#### Pages 1 - 26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Edward M. Chen, Judge

IN RE CHRYSLER-DODGE-JEEP
ECODIESEL MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION,

) Case No. 17-MD-02777-EMC

San Francisco, California Thursday, August 2, 2018

### TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

#### **APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiff United States of America:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Environment & Natural Resources Division

P.O. Box 7611

Washington, DC 20044

BY: JOSEPH WARREN, ESQUIRE LEIGH RENDÉ, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel and Chair of Plaintiffs' Steering Committee:

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN
275 Battery Street - 29th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

BY: ELIZABETH J. CABRASER, ESQUIRE

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN 250 Hudson Street - 8th Floor

New York, NY 10013

BY: DAVID S. STELLINGS, ESQUIRE

(Appearances continued on the following page)

Reported By: Pamela A. Batalo, CSR No. 3593, RMR, FCRR

Official Reporter

#### APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

For California Attorney General and the California Air Resources Board:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
600 West Broadway - Suite 1800

San Diego, CA 92101

BY: JUDITH FIORENTINI

JON WORM

DEPUTY ATTORNEYS GENERAL

For Defendants FCA US LLC and Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V.:

SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP

125 Broad Street New York, NW 10004

BY: ROBERT J. GIUFFRA, JR., ESQUIRE DARRELL S. CAFASSO, ESQUIRE

For Defendant Robert Bosch GmbH Robert Bosch LLC:

CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

BY: MATTHEW D. SLATER, ESQUIRE

Special Master: THE LAW OFFICES OF KENNETH R. FEINBERG

1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Suite 390

Washington, DC 20004

BY: KENNETH R. FEINBERG, ESQ.

(And all other appearances as indicted in the minutes.)

## Thursday - August 2, 2018

10:00 a.m.

2

1

# PROCEEDINGS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

---000---

THE CLERK: Calling 17-MD-02777, In re Chrysler-Dodge-Jeep EcoDiesel Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation.

Counsel, please step forward and state your appearances for the record.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, Joe Warren for the United States. Ms. Rendé is going to be speaking for the United States today. She should be here any minute.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Warren.

MS. FIORENTINI: Good morning, Your Honor. Judith Fiorentini and Jon Worm. We are here on behalf of the California Attorney General's Office and the California Air Resources Board.

THE COURT: Welcome. Good morning.

MS. CABRASER: Good morning, Your Honor. Elizabeth Cabraser, David Stellings from Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein for plaintiffs.

> Thank you, Ms. Cabraser. THE COURT: Great.

MS. RENDÉ: Good morning. Leigh Rendé for the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Rendé.

MR. SLATER: Good morning, Your Honor. Matthew Slater

for Robert Bosch GmbH and Robert Bosch LLC.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Slater.

MR. FEINBERG: Good morning, Your Honor. Kenneth Feinberg, Settlement Master in this matter.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Feinberg.

And I know Mr. Giuffra is in the building, but we can proceed without him. He's coming.

I know that Mr. Feinberg has a plane to catch, but I wanted him to give me an update officially for the record as to where things are.

MR. FEINBERG: Thank you, very much, Your Honor.

The negotiations involving all parties are continuing in absolute good faith. Complicated case. The Government -- federal, state -- FCA, Chrysler, Bosch, everybody, PSC, of course, Ms. Cabraser -- everybody is working rather intensively. We've had, in the last 48 hours, about 20 hours of face-to-face negotiation here in San Francisco.

We are making substantial progress. I think that the negotiations will continue throughout the month of August into September. I can't say at this time with any assuredness to the Court when these negotiations will end and when I hopefully believe they will be approved, but I can say that everybody is certainly focused on this, and I commend all the parties for their work.

There are a series of issues that have to be addressed.

Also the testing of the vehicles, as Your Honor knows, continues, hopefully nearing completion in the next -- by sometime in September.

And in the meantime, we will continue to work to try and get all of the issues resolved, any potential monetary issues resolved. And my update concludes rather generally because everybody is in confidence trying to evaluate the various terms, the various conditions, the various remedies that will be available to class members, but I commend everybody for their efforts.

And I will continue, per Your Honor's suggestion, to give you weekly reports during the month of August into September as to the progress that's being made so Your Honor will be kept up to date, even before the next status conference, with my providing the Court input each week as to the progress of these negotiations, as we try and get to the end game.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Feinberg.

