

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

NOTICE OF HEARING SESSION

Pursuant to the order of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation filed today, notice is hereby given that a hearing session has been scheduled to consider various matters under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

DATE OF HEARING SESSION: **March 29, 2018**

LOCATION OF HEARING SESSION: Richard B. Russell Federal Building and
United States Courthouse
Ceremonial Courtroom, 23rd Floor
75 Ted Turner Drive S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

TIME OF HEARING SESSION: In those matters designated for oral argument, counsel presenting oral argument must be present at **8:00 a.m.** in order for the Panel to allocate the amount of time for oral argument. Oral argument will commence at **9:30 a.m.**

SCHEDULED MATTERS: Matters scheduled for consideration at this hearing session are listed on the enclosed Hearing Session Order and Schedule of Matters for Hearing Session.

- Section A of this Schedule lists the matters designated for oral argument and includes all actions encompassed by Motion(s) for transfer filed pursuant to Rules 6.1 and 6.2. Any party waiving oral argument pursuant to Rule 11.1(d) need not attend the Hearing Session.
- Section B of this Schedule lists the matters that the Panel has determined to consider **without oral argument**, pursuant to Rule 11.1(c). Parties and counsel involved in these matters need not attend the Hearing Session.

ORAL ARGUMENT:

- The Panel carefully considers the positions advocated in filings with the Panel when it allocates time to attorneys presenting oral argument. The Panel, therefore, expects attorneys to adhere to those positions including those concerning an appropriate transferee district. Any change in position should be conveyed to Panel staff before the beginning of oral argument. Where an attorney thereafter advocates a position different from that conveyed to Panel staff, the Panel may reduce the allotted argument time and decline to hear further from that attorney.

- 2 -

- The Panel expects attorneys presenting oral argument to be prepared to discuss what steps they have taken to pursue alternatives to centralization including, but not limited to, engaging in informal coordination of discovery and scheduling, and seeking Section 1404 transfer of one or more of the subject cases.

For those matters listed on Section A of the Schedule, the "Notice of Presentation or Waiver of Oral Argument" must be filed in this office no later than **March 12, 2018**. The procedures governing Panel oral argument (Panel Rule 11.1) are attached. The Panel strictly adheres to these procedures.

FOR THE PANEL:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffery N. Lüthi", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Jeffery N. Lüthi
Clerk of the Panel

cc: Clerk, United States District for the Northern District of Georgia

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

HEARING SESSION ORDER

The Panel issues the following orders in connection with its next hearing session,

IT IS ORDERED that on March 29, 2018, the Panel will convene a hearing session in Atlanta, Georgia, to consider the matters on the attached Schedule under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel may, on its own initiative, consider transfer of any or all of the actions in those matters to any district or districts.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel will hear oral argument on the matters listed on Section A of the attached Schedule, unless the parties waive oral argument or unless the Panel later decides to dispense with oral argument pursuant to Panel Rule 11.1(c).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel will consider without oral argument the matters listed on Section B of the attached Schedule pursuant to Panel Rule 11.1(c). The Panel reserves the prerogative, on any basis including submissions of parties pursuant to Panel Rule 11.1(b), to designate any of those matters for oral argument.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation shall direct notice of this hearing session to counsel for all parties involved in the matters on the attached Schedule.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



Sarah S. Vance
Chair

Marjorie O. Rendell
Lewis A. Kaplan
R. David Proctor

Charles R. Breyer
Ellen Segal Huvelle
Catherine D. Perry

SCHEDULE OF MATTERS FOR HEARING SESSION
March 29, 2018 -- Atlanta, Georgia

SECTION A
MATTERS DESIGNATED FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

(This schedule contains only those civil actions listed in the Schedule(s) of Actions submitted with the docketed motion(s) for transfer. See Panel Rules 6.1 and 6.2. In the event these dockets are centralized, other actions of which the Panel has been informed may be subject to transfer pursuant to Panel Rule 7.1.)

