller Rudman and Dowd for the plaintiffs. 16 MR. BICKFORD: Good morning, Your Honor. 17 Bickford from Martzell Bickford and Centola in New Orleans for 18 the plaintiffs. MS. BENEDETTO: Good morning, Your Honor. 19 TerriAnne 20 Benedetto of the Dugan Law Firm for the plaintiffs. 21 MS. ROARK: Good morning, Your Honor. Emily Roark with Bryant Law Center from Paducah, Kentucky for the 22 23 plaintiffs, with the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee. MR. MEHRI: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Cyrus 24 25 Mehri of Mehri and Skalet in Washington, D.C. on behalf of the

plaintiffs. 1 MR. GRABHORN: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael 2 Grabhorn on behalf of the Michigan, Indiana and Kentucky local 3 4 governments. 5 MS. LEONARD: Good morning, Your Honor. Whitney 6 Leonard with the Sonosky Chambers Law Firm in Anchorage, Alaska 7 for the plaintiffs. MR. COHEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Josh Cohen, 8 Clarence Dyer and Cohen, for the McKinsey defendants. 9 THE COURT: Good morning. 10 11 MR. CHEIFETZ: Good morning, Your Honor. David Cheifetz with Strook and Strook and Lavan also for the McKinsey 12 defendants. 13 Good morning, Your Honor. Mark David 14 MR. McPHERSON: 15 McPherson from Morrison and Foerster also for the McKinsey 16 defendants. 17 THE COURT: Good morning. Seems like a fair number. Mr. Bickford, how is New Orleans? 18 MR. BICKFORD: It's -- we're getting power back 19 20 Should have it all back by the weekend. The city 21 wasn't too badly damaged compared to the suburbs outside 22 New Orleans, but I think we'll be back up and running Wednesday 23 or Thursday of next week, so... THE COURT: Well, good. I have a number of 24 25 colleagues in New Orleans that I am in frequent contact with.

Obviously, the disaster of Katrina, it was hard to see that New Orleans would bounce back because New Orleans are the people and the culture.

And Judge Fallon said, well, a very interesting thing happened is that a lot of people left, and then the people who came back were the people who really wanted to come back. And I was so pleased to see that that was the case.

I mean, it's such a remarkable area. So enriches our entire -- well, I would say world and certainly country.

MR. BICKFORD: Well, I appreciate your thoughts. You come from a very similar sister city that has it's own culture and deep background. But this time we didn't flood, so I think that -- that really --

THE COURT: Money well spent. Money well spent. Glad to see that.

MR. BICKFORD: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Great.

Well, first, let me start out by thanking the parties.

Obviously, they -- the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, and I would assume the plaintiffs' lead counsel and counsel for McKinsey, did a lot of work and came to an organization that I think makes complete sense as far as I can see. I don't know if anybody has some concerns about it in terms of its organization.

I want to talk a little bit about dates. But is there

anybody who wants to voice some concern about how it's organized? That is, what is going to take place first and second and third and simultaneously? Now is the time to speak, because I will enter it as an order.

(No response.)

THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's fine. That's great. Maybe it's one of the few times that the -- that everybody is pleased. I don't know. Maybe that's not the right word, but anyway, let me -- let me throw out one tweak, which I call a tweak, which is this.

The date for the Motion to Dismiss based upon the A.G. settlements, and I think the personal jurisdiction motion, in the proposal was January 14th, 2022. I think that that ought to be advanced to December 10th of this year, because I didn't see that there was really a good reason to kick it over a month.

That's essentially my view, based upon the fact that I'm very concerned that this litigation not be viewed as a marathon, like the New York City Marathon, but be viewed sort of like the San Francisco Bay to Breakers. That is, that there is an issue. It may be the -- a hill, but the sooner we get to the hill, which in my view at this point is the question of the A.G. settlements, the happier I'll be and I think the clearer -- hopefully, the clearer the path of litigation will be.