And I will state for the record that with the parties' consent, I have gotten updated information about the status of testing in some detail and as well as the general process of negotiating terms of settlement, and my understanding now, that I will put on the record, is that the testing is proceeding.

There have been some glitches and problems, some of which are alluded to in the Case Management Conference Statement, but the parties anticipate and agree that there are a number of

issues that need to be addressed, that some data needs to be provided by FCA to the Government, to the testing agencies.

And meanwhile, testing is going on on some of the vehicles and testing is about to commence on some other vehicles, but the anticipation is that with the provision of data and reports from FCA to the Government, which is going to occur starting really in the next week or two into through the month of August, that the testing agencies will have completed their testing by mid September, is the anticipation, and will complete their analysis by the end of September.

And the Court is quite anxious about having that process proceed because as stated for the record previously, it had been anticipated that testing would be done in June and then now it's been delayed to July and August, so now we're talking about the end of September, and this is all occurring at a time -- and I understand there are reasons and we need to make sure that the quality of the testing data is acceptable, but in the meanwhile, every day that we wait and await a remedy here, we have a hundred thousand cars on the road that are causing -- that are emitting emissions that are evidently in excess of applicable standards.

MR. FEINBERG: I should say, Your Honor, in light of your placing on the record the September dates for the testing, the finishing and the analysis of that, as Your Honor knows, on a parallel track, we are hoping, all parties, to, on a parallel

track, come up with a comprehensive global settlement agreement that would track the chronology of the testing so that, again, the goal would be that by the end of September, we would have the testing finalized and a comprehensive settlement involving all parties to the MDL would be completed and successfully completed at the same time. That's the goal.

THE COURT: Right. Thank you, Mr. Feinberg.

And on that front, my understanding is that the parties are agreeable -- or the Court has indicated that it expects that the drafting of the documents -- and there may be some open issues, hopefully not, with respect to substantive terms such as monetary terms, etc., etc., but the terms of the documents, the terms of the consumer-facing issues and how those will be dealt with, that that will also be completed by the end of September, and I've directed the parties to meet and confer on an intense basis and affirm and further empower Mr. Feinberg to oversee that process, to give me weekly updates, and to direct the parties, not only as a facilitator of exchange of information, but, if necessary, to indicate and order certain parties to appear, including management, if necessary, in order to get this deal done.

And so I'm going to press again the priority of this Court to figure out whether we've got a deal or not, whether we are going to have a fix or not by the end of September, which is now understandable because of the -- the delays have been

understandable, but it is two, three months behind what we originally anticipated.

So let me ask the parties if there is anything more to add in that regard with respect to updates on testing, settlement discussions, etc.?

(No response from counsel.)

THE COURT: All right.

Well, I will indicate that record. I would like to have a further status conference towards the middle or end of September to see how that -- to get a further update on the testing and on the negotiation progress. We can specially set this -- I don't know, Mr. Feinberg, if you have a date or series of dates in mind.

MR. FEINBERG: Your Honor, it might be, on the status conference schedule for September -- one suggestion is with my weekly reports, at some point in August based on the weekly reports, to decide whether earlier in September, middle of September, later in September for a status conference depending on progress to date.

Is that a possibility or would Your Honor prefer to set a date now or wait for my --

THE COURT: Why don't we reserve two dates: One, if we need an earlier one, we can call it; and if not, if things are going well and you don't think we need one, we'll opt for the later dates.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Why don't we set two dates: One for -- what about the first week of September? That is a short week, but -- I don't know if it works better to specially set this on a particular day of the week. I can't remember what our patterns have been, whether Fridays, Mondays, middle of the week. MS. CABRASER: For plaintiffs, any day that week would work, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** The Government? MS. RENDÉ: We can be available any time you would like, Your Honor. MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, the 6th or the 7th, which is a Thursday or Friday, would be best for us. THE COURT: All right. I usually have a pretty packed calendar on law and motion day, which is the 6th, so the 7th --Teresa, are we open? (Pause in proceedings.) THE COURT: So the 7th in the morning would work, That's kind of provisional, but we'll mark that date, and then a later date in September, perhaps towards the end of September, either the third or fourth week, the 23rd or the 28th. THE CLERK: The 28th. THE COURT: The 28th? MR. GIUFFRA: I can't do the 28th. THE COURT: No? Okay.

