

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

CHARLESTON DIVISION

IN RE: C. R. BARD, INC.,
PELVIC SUPPORT SYSTEMS
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL 2187

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO C. R. BARD, INC.
WAVE 6 CASES

**PRETRIAL ORDER # 268
(Docket Control Order – C. R. Bard Wave 6 Cases)**

At my request, the parties have previously submitted a joint list of remaining cases in the C. R. Bard MDL, MDL 2187, with claims against C. R. Bard, Inc. (“Bard”) and other defendants where counsel has at least 20 cases in the Bard MDL. That list included nearly 3,000 cases. From that list, the Bard Wave 4 (Pretrial Order (“PTO”) # 236) and Bard Wave 5 (PTO # 244) cases were chosen. In light of the remaining number of total cases left in this MDL, I find it necessary to place more cases from that list on the scheduling order as set forth below. *To the extent other defendants, in addition to C. R. Bard (“Bard”) are named in these Wave 6 cases, deadlines below apply to those defendants as well.* The court **ORDERS** that the following deadlines apply in the cases attached hereto as Exhibit A:

A. SCHEDULING DEADLINES. The following deadlines shall apply in the Bard Wave 6 cases:

Plaintiff Fact Sheets. ¹	12/08/2017
Defendant Fact Sheets. ²	01/08/2018
Deadline for written discovery requests.	03/05/2018

¹ The court reminds plaintiffs who have named additional defendants other than C. R. Bard, Inc. to serve a defendant-specific Plaintiff Fact Sheet from that particular defendant’s MDL.

² Where plaintiffs have named multiple defendants (i.e., C. R. Bard, Inc., and Ethicon, Inc., Boston Scientific Corp., etc.), each defendant must serve a Defendant Fact Sheet using the form agreed to for that particular defendant’s MDL.

Expert disclosure by plaintiffs.	02/20/2018
Expert disclosure by defendants.	03/20/2018
Expert disclosure for rebuttal purposes.	04/03/2018
Deposition deadline and close of discovery.	04/30/2018
Filing of Dispositive Motions.	05/16/2018
Response to Dispositive Motions.	05/30/2018
Reply to response to dispositive motions.	06/06/2018
Filing of <i>Daubert</i> motions.	05/25/2018
Responses to <i>Daubert</i> motions.	06/08/2018
Reply to response to <i>Daubert</i> motions.	06/15/2018

1. **Discovery Completion Date.** The last date to complete depositions shall be the “discovery completion date” by which all discovery, including disclosures required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1), and (2), but not disclosures required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(3), shall be completed.

2. **Limitations on Interrogatories, Requests for Admissions and Depositions.** The following limitations apply:

- a. Each defendant³ is limited to 10 interrogatories, 10 requests for production of documents and 10 requests for admission per case.
- b. Plaintiffs are limited to 10 interrogatories, 10 requests for production of documents and 10 requests for admission to each defendant.
- c. In each individual member case, no more than 4 treating physicians may be deposed.⁴
- d. Depositions of plaintiff’s friends and family members may be taken at any time prior to trial provided the deposition is requested before the discovery completion date.

³ In referring to the “defendant” or “defendants” throughout this order, it is my intention that a defendant(s) includes the defendant and its related entities, i.e., Ethicon, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson are related entities and treated as one defendant for purposes of these discovery limitations. Likewise, if more than one plaintiff is named, plaintiffs are treated as one entity for purposes of these discovery limitations.

⁴ To the extent disputes arise regarding the division of time between the parties for the deposition of treating physicians (three hours total absent agreement), I will address those disputes, rather than the assigned Magistrate Judge, Judge Eifert.

- e. Depositions of any witness are limited to 3 hours absent agreement of the parties.
 - f. The court will consider modifications to the above limitations upon good cause shown.
3. **Limitations on Experts.** The following limitations related to experts apply:
- a. The parties may conduct general and specific expert discovery on all products at issue in Bard Wave 6 cases. In light of the products involved in C. R. Bard Wave 6 cases, the likelihood of overlap in expert opinion from one case to another (except as to specific causation) and the need to streamline discovery in these cases, **the plaintiffs and each defendant are limited to no more than five experts per case (exclusive of treating physicians)**. It is the court's expectation that these experts will overlap for plaintiffs who have the same product(s), to some extent, if not entirely.
 - b. The parties shall coordinate the depositions of general causation experts. Insofar as multiple plaintiffs or multiple defendants utilize the same general causation expert or experts or general causation rebuttal experts, those experts shall be deposed only once on the issue of general causation. As to defendants' experts, plaintiffs are instructed to choose a lead questioner.
 - c. The court encourages the coordination of depositions of specific causation experts to the extent there is overlap in the parties' use of specific causation experts by multiple parties.
 - d. The court will consider modifications to the above limitations upon good cause shown.