MDL No. 2822 – IN RE: FIRST DATABANK PRESCRIPTION INFORMATION LITIGATION

Motion of defendant First Databank, Inc., to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Northern District of California

EXELTIS USA, INC. v. FIRST DATABANK, INC., C.A. No. 4:17-04810

Northern District of Georgia

ACELLA PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC v. FIRST DATABANK, INC.,
C.A. No. 1:17-05013

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

WOMEN'S CHOICE PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC v. FIRST DATABANK, INC.,
C.A. No. 2:17-03725

MDL No. 2824 – IN RE: GOLD KING MINE RELEASE IN SAN JUAN COUNTY, COLORADO, ON AUGUST 5, 2015

Motion of defendant Environmental Restoration, LLC, to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico:

District of New Mexico

STATE OF NEW MEXICO v. UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, C.A. No. 1:16-00465
NAVAJO NATION v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:16-00931
MCDANIEL, ET AL. v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-00710

District of Utah

STATE OF UTAH, THE v. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:17-00866

MDL No. 2825 – **IN RE: ALTERYX, INC., CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH
LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiff David Kacur to transfer the following actions to the United States
District Court for the Central District of California:

Central District of California

KACUR v. ALTERYX, INC., C.A. No. 8:17-02222

District of Nevada

FOSKARIS v. ALTERYX, INC., C.A. No. 2:17-03088

District of Oregon

JACKSON v. ALTERYX, INC., C.A. No. 3:17-02021

MDL No. 2826 – **IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., DATA SECURITY BREACH
LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiffs Steven Agans, et al., to transfer the following actions to the United
States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Northern District of Alabama

GRICE v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., C.A. No. 5:17-01975

Central District of California

FLORES v. RASIER, LLC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-08503
HELLER, ET AL. v. RASIER, LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-08545

Northern District of California

WEBBER, ET AL. v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:17-06758

AGANS, ET AL. v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., C.A. No. 3:17-06759
BURNETT, ET AL. v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., C.A. No. 4:17-06835

Northern District of Illinois

HARANG, ET AL. v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-08500
FRANKLIN, ET AL. v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., C.A. No.1:17-08510
WEST v. UBER USA, LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-08593
PATNI, ET AL. v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-08709

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

DESIGNOR v. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 5:17-05289

MDL No. 2827 – **IN RE: APPLE INC. DEVICE PERFORMANCE LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiff Nicole Gallmann to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Central District of California

BOGDANOVICH, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-09138
MAILYAN v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 2:17-09192

Northern District of California

HARVEY v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 5:17-07274
GALLMANN v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 5:17-07285
HAKIMI v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 5:17-07292
BATISTA, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 5:17-07355

Southern District of California

COOK v. APPLE INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:17-02579

Southern District of Florida

ABUROS v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 1:17-24712

Northern District of Illinois

MANGANO, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 1:17-09178
NEILAN v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 1:17-09296

Southern District of Indiana

SCHROEDER v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 1:17-04750

Eastern District of Louisiana

LANASA v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 2:17-17878

Southern District of Mississippi

MCINNIS, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 1:17-00358

Western District of Missouri

BURTON, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 2:17-04257

Eastern District of New York

DRANTIVY v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 1:17-07480

LAZARUS, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 1:17-07485

Southern District of New York

RABINOVITS, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 1:17-10032

District of South Carolina

BRAND, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 2:17-03453

Eastern District of Texas

MILLER, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 4:17-00889

MDL No. 2828 – **IN RE: INTEL CORP. CPU MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiffs Stephen Garcia, et al., and Richard Reis, et al., to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Northern District of California

GARCIA, ET AL. v. INTEL CORPORATION, C.A. No. 5:18-00046

REIS, ET AL. v. INTEL CORPORATION, C.A. No. 5:18-00074

Southern District of Indiana

JONES v. INTEL CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:18-00029

Eastern District of New York

STERN v. INTEL CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:18-00065

District of Oregon

MANN v. INTEL CORPORATION, C.A. No. 6:18-00028

MDL No. 2829 – **IN RE: MT. GOX BITCOIN EXCHANGE LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiff Anthony Motto to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