MR. GIUFFRA: That entire week is bad. 1 THE COURT: The entire week is bad? How about the 2 21st? 3 MS. CABRASER: Your Honor, the 21st would work for 4 plaintiffs in the morning. 5 6 MR. GIUFFRA: I have a court appearance in Delaware on 7 the 21st. MS. CABRASER: The 20th? 8 MR. GIUFFRA: I could do the 19th. I could do the 9 18th. What about the first week in October? After the 10 11 September deadline that we're talking about comes to 12 conclusion, it might be -- October 1, 2, 3, something like 13 that. I'm just making that suggestion because of the time 14 frame. 15 THE COURT: All right. How are we October 1st or 2nd, 16 Teresa? 17 MR. GIUFFRA: I have to be in New Orleans -- I'm sorry 18 about this -- for an argument before the Fifth Circuit on the 19 It hasn't been set yet, but I think that is the date 20 they're looking at. So for me that week of the 3rd would 21 probably be the best. 22 THE COURT: All right. How is our 3rd calendar? 23 MR. GIUFFRA: Or the 5th. 24 MS. CABRASER: The 3rd would work. The 2nd, 3rd or 25 4th.

THE COURT: Yeah. I'm out the 4th. I'm out the 4th 1 2 and 5th. MR. FEINBERG: It looks like the 3rd, morning of the 3 3rd. 4 5 **THE COURT:** Why don't we say 9:30 on the 3rd? MR. FEINBERG: Of course, Your Honor, weekly I will 6 7 keep you up to date about the efficacy of these dates. 8 THE COURT: Yes. MR. FEINBERG: Thank you. 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MR. SLATER: Just to be clear, Your Honor, on 11 September 7th, I'm scheduled to be out of the country, but we 12 13 will have somebody else here if that date goes forward. 14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Slater. 15 MS. RENDÉ: Your Honor, if I may just comment on 16 something you said a little earlier. You did mention that the 17 Court expects the drafting of the settlement documents to be completed by the end of September, and I just want to state for 18 the record that the United States -- we will endeavor to meet 19 20 that deadline as best as we possibly can, and of course that will depend on the testing results, but we do understand that 21 that's the Court's goal, and we will --22 23 That is the goal. And if for some reason THE COURT: I am getting reports that it's not happening and that things 24 25 may need to be done to make it happen, then when we get

together in August or whenever it is, I may order further meetings, whatever.

So it is a goal, but it is a goal that could have consequences if it's not met.

MS. RENDÉ: Understood. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Let's talk about the case management itself. There is an update in here, some of it on the testing, which I think we've gone through and I have already obtained information on, as well as the ADR.

There is a question -- we've got a schedule in terms of class cert and it looks like there may be some *Daubert* motions filed in conjunction with the class cert.

One thing that we haven't done yet is to set a trial date in this matter. Although I'm hopeful that this case can be resolved, as I think it should be and more effectively through settlement process, my intent is if that does not succeed, is to continue to move on the litigation and trial track.

And we had previously discussed dates in, I think, the spring, and so I want to talk about potential dates, one of them being either March or April, and I want to talk to you about that and get your thoughts about whether, assuming we proceed with class cert and get that resolved one way or another and the state of discovery -- and some of it is, I know, international -- whether this case can be tried within

that time frame. Let's say -- April 1st is one date that I have.

That would mean a Pretrial Conference in March and that means pretrial filings in late February. It also means summary judgment motions toward the end of the year.

Is that doable?

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, may I be heard on this?

MR. GIUFFRA: A couple of things.

One suggestion we would have, right now you have the class cert hearing -- I just want to put a marker down -- for October 30th at 10:00 a.m.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GIUFFRA: Our papers will be submitted, I believe, on Monday, which is the 6th, and then the other side will be done on -- I think it's September 3.

We'll be asking the Court to hold an evidentiary hearing allowing, you know, maybe two experts on each side to testify at the class cert hearing. We think there are substantial class cert issues in this case, and it's become routine -- I actually had a hearing last week, two days, before Judge Crotty in a securities case where we actually had three witnesses testify.