So I don't see any reason to wait to January to do it and ruin a lot of Christmas vacations for a lot of people. And I was going to set the date at December 10th.

Now, I am mindful that the time periods, the intervals between the filing of the motion, the opposition and the replies have probably been carefully negotiated, and the parties are satisfied with those times. And I'm going to keep to those times, but I'm going to actually add a further twist to it.

The days between the motion and the opposition were 45 days. The days between the opposition and the reply was 30 days. What I'm going to do is increase the number of days in one sense between the motion and the opposition. I was going to set the opposition for January 31st. So that's an additional week. However, in exchange for that, I'm directing plaintiff's counsel to direct members of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and anyone else who is working on this, to their knowledge, to not assign any work in any way related to this litigation to any associate from December 19th midnight to midnight December 26th.

Now, I don't know that that's a normal order, and maybe it's immediately appealable, and I will certify it if you wish. But it comes out of an experience I had when I was in private practice, and I -- I was defending a deposition. It was actually a third-party deposition that was going to be taken in

Boston, Massachusetts, and it was set for December 24th. And I thought that that was a little outrageous because I was in San Francisco having to travel to Boston for December 24th.

So I went to the magistrate judge, Steel Langford at the time. They were called Commissioners, by the way, at the time. And he said: Well, there are a lot of good reasons to take this deposition, but the reason not to take this deposition is that I don't want Mr. Breyer to be sitting in a Horn & Hardart and having a steamed turkey over lumpy mashed potatoes as his Christmas dinner. Actually, it sounded pretty good given what I was probably facing anyway, but I appreciated that.

And so, look. Partners, you spend your lives as you wish.

But associates, who must take your direction and must -- and

must please you and must obey your directions, they are at your

mercy. Well, not for the week of December 19th to

December 26th in this litigation. Can't control any other

litigation.

So any problem with that, Ms. Cabraser?

MS. CABRASER: Not at all, Your Honor. And we won't take advantage of that by making a number of field promotions to partner for that period, although that might be an alternative. And I hope that this -- this order does become precedential. I think it's very wise and the nation's associates would thank you.

THE COURT: All right. So the -- then the reply will

be due on March 4th.

I gave the -- I gave McKinsey a couple of extra days in light of Ski Week, which I don't feel so strongly about.

And the argument, that will be on St. Patrick's Day. I had no idea how I was going to celebrate it this year, but that's -- I think I should celebrate it by setting aside the day for all of you to argue this matter. The 17th.

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, Josh Cohen for McKinsey.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Cohen.

MR. COHEN: Can I just address the issue that the Court raised at the outset about the timing of the initial filing of our Motion to Dismiss?

THE COURT: All right. Sure.

MR. COHEN: Putting aside the wisdom of comparing any case to Bay to Breakers, our view, Your Honor, is that the -- the critical issue here -- and actually the issue that was the subject of the most discussion among the parties in preparing this joint proposal, is the need for McKinsey to have a measurable amount of time with the Master Consolidated Complaints once they are filed in order to prepare a motion that is tailored to the specific claims that are being asserted in those motions.

We absolutely are going to use the time between now and the filing of those motions to begin briefing the -- the effect of the settlement agreements in 17 different jurisdictions as

to 34 different political subdivision's claims.

But if we only have four days, Your Honor, to actually ensure that our motion is speaking to the claims that are asserted in those complaints once they are filed, we're not going to be able to do an adequate job of ensuring that the motion is directed to the pleading.

THE COURT: Well, that's a good point. Let me just take a look. Let me just take a look.

MR. COHEN: What we had discussed with the plaintiffs is that we -- and this really was the very first issue that we raised in our first call with them a week ago Monday, was that we believe we need roughly 30 days after the Complaint is filed to make sure that the motion that we are filing is directed to that pleading.

You're right. We built in a few extra days because of the Court's concern about associate time over the Christmas holiday, and that's why it was not exactly 30 days after the MCCs were filed. But our concern, Your Honor, is that the schedule that the Court proposed is going to collapse back --

THE COURT: Well, it would collapse a little bit.