Central District of California

LACK v. MIZUHO BANK, LTD., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00617

Northern District of Illinois

GREENE, ET AL. v. MTGOX, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:14-01437

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

PEARCE v. MIZUHO BANK, LTD., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00306

MDL No. 2830 – **IN RE: UNILOC USA, INC., AND UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A., HPE PORTFOLIO PATENT LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiffs Uniloc USA, Inc., et al., to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas:

Northern District of California

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. LOGITECH, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:17-06733

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 3:18-00358

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 3:18-00360

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 3:18-00363

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 3:18-00572

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 4:18-00359
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. APPLE INC., C.A. No. 4:18-00365

District of Delaware

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. MOTOROLA MOBILITY, LLC, C.A. No. 1:17-01526
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. MOTOROLA MOBILITY, LLC, C.A. No. 1:17-01527
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. PEEL TECHNOLOGIES, INC., C.A. No. 1:17-01552
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. WINK LABS, INC., C.A. No. 1:17-01656
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. MOTOROLA MOBILITY, LLC, C.A. No. 1:17-01657
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. MOTOROLA MOBILITY, LLC, C.A. No. 1:17-01658

Southern District of Indiana

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. EXCLUSIVE GROUP LLC, C.A. No. 1:17-03962

Eastern District of Texas

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:17-00707
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:17-00714
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:17-00722

Northern District of Texas

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 4:17-00825
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 4:17-00826
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 4:17-00827
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 4:17-00828
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 4:17-00858

Western District of Washington

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. HTC AMERICA, INC., C.A. No. 2:17-01558
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. HTC AMERICA, INC., C.A. No. 2:17-01561
UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL. v. HTC AMERICA, INC., C.A. No. 2:17-01562

MDL No. 2831 – **IN RE: AM RETAIL GROUP, INC., FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT (FLSA) AND WAGE AND HOUR LITIGATION**

Motion of defendant AM Retail Group, Inc., to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California:

Eastern District of California

WATKINS, ET AL. v. AM RETAIL GROUP, INC., C.A. No. 1:17-01287

Northern District of California

SANCHEZ v. AM RETAIL GROUP, INC., C.A. No. 3:18-00287

MDL No. 2832 – **IN RE: LIQUID TOPPINGS DISPENSING SYSTEM ('447) PATENT LITIGATION**

Motion of defendants Guillermo Canedo and Icetastic Enterprises, LLC, to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida:

District of Arizona

KONA ICE, INC. v. MESSIER, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-03298

District of Colorado

KONA ICE, INC. v. LIU, C.A. No. 1:17-02301
KONA ICE, INC. v. SILVA-ROMERO, C.A. No. 1:17-02302

Northern District of Florida

KONA ICE, INC. v. BAILEY, ET AL., C.A. No. 3:17-00698

Southern District of Florida

KONA ICE, INC. v. CANEDO, ET AL., C.A. No. 0:17-61842
TIKIZ FRANCHISING, LLC, ET AL. v. KONA ICE, INC., C.A. No. 0:18-60237

Western District of Louisiana

KONA ICE, INC. v. NAVARRE, C.A. No. 2:17-01208

District of Maryland

KONA ICE, INC. v. SNEE, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-02809

Western District of North Carolina

KONA ICE, INC. v. BUMGARNER, C.A. No. 3:17-00563

Eastern District of Texas

KONA ICE, INC. v. HODGSON, ET AL., C.A. No. 4:17-00667

Southern District of Texas

KONA ICE COMPANY v. CROWDER, ET AL., C.A. No. 4:17-02837

Western District of Texas

KONA ICE, INC. v. DETAVERNIER, ET AL., C.A. No. 5:17-00931

SECTION B
MATTERS DESIGNATED FOR CONSIDERATION WITHOUT ORAL ARGUMENT

MDL No. 2291 - IN RE: WESSON OIL MARKETING AND SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION

Motion of defendant Conagra Brands, Inc., to reassign this MDL, comprised of the following cases, from the United States District Court for the Central District of California to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

Central District of California

BRISENO v. CONAGRA FOODS, INC., C.A. No. 2:11-05379
TOOMER v. CONAGRA FOODS, INC., C.A. No. 2:11-06127
MCFADDEN v. CONAGRA FOODS, INC., C.A. No. 2:11-06402
RUIZ v. CONAGRA FOODS, INC., C.A. No. 2:11-06480
KREIN v. CONAGRA FOODS, INC., C.A. No. 2:11-07097
VIRR v. CONAGRA FODS, INC., C.A. No. 2:11-08421
SCARPELLI, ET AL. v. CONAGRA FOODS, INC., C.A. No. 2:11-08513
(D. New Jersey, C.A. No. 2:11-04038)
ANDRADE v. CONAGRA FOODS, INC., C.A. No. 2:11-09308

MDL No. 2295 - IN RE: PORTFOLIO RECOVERY ASSOCIATES, LLC, TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT (TCPA) LITIGATION

Motion of defendant Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC, to transfer the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of California:

Middle District of Florida

WILLIAMS v. PORTFOLIO RECOVERY ASSOCIATES, LLC, C.A. No. 6:17-02064

MDL No. 2406 - IN RE: BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Opposition of plaintiff Reva, Inc., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama:

Southern District of Florida

REVA, INC. v. HEALTHKEEPERS INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-24158

MDL No. 2433 – **IN RE: E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY C-8
PERSONAL INJURY LITIGATION**

Oppositions of defendants E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company and The Chemours Company to transfer of the following actions to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio:

Southern District of West Virginia

RISER v. E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY, C.A. No. 2:17-03795
GREGG v. E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY, C.A. No. 2:17-03926
BRAGG v. E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY, C.A. No. 2:17-04228
STOVER v. E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:17-04375
ANDERSON, ET AL. v. E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY,
C.A. No. 2:17-04400

MDL No. 2557 – **IN RE: AUTO BODY SHOP ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Motion of defendant Government Employees Insurance Company to transfer the following action to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida:

District of Oregon

LEIF'S AUTO COLLISION CENTERS, LLC v. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
INSURANCE COMPANY, C.A. No. 3:17-01822

MDL No. 2590 – **IN RE: NAVISTAR MAXXFORCE ENGINES MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff Christopher Moser to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

Eastern District of Texas

MOSER v. NAVISTAR INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 4:17-00598

MDL No. 2599 – **IN RE: TAKATA AIRBAG PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiffs Arthur L. Bustos, et al., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida:

District of New Mexico

BUSTOS, ET AL. v. LUCERO, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:18-00058

MDL No. 2613 – **IN RE: TD BANK, N.A., DEBIT CARD OVERDRAFT FEE LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiff Britney Lawrence and Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs, et al., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina:

District of New Jersey

LAWRENCE v. TD BANK N.A., C.A. No. 1:17-12583

MDL No. 2627 – **IN RE: LUMBER LIQUIDATORS CHINESE-MANUFACTURED FLOORING PRODUCTS MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiffs Kaleigh Craig, et al., and Bryan Gaus, et al., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia:

District of Nebraska

CRAIG, ET AL. v. LUMBER LIQUIDATORS, INC., C.A. No. 8:17-00480

Northern District of West Virginia

GAUS, ET AL. v. LUMBER LIQUIDATORS, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 5:17-00177

MDL No. 2738 – **IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON TALCUM POWDER PRODUCTS
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiffs Darren Cartwright, et al.; Maureen Kassimali, et al.; Janice M. Callahan, et al.; and Phyllis D. Smith, et al., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey:

Eastern District of Missouri

CARTWRIGHT, ET AL. v. JOHNSON & JOHNSON, ET AL., C.A. No. 4:17-02851
KASSIMALI, ET AL. v. JOHNSON & JOHNSON, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00014