B. MOTION PRACTICE.

1. **Daubert Motions.** For the filing of *Daubert* motions on general causation issues only, the parties are instructed to file one *Daubert* motion per expert in the main MDL (MDL 2187) instead of the individual member case.⁵ Each side may file one response and one reply in the main MDL to each *Daubert* motion. This limitation does not apply to specific causation *Daubert* motions, responses and replies. Specific causation *Daubert* motions, responses and replies must be filed in the individual member cases. To the extent a challenged expert is both a general and specific causation expert, the parties must file a general causation motion in the main MDL 2187 and an individual specific causation motion in an individual member case.

2. **Hearings.** Hearing dates for dispositive and *Daubert* motions, if any, will be set at a future status conference.

3. **Page Limitations.** The page limitations provided in Local Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1(a)(2) apply to memoranda in support of all dispositive and *Daubert* motions, oppositions, and replies, and the court will not be inclined to grant motions to exceed the page limit.

4. **Confidential Documents.** In the past, the court has permitted parties to file placeholder exhibits in support of *Daubert*, dispositive and other motions, responses and replies in the place of confidential documents that may be sealed and then, within five days, redact/dedesignate the documents or file a motion to seal. *Moving forward, the court will no longer permit this practice. Parties may no longer file placeholder exhibits.* The court expects leadership counsel for plaintiffs and defendants to resolve issues related to confidential designations well before the filing of motions. Filings containing placeholder exhibits will be struck. In the event

⁵ If parties wish to adopt previous *Daubert* motions on general causation experts from other MDLs, they may so indicate in a filing in the main MDL 2187 which includes a notice of adoption and a copy of the previous filing they wish to adopt.

there are issues related to sealing of confidential documents that the parties are unable to resolve, they must be brought to the court's attention in a consolidated manner as follows: A consolidated motion to seal is due on or before **April 9, 2018**, any response is due **April 23, 2018** and any reply is due **April 30, 2018**.

5. **Locations of Filings.** With the exception of the general causation *Daubert* motions as outlined above, the parties are reminded that they must file dispositive and *Daubert* motions on specific causation, responses and replies in the applicable member cases only, not in the Bard MDL.

C. **CASES READY FOR TRANSFER, REMAND OR TRIAL**

1. **Venue Recommendations.** By no later than **April 23, 2018**, the parties shall meet and confer concerning the appropriate venue for each of the cases, and the parties shall submit joint venue recommendations to the court by **May 4, 2018**. The parties' joint recommendation(s) shall identify the cases about which the recommended venue is in dispute. The court may then request briefing concerning the venue for those cases about which the parties disagree. Each party reserves the right to object to the venue selected by its adversary or the court.

2. **Transfer and Remand.** At the conclusion of pre-trial proceedings, the court, pursuant to PTO # 51 and 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), will transfer each directly-filed case to a federal district court of proper venue as defined in 28 U.S.C. § 1391. In the alternative, pursuant to PTO # 15 and 28 U.S.C. § 1407, cases that were transferred to this court by the MDL panel shall be remanded for further proceedings to the federal district court from which each such case was initially transferred.⁶

⁶ As expressly contemplated by PTO # 51, Bard does not waive its right to seek transfer—pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) or any other available ground—of any case to a court of proper venue, regardless of whether that case was transferred to or directly-filed in the Southern District of West Virginia. I entered identical PTOs in the remaining MDLs assigned to me.

3. **Trial Settings.** If a case is to be tried in the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia (either by agreement of the parties or where venue in the Southern District is determined to be proper by the court), the case shall be deemed trial-ready when discovery is completed and the court rules on the parties' pretrial motions. The trial date for cases transferred or remanded to other federal district courts shall be set by the judge to whom the transferred or remanded case is assigned (including the undersigned through intercourt assignment).