Let me -- let me address this.

Let me -- so I'm going to go back in the other direction.

My question is, since there is no magic to December -- what did

I say? It was December 6th? No. It was -- in your suggestion

it's December 6th. Mine -- I'm actually addressing the

plaintiffs, the Master Complaint is December 6th.

Now, the question is how much -- how can we advance that?

I mean, is it -- there's no magic in December 6th. Why do you need until December 6th to file the Master Complaint?

MS. CABRASER: We need until December 6th to file the Master Complaint, or we built in until December 6th to file the Master Complaint, Your Honor, to provide us with sufficient time to at least have a preview of the A.G. production, which is occurring on November 4th, and also to make determinations as to which claims would actually go forward, and then, of course, to organize the pleadings so that we had consistent factual allegations across the Complaints and so the defendants weren't trying to address, you know, a scattershot of pleadings. So that's why we built in the time.

I think a few days -- you know, shaving some time off of that I think would work. We'll just work a little more quickly.

THE COURT: Well, let's see whether you could live with -- looking at -- I'm trying to figure out, if I were to say November 22nd for you to file your -- then that's Thanksgiving week. So, or I could say December 23rd -- I mean, November 23rd. Doesn't make any difference.

I don't want to -- I don't want to necessarily put it, like, the week after Thanksgiving because that means everybody is working on Thanksgiving. I mean, that's the reality. I

know how it works.

I mean, unless you all have become so much more enlightened, and maybe you have, but I'd like to sort of set it for -- why not file on the 22nd or the 23rd. Then it's off and people feel better about it.

I understand you don't have the magic of each day and so forth, but I also -- I also recognize, Ms. Cabraser, you're entitled -- you're authorized. You know, if you need additional people because of additional issues and so forth, you're authorized to do that. That's not a problem.

I'm not going to complain -- you can hold me to this, and
I'm sure you will. But I'm not going to complain that too many
people worked on this, if, in fact, the work is done by these
people. I've never found it a lot of unnecessary work,
especially from the firms that I have familiarity with on the
Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, and you just give them some
guidance. And we're now -- after all, we're -- we have
September, October. We've got a lot of time to sort of think
about what to do in this case.

I've also found that additional time leads to expansion of documents, and that's not necessarily consistent with good case management.

So what if I were to say, okay, file your Complaint by November -- by November 23rd, instead of December 6th. And there you go.

1	And then I'm going to stick to my other times for filings,
2	because I think I have to think number one, I have to
3	think that McKinsey, having the basic issue of do these
4	settlements are these settlements effective in terms of
5	releases. I have a pretty good idea what their arguments are
6	at this point. It's not like, oh, I'll be surprised. You
7	mean, we have to address this subject. To the contrary.
8	They've been saying these things for a considerable period of
9	time.
10	Now, the time is, okay, they are basically legal
11	arguments, as I understand them to be, so write them out. You
12	know, now we have ask Mr. Cohen. How many lawyers do you
13	have in your firm, as an example?
14	MR. COHEN: In my firm, Your Honor?
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	MR. COHEN: There are six of us.
17	THE COURT: And Strook and Strook and Lavan and
18	Morrison, they are comparable; is that right?
19	MR. COHEN: Exactly.
20	THE COURT: All right. So that's plenty of lawyers
21	the way I look at it. That's plenty of lawyers to work on
22	this. Work together.
23	MR. COHEN: Could I make one request, Your Honor?
24	One suggestion to the Court's proposed schedule?
25	THE COURT: Yes.

MR. COHEN: Given that filing the Consolidated

Complaints on the 23rd would put it just before Thanksgiving and, therefore, leave us relatively little time with those Complaints thereafter, is there any reason that we couldn't have until December the 17th to file the motion, which would not materially impact the rest of the schedule that the Court has proposed?