Middle District of Pennsylvania

CALLAHAN, ET AL. v. ACME MARKETS, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:18-00022
SMITH, ET AL. v. GIANT FOOD STORES, LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 3:18-00023

MDL No. 2741 – **IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiffs Joseph Shible and Richard Heinzen, et al., and defendant Monsanto Company to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Eastern District of Arkansas

WINDLE, ET AL. v. MONSANTO COMPANY, C.A. No. 4:18-00023

District of Delaware

SHIBLE v. MONSANTO COMPANY, C.A. No. 1:18-00080

Eastern District of Missouri

HEINZEN, ET AL. v. MONSANTO COMPANY, C.A. No. 4:17-02881

MDL No. 2754 – **IN RE: ELIQUIS (APIXABAN) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiffs to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

District of Delaware

BAGINSKI v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01607

MORROW v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01608

BATES v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01609
RISNER v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01610
GREEN v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01611
HASSENPFUG v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01644

BEECHIM v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01666

BISHOP v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01667
WALLS v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01694
EDMONDSON v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01695

HAGEDORN v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01708

ARDEN v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01709
CARTER v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01715
LOONEY v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01716
SWEENEY v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01756

WOLFE v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01757
HOWARD v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01759

CALLAIS v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01760
MELSER v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01761
DOLLAR v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01762
JENNINGS v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01763

TOUPS v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01764
RUGGLES v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-01765

JENKINS v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01766
DOWELL v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01767
FRIDDLE v. BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-01768

MDL No. 2777 – **IN RE: CHRYSLER–DODGE–JEEP ECODIESEL MARKETING,
SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Motion of defendants Chrysler Automobiles N.V., FCA US LLC, Sergio Marchionne, Scott Kunselman, Michael Dahl, Steve Mazure, and Robert E. Lee to transfer the following action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Southern District of New York

PIRNIK v. FIAT CHRYSLER AUTOMOBILES N.V., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:15–07199

MDL No. 2782 – **IN RE: ETHICON PHYSIOMESH FLEXIBLE COMPOSITE HERNIA
MESH PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff Janice Gilmore to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia:

Southern District of Indiana

GILMORE v. HOWARD, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:18–00087

MDL No. 2800 – **IN RE: EQUIFAX, INC., CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH
LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiffs Ashley Abramson, et al.; Katiushka Rebeca Acosta-Smith, et al.; City of Chicago; Kevin L. Cofield, Sr., et al.; Craig Ward, et al.; and Craven Randall Casper and defendants Experian Information Solutions, Inc., and Trans Union, LLC to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia:

Central District of California

ABRAMSON, ET AL. v. EQUIFAX INC., C.A. No. 8:17–02201
ACOSTA–SMITH, ET AL. v. EQUIFAX, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 8:18–00005

Northern District of Illinois

CITY OF CHICAGO v. EQUIFAX, INC., C.A. No. 1:17–07798

District of Maryland

COFIELD, SR., ET AL. v. EQUIFAX, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17–03119
WARD, ET AL. v. EQUIFAX, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17–03246

Middle District of North Carolina

CASPER v. EQUIFAX, INC., C.A. No. 1:17-01004

MDL No. 2804 – **IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE LITIGATION**

Oppositions of certain plaintiffs and defendants KVK-Tech, Inc., and Bloodworth Wholesale Drugs, Inc., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio:

Southern District of Alabama

THE ESTATE OF BRUCE BROCKEL, DECEASED, BY AND THROUGH DONNA BROCKEL, AS PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:17-00521

Northern District of Georgia

THE COUNTY OF FULTON v. PURDUE PHARMA, LP, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 1:17-04757

Eastern District of Kentucky

THE COUNTY OF FLOYD v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 7:17-00186
PIKE v. TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 7:17-00193
KNOTT v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL., C.A. No. 7:18-00006

Middle District of Louisiana

LOUISIANA HEALTH SERVICE & INDEMNITY COMPANY D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF LOUISIANA, ET AL. v. PURDUE PHARMA, LP, ET AL., C.A. No. 3:17-01766