And given the fact that under Rule 23(f), there is the ability to appeal a class cert order, we think it would make

sense to have an evidentiary hearing, in which case it might make sense to block out or at least have the option of blocking out that second day.

So that would be the -- right now you have it set for the 30th, and you might just want to think about having, you know, the next day available if you go down the road of having the witnesses actually testify.

THE COURT: And what kind of -- you're expecting expert testimony?

MR. GIUFFRA: Yeah. That would be -- what I would envision -- again, I did this last week and I've done it before. I would envision a two-day hearing where you would have opening statements for probably 30 minutes. Then the plaintiffs and defendants would put on, you know, their respective experts, and in this case, I think it's probably two experts a side.

THE COURT: And what would the experts address?

MR. GIUFFRA: They would -- they would address the subject of their reports on direct and then you would have cross-examination. Your Honor can obviously ask them questions.

But that is now considered to be good practice in a case of this complexity.

THE COURT: Right. But I was asking what's an example of a topic area in the context of this class certification

motion?

MR. GIUFFRA: There would be -- there will be issues that would have to be dealt with with respect to reliance. There will be issues with respect to materiality, the causation, damages, whether the -- whether the damages model of the other side works, things like that.

One of the issues we have in this case is you do not have a nationwide ad campaign, and so one of the questions is going to be was everyone similarly situated in terms of what they -- why they bought the cars, for example, or the vehicles.

THE COURT: All right.

Ms. Cabraser.

MS. CABRASER: Your Honor, plaintiffs would request that the Court defer its decision on that until the class cert papers have come in and Your Honor has had a chance to review them so that you can determine whether an evidentiary hearing and what type of evidentiary hearing would be helpful to the Court.

This is a minor point, but I'd note in passing that the October 30th date for class certification was the subject of some back and forth among counsel.

Mr. Giuffra has a very busy schedule, but sometimes mine is busy, too, and so if the Court's decision were to hold additional time past October 30th, we would be requesting that it take place that next week. I have a court hearing the very

next day.

We both seem to be in constant transit. And -- yes. We will stipulate to that.

So that would just be a point of scheduling, if the Court were to determine that that were appropriate.

But at this point, I think our view is that the papers and argument ought to be sufficient, but obviously that's for Your Honor to decide when you see them.

MR. GIUFFRA: Actually, I think maybe -- I have no problem -- I really just wanted to alert the Court to the fact that we will be making the request for the evidentiary hearing and just so, for purposes of scheduling, to at least put that on the Court's radar.

I agree that the Court can get our papers, read the expert reports, and determine whether it makes sense. I think that in this case given the issues with respect to damages, whether there is an injury, what the scope of the injury is, is everyone in the same position, did everyone rely on the same advertising, why do they buy these vehicles -- I think there's lots of issues that will go and make this a very complicated class certification issue, so I just wanted to put it on the radar -- on the Court's radar.

THE COURT: Right now we've got this scheduled -Teresa, is there -- are we devoting a full day, or what do we
have on the 30th?

THE CLERK: Of October? 1 Yes. Currently scheduled for the 30th. 2 THE COURT: THE CLERK: That's all that is there for that day. 3 THE COURT: We are scheduled to have that at what 4 time? 5 THE CLERK: 10:00. 6 THE COURT: I would think if I find that an 7 evidentiary hearing is required, a full day would be enough 8 because I don't need to hear on every single point, is my 9 guess, and I'm not sure I need to hear anything, but --10 11 MR. GIUFFRA: I think that Your Honor -- again, I'm trying to just sort of foresee the issue. 12 13 Whatever happens with respect to class cert, there will be 14 an appeal, and it would make sense, we believe, for the Court 15 to actually hear from the experts. I think there is two on 16 each side that would make sense for the Court to hear from. 17 Realistically in order to put four people up and down and 18 have cross-examination -- in the proceeding I had last week in the Southern District of New York, we had directs for 40 19 20 minutes, crosses for 30 minutes, 10 minutes each for recrosses -- I mean, redirects and recrosses. So you're 21 22 talking about an hour and twenty minutes per witness. When you 23 have four witnesses, it takes some time.

So realistically to do it all in one day, plus having some

sort of opening to at least set the issues for the Court and

24

25

then some sort of a closing where you can sum up what people have said, I think it would actually be very helpful to the Court because you're going to be looking at a stack of papers from each side that are going to be very, very thick. So I'm trying to just put this on the Court's radar.