THE COURT: Here is my concern. I thought about that. And my concern was you drop it on the 17th. You drop it on the 17th. I can do that, but the problem is for the plaintiffs then, you're not going to have the associates working on it.

Is that okay, Ms. Cabraser?

MS. CABRASER: We'd prefer not, Your Honor. We'll -we can live with getting -- you know, getting pushed on our
side to the 23rd if -- if the rest of the schedule stays --

THE COURT: Yeah. I'm going to keep the rest of the schedule. I am going to keep the rest of the schedule.

And I want to say one other thing, Mr. Cohen. You do have -- you do have the -- you're going to have the last word, the last written word in this. It's called the reply. I'm not going to get any sur replies and so forth. I say that. I say that hopefully.

But so I'm -- you know, I'm not so concerned about it.

I'm not so concerned that you won't be able to -- between two

shots at this, you won't be able to state your arguments, especially with the size of these firms that are going to be working on this.

So I will amend it to December -- I mean November, what did I say, 23rd?

MR. COHEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That's the way it is.

So now I wanted to say one other thing, the size of these filings. I actually don't have in my mind what the local rule is as to the number of pages.

My guess is, just a wild guess, is that the parties will immediately address how large the briefs can be. I think that's probably right; right? You think that's a fair expectation that maybe you'll seek to extend the page limit?

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, given the number of states and the number of claims that we have in this case, it's a fair assumption, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Exactly. And I will certainly grant it within -- within reason.

And I only ask you to be guided by a principle that you are writing to a person who may have somewhat limited shelf life in retention and attention to, you know, something that is so important to the parties. And therefore, therefore, put the best arguments in the beginning. Put it there. Make it clear. Don't just throw in the kitchen sink.

As soon as I see one bad argument, you know what I do?
Well, you might. I stop reading. This is nonsense. And so
I'm sure that we'll have no bad arguments. I'm sure we will
have good arguments, but make them in the beginning. Make them
clear. Choose your best argument, your best cases, and just
set it out there.

Okay. I'm already exhausted. So I also don't want to detract from the fact that I know -- and I want to really thank the parties who negotiated this. I know that a lot went into this. I'm not -- I'm not at all disappointed. I just want to try to move it along, and this seems to be an approach that I would take.

I also am hopeful, by the way, that in terms of the argument, that I will be able to suggest questions that the Court has in light of the filings. Just so -- so that that day on the 17th, we'll try to focus on what is really still to be decided by the Court.

Now, I'm not suggesting -- when I say "still to be decided," I can be -- as you know, I can think one thing and then be talked into something else because what I thought originally was wrong.

But I -- I want to make sure that we have an honest and -exchange of views and that nobody is blindsided by it. It's
just -- it's too important. It's too important to the
plaintiffs, and it's too important for McKinsey that some -- a

I don't like surprises. As a matter of 1 surprise comes up. fact, no trial lawyer likes surprises. So we're just going to 2 try to minimize those, if I can. 3 So I would appreciate the parties -- I know that they are 4 5 going to furnish the Court with a -- sort of a schedule consistent with what I've said today. 6 And I would ask, do you have any questions? 7 MS. CABRASER: No questions from plaintiffs, Your 8 9 Honor, I don't think. Thank you. As we noted in the joint status conference statement, 10 11 we're working on a proposed protective order and a proposed ESI protocol. And we'll get those to the Court, by -- I think the 12 10th is what we said, unless Your Honor needs --13 THE COURT: No, no. I leave all that up to you. 14 Ι 15 leave all that up to you. 16 So anything from the defense? 17 MR. COHEN: No, Your Honor. Thank you very much. We will work to get the Court a case management order that 18 19 covers the schedule, as well as various other case management 20 issues roughly contemporaneous with the ESI protocol. 21 THE COURT: Okay, okay. I appreciate it. Thank you 22 very much. 23 MR. COHEN: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Take care. Bye bye. 24 (Proceedings adjourned.) 25

# CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Lletura X. Pard

Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR
Monday, September 13, 2021