District of New Jersey

CITY OF PATERSON v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-13433

Southern District of Ohio

JEFFERSON COUNTY, OHIO v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-00037

District of Oregon

COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH v. PURDUE PHARMA, LP, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 3:17-02010

Northern District of West Virginia

BROOKE COUNTY COMMISSION v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 5:18-00009
HANCOCK COUNTY COMMISSION v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 5:18-00010
HARRISON COUNTY COMMISSION v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 5:18-00011
LEWIS COUNTY COMMISSION v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 5:18-00012
MARSHALL COUNTY COMMISSION v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 5:18-00013
OHIO COUNTY COMMISSION v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 5:18-00014
TYLER COUNTY COMMISSION v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 5:18-00015
WETZEL COUNTY COMMISSION v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 5:18-00016

Western District of Wisconsin

ST. CROIX CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF WISCONSIN v. MCKESSON
CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 3:17-00914

MDL No. 2823 – **IN RE: BERNZOMATIC AND WORTHINGTON BRANDED
HANDHELD TORCH PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiffs Jason Lou Peralta and Kurtis M. Bailey to transfer the following
actions to the United States District Court for the Central District of California:

District of Arizona

PERALTA v. WORTHINGTON INDUSTRIES INCORPORATED, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:17-03195

Central District of California

MARMONT, ET AL. v. BERNZOMATIC CORP., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:16-00848

Northern District of Illinois

BAILEY v. BERNZOMATIC, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:16-07548

District of South Carolina

LOFTON v. IRWIN INDUSTRIAL TOOL COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-01358

RULE 11.1: HEARING SESSIONS AND ORAL ARGUMENT

(a) Schedule. The Panel shall schedule sessions for oral argument and consideration of other matters as desirable or necessary. The Chair shall determine the time, place and agenda for each hearing session. The Clerk of the Panel shall give appropriate notice to counsel for all parties. The Panel may continue its consideration of any scheduled matters.

(b) Oral Argument Statement. Any party affected by a motion may file a separate statement setting forth reasons why oral argument should, or need not, be heard. Such statements shall be captioned “Reasons Why Oral Argument Should [Need Not] Be Heard” and shall be limited to 2 pages.

- (i) The parties affected by a motion to transfer may agree to waive oral argument. The Panel will take this into consideration in determining the need for oral argument.

(c) Hearing Session. The Panel shall not consider transfer or remand of any action pending in a federal district court when any party timely opposes such transfer or remand without first holding a hearing session for the presentation of oral argument. The Panel may dispense with oral argument if it determines that:

- (i) the dispositive issue(s) have been authoritatively decided; or
- (ii) the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented and oral argument would not significantly aid the decisional process.

Unless otherwise ordered, the Panel shall consider all other matters, such as a motion for reconsideration, upon the basis of the pleadings.

(d) Notification of Oral Argument. The Panel shall promptly notify counsel of those matters in which oral argument is scheduled, as well as those matters that the Panel will consider on the pleadings. The Clerk of the Panel shall require counsel to file and serve notice of their intent to either make or waive oral argument. Failure to do so shall be deemed a waiver of oral argument. If counsel does not attend oral argument, the matter shall not be rescheduled and that party’s position shall be treated as submitted for decision on the basis of the pleadings filed.

- (i) Absent Panel approval and for good cause shown, only those parties to actions who have filed a motion or written response to a motion or order shall be permitted to present oral argument.
- (ii) The Panel will not receive oral testimony except upon notice, motion and an order expressly providing for it.

(e) Duty to Confer. Counsel in an action set for oral argument shall confer separately prior to that argument for the purpose of organizing their arguments and selecting representatives to present all views without duplication. Oral argument is a means for counsel to emphasize the key points of their arguments, and to update the Panel on any events since the conclusion of briefing.

(f) Time Limit for Oral Argument. Barring exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall allot a maximum of 20 minutes for oral argument in each matter. The time shall be divided among those with varying viewpoints. Counsel for the moving party or parties shall generally be heard first.