You will obviously get our papers next week. You can peruse them at your leisure. But I think when you read our papers or read their papers, you're going to say there is a lot of issues here, there's a lot of factual issues here, there's a lot of complicated expert issues here, more so, candidly, than in the typical case.

MS. CABRASER: Your Honor, I would just indicate that while evidentiary hearings on class cert are sometimes useful in certain types of cases, in our view, at least, this is a case predominantly about what people didn't know and what they weren't told uniformly.

So certainly, while there are experts with respect to some of the damages issues, we're really focused here on predominance of issues as they relate to liability with respect to class certification.

But, again, I think it's for the Court to decide what would be most helpful to it in making -- in going through its own decision process and sorting those issues out.

I think it's fair to say we have different views on class certification. We have different views on the issues of the

case. And, really, it's something for the Court, as the decision-maker, to decide.

get the papers. And what I might do is advance that hearing up to earlier in the day, get an early start, like 8:30 or something, make sure if we need to hear from two, three, four witnesses, that we can get them all done. Whatever it is, even if we have an evidentiary hearing, right now my sense is if we are taking expert testimony, which can be done fairly efficiently -- we are not trying this case for the jury -- that can all be done in one full day and I have a full day available. So --

MS. CABRASER: Thank you.

THE COURT: If needed.

MR. GIUFFRA: On the issue of the trial, Your Honor, let me raise that.

THE COURT: Yep.

MR. GIUFFRA: You know, our position has been from the beginning that we want to try to resolve this case on a global basis, and we're hopeful that can be done. And we would like to obviously see Your Honor be the judge who signs the settlement papers.

But with respect to the setting of a trial, the Department of Justice made the decision to file this case in the Eastern District of Michigan, and right now FCA's position is we will

not consent to a trial of the Department of Justice's claims in this Court at this time. That could change down the road.

But, you know, that's our right. We think that, you know, we have fact discovery that is ongoing. There's, you know, a lot of complexity in this case. And -- for example, it's entirely possible that there might -- the only trial you might ever have with the DOJ might be over the penalty if we can't come to an agreement.

And then with respect to the PSC case, you know, again we have this class certification issue. There will be an appeal by the party that loses on class certification. You know, there is going to be extensive motion practice. There is a lot of discovery that is going on, and -- for example, until you know whether the carry-back configuration on the calibration, you know, is effective, that obviously will affect the damages that they will claim.

And so we think it's premature at this point. And this is a case where the parties are working very hard to promote a settlement, so it's not like you need to set a trial date in order to encourage the parties to settle.

We had meetings the last two days with the Department of Justice and the EPA and CARB. So we just think it's premature to do so at this point.

THE COURT: All right. And you state in your papers that FCA has not decided that they would consent to trial of

the Justice Department's case here, and if that's the case, I would remand the case back to the originating district, but I will also indicate that I have no intent of not trying the cases that are before me, whether -- with or without MDL and with or without Lexicon Consent.

So I am going to set a trial date. I may defer that, maybe perhaps one more time, because I want to see how things progress, but I do want to get some input in terms of, for instance, if for sure your case is going to go to trial,

Ms. Cabraser, if this doesn't settle, whether the DOJ ends up in Michigan or not, what your feeling is if we set an April or perhaps May trial date.

MS. CABRASER: Well, we -- we took the trial -- the preview trial dates we got last time very seriously and we have been working towards trying to meet those.

Frankly, Your Honor, one of the assumptions we made was that that would be a unitary trial with the DOJ and it would be a phased trial as is described in the Status Conference Statement for the obvious reasons of judicial economy and consistency and the fact that we would be putting on the very same evidence with respect to the very same conduct and the very same parties and the very same events.

And so trying to figure out how to deal with that, given the Lexicon problem, we don't have complete control of that.

From the PSC, we would hope the parties would continue to

explore some creative ways of getting that done through 1404, for example.

I don't think the DOJ had any problem trying the liability and injunctive relief issues of its case here, and that's why we made the joint trial proposal. That would still be our hope.