D. COMMON BENEFIT TIME. I have entered a number of Pretrial Orders related to the eventual recovery of the cost of special services performed and expenses incurred by participating counsel in this and the other MDLs assigned to me. I direct the parties' attention to PTO # 54⁷, and its warning that "[n]o time spent on developing or processing purely individual issues in any case for an individual client (claimant) will be considered or should be submitted, nor will time spent on any unauthorized work." Pretrial Order No. 54, ECF No. 365, ¶ C. The nature of this litigation persuades me that I should inform counsel that at this point in the litigation, where most if not all of the general causation discovery has been completed, it is difficult to envision that any work performed by counsel on individual wave cases would rise to the level of common benefit work.

The court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to file a copy of this order in 2:12-md-2187 **and in the Bard Wave 6 cases listed on Exhibit A.** In cases subsequently filed in this district after 2:17-cv-04320, a copy of the most recent pretrial order will be provided by the Clerk to counsel appearing in each new action at the time of filing of the complaint. In cases subsequently removed or transferred to this court, a copy of the most recent pretrial order will be provided by the Clerk to counsel appearing in each new action upon removal or transfer. It shall be the responsibility

⁷ I entered identical PTOs in the remaining MDLs assigned to me.

of the parties to review and abide by all pretrial orders previously entered by the court. The orders may be accessed through the CM/ECF system or the court's website at www.wvsd.uscourts.gov.

ENTER: November 17, 2017



JOSEPH R. GOODWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**Exhibit A
to PTO # 268**

	Case Style	Civil Action No.
1	Maria Morrell v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:13-cv-01989
2	Stacy Peirson vs. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:13-cv-02012
3	Elizabeth Williams v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:13-cv-04202
4	Robin Shirer v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:13-cv-16408
5	Irene Zubiata v. C. R. Bard, et al.	2:13-cv-20269
6	Laurie D. Ross v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:13-cv-20452
7	Marie C. Coen v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:14-cv-10600
8	Silverio, Lourdes v. C.R. Bard	2:14-cv-14208
9	Cowart, Maryanne v. C.R. Bard	2:14-cv-24243
10	Stetter, Eunice v. C.R. Bard	2:14-cv-27454
11	Downs, Melissa v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:15-cv-00072
12	Lisa Baldwin v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-02795
13	Meyers-Flach, Janet v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-03840
14	Putscher, Angela v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-03895
15	Gardner, Rozetta v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-03952
16	Darnell, Linda v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-03979
17	Reyes, Amalia v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-03982
18	Wilson, Judy v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-03990
19	Parodi, Maria v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-04033
20	Roberts, Christine v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-04035
21	Williams, Shelliann v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-04036
22	Minich, Betsy v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-05001
23	Manges, Debra v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-06358
24	Perrigen, Susan v. C.R. Bard	2:16-cv-07458
25	Roseann Aquino v. C. R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-10805
26	Ashley Hobbs v. C. R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-10820
27	Eleuteria Paramo v. C. R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-10822
28	Maria Aquino v. C. R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-10824
29	Downey, Mary v. C.R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-10997
30	Bray, Jaclyn v. C.R. Bard, Inc..	2:16-cv-11008
31	Brown, Dana v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11009
32	Christian, Julie v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11010
33	Landis, Sharon v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11012
34	McKay, Judy v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11013
35	Murbarger, Kelly v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11018
36	Schneider, Mary v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11019
37	Hughes, Laurie v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11102
38	Renfroe, Honee v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11108
39	Keller, Beverly v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11162
40	Nelson, Carmalita v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11171
41	Parks, Mercedes v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11173

**Exhibit A
to PTO # 268**

	Case Style	Civil Action No.
42	Sadler, Sofia v. C.R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11176
43	LoCasto, Patricia v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11182
44	Peasall, Robin v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11188
45	Alvarado, Mariam v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11422
46	Flores, Matilde v. C.R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11423
47	Rogers, Rebecca v. C. R. Bard, Inc.	2:16-cv-11593
48	Carolee Ann Jacobsen v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11797
49	Linda Johansson v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11799
50	Marilyn Kyes v. C. R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11804
51	Mabel Leiser v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11805
52	Sheila Lureen v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11806
53	Holly Lyndaker v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11807
54	Candy Pontious v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11812
55	Sara Simball v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11816
56	Tami Whitmire-Williams v. C.R. Bard, et al.	2:16-cv-11822