If we can't do that, we obviously would be going to trial here and can we meet an April date. I think it is still doable, although it is much more challenging, because of discovery delays, because of our need to take depositions of the Italian witnesses, and Mr. Marchionne's unfortunate death complicates that for us because we would have more people to examine.

I think there are some creative solutions to that. For example, being able to use the documents rather than live witnesses if the parties were both held to using documents rather than witnesses so there wouldn't be unfair advantage or surprise on either side. That would be one way to help us get to trial in the spring of next year.

So it's increasingly tight. We'll still meet a trial date if Your Honor gives us one today or if you wait until the next time, but that may put a premium on some expedited and creative approaches to the way the trial will be conducted, which I think would be fully appropriate given that it may well be a phased trial on common questions of liability that are going to

focus, I think, a hundred percent on the defendants and their conduct and their documents and their witnesses, if we have a chance to depose them. THE COURT: Okay. MS. CABRASER: Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Ms. Rendé, do you have any thoughts? MS. RENDÉ: We are in a bit of an awkward position. And as you mentioned, you know, if the defendants will not agree to the waivers, then it does appear as though our trial is set to be remanded at some point in the future to the Eastern District of Michigan.

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

With that in mind, as we stated in the joint CMC statement, we're not really sure how much we can comment on the trial specifics, although for what it's worth, you did have a question about a trial date in April and then you mentioned the discovery schedule leading up to that trial.

As far as the United States is concerned, for us and our trial, scheduling up to an April 29 trial date -- 2019 trial date would really not give us sufficient time to meet any discovery deadlines that would be geared towards an --

THE COURT: When do you think discovery -- if all else fails and we're on a trial track, how much time do you need to complete discovery to prepare for trial?

MS. RENDÉ: Well, for one example, you mentioned

possibly a Motion for Summary Judgment being due at the end of 2018. We would seek an additional several months. I mean, perhaps, you know, aiming for trial in June or later, and it really would depend on what the judge in Michigan would have in mind, I think, for a trial date.

And with that in mind, you know, we would still plan to have discovery for phase 1 of our trial continue before this Court, but we do not expect to have or would not prefer to have a discovery schedule that is directly in line, you know, with experts, for example, with the PSE's trial set for April, if that's when Your Honor chooses to set it.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to defer, but I'm going to ask the parties when we get back together on September -- whatever the date was -- the first date -- the 7th, I think it was. In addition to getting an update on progress with respect to discussions, settlement discussions, to -- I'd like the parties to meet and confer and see if you can come to -- and I understand there is some uncertainty about where the United States' case may be tried, but assuming it either is tried at the same time in -- within the same time frame, whether it's in Michigan or here, I think realistically, you know, I want to keep this within that same spring time frame that we talked about.

So maybe instead of April, it might be May, perhaps pushing towards June, to be realistic, but I don't want it to

go much beyond that if we are going to try this case -- if we are going to have to try this case.

If you could meet and confer before that and perhaps come up with a proposed schedule of summary judgment motions, etc. -- I have a normal template. That may have to be compressed or changed here in view of the international discovery and everything else.

So let's put that on the agenda for the 7th.

MS. RENDÉ: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else that we need to discuss this morning?

All right. Well, I guess everybody has their marching orders, so to speak, and Mr. Feinberg has his. Even though he left, he knows what he has got to do.

Right now we are planning on seeing you back on the 7th.

Everything else remains on track in terms of the next

litigation event.

Of course we will see you again this afternoon on the Motion to Dismiss, but the time frame for the certification motion remains in place.

And we will -- I'm going to endeavor to set a trial date at the next setting of this case in September. All right.

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, one thing. What I will do is when we send in our papers shortly thereafter, maybe what we will do is send a letter to the Court elucidating what we think

makes sense in terms of the possible evidentiary hearing and then the other side can say what they think and then at least from the scheduling standpoint, if it needs to be moved a week so you have a day and a half rather than a day or maybe we can do it in a day, although I'm sort of skeptical about that, we can at least put it on the -- you know, put it in the calendar. THE COURT: Okay. MR. GIUFFRA: If that makes sense. I think that's fair. THE COURT: All right. Good. Thank you. (Proceedings adjourned at 10:33 a.m.) 

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Friday, August 3, 2018 DATE: Pamela Batalo Hebel Pamela Batalo Hebel, CSR No. 3593, RMR, FCRR U.S. Court Reporter