G7iWgenC		
UNITED STATES D SOUTHERN DISTRI		
In re GENERAL M IGNITION SWITCH		14 MD 2543 (JMF) Telephone Conferenc
		New York, N.Y. July 18, 2016 2:30 p.m.
Before:		
	HON. JESSE	M. FURMAN,
		District Judge
	APPEA	RANCES
Co-Lead Pl BY: STEVE W. B	OBOL SHAPIRO LLE aintiff Counsel ERMAN	
-and- LIEFF CABRASER BY: RACHEL GEM -and-	HEIMANN & BERNSI IAN	EIN LLP
HILLIARD MUNOZ BY: ROBERT C.		
-and- GOODWIN PROCTER		
	WEINTRAUB	
_	for Defendant	
BY: ROBERT C. ANDREW B.		
ALSO PRESENT:		
	Reporter, Law 36	U

1

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

1 (In chambers) THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is Judge Furman. 2 3 Who is on the line for plaintiffs? 4 MR. HILLIARD: Judge, Bob Hilliard. Good afternoon. 5 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Anyone else with you? 6 MR. BERMAN: Yes. Steve Berman. Good afternoon, your 7 Honor. 8 MS. GEMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Rachel Geman. 9 Elizabeth apologizes she can't be here. She had a death of a 10 family friend. 11 THE COURT: I'm sorry to hear that. 12 Anyone else on the plaintiff's side? 13 MR. WEINTRAUB: Yes. Good afternoon, your Honor. 14 William Weintraub of Goodwin Procter. I work with 15 Mr. Hilliard. MS. FORNECKER: And Anne Fornecker from Hilliard Munoz 16 17 Gonzalez also on the line. 18 THE COURT: All right. Is that it? 19 All right. On the defense side, maybe one person can 20 just indicate who is present and then we can go from there. 21 MR. BROCK: Judge Furman, this is Mike Brock. Good 22 afternoon. There are a number of folks on for GM. I expect 23 that Andrew Bloomer and myself will address the issues the 24 Court has raised. I quess we could try to go through the 25 others who are on the call, although I'm not sure I have a

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

1 complete list.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: If you anticipate being the only ones who speak, I'm happy to just take your appearances and everyone else can basically listen in, if that's OK.

MR. BROCK: OK. Yes, sir. That's fine with us.

THE COURT: Just a reminder to make sure you identify yourselves when you're speaking. I think at this point I recognize your voices, but we are on the record, so for the court reporter's benefit, please say who you are.

I also want to note that we are not only on the record but we have an actual reporter here from Law 360, who contacted my chambers with an interest in attending this conference. It was not my intention in scheduling it as a telephone conference to make it unavailable to the press or the public; that was merely for convenience and speed, so I welcomed him to my chambers. He is sitting here, listening in and obviously not going to participate, but I wanted to make sure you were all aware he is here.

With those preliminaries, let's talk about what implications the Second Circuit's ruling have for the next bellwether. Obviously there is a much larger issue of what implications it has on the MDL writ large. I'd like to table those until the conference a week from Thursday to give you an opportunity to think about it and talk about it more and for me to do the same, but I thought that there was an interest in our

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

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

having a conversation sooner rather than later with respect to the next bellwether on the theory that if there was a dispute with respect to the implications for the case that we figured out a way to resolve it sooner rather than later with the trial date looming and many motions already pending. That was the idea behind scheduling this conference. I'd like to limit it to Cockram and see if we can do that.

With that, why don't I first turn to plaintiffs. I don't know who wants to speak on your side, but what are your thoughts?

MR. HILLIARD: Judge, Mike Brock and I have met and conferred a couple of times on this issue. The big theory is maybe the Court is reading something in the opinion that we don't see, but the bottom line is for us we don't think that the Second Circuit opinion affects Cockram substantively or procedurally, and since an hour ago when we last conferred, we thought that it would probably make this a pretty short conference, unless you had a feeling there was a place in the opinion you wanted to direct us to and we'll reevaluate.

My fear, quite frankly, unless I must be missing something, but as far as Cockram and Virginia law, it looks like we're still on track and it's pretty straightforward.

THE COURT: All right. I'm not interested in generating controversies or issues where there are none, but I will tell you not having done a deep dive to think this

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

4

through, at least on the surface the question occurred to me whether this had any bearing on Judge Gerber's ruling that punitive damages were available only for independent claims, that is, claims arising from new GM's own conduct. Obviously he had ruled that he assumed liabilities did not include punitive damages with respect to accidents and incidents as to which New GM had assumed compensatory damages, and it candidly wasn't clear to me on a quick read whether the Second Circuit's ruling affected or had any bearing on that aspect of his rulings, but I certainly thought there might be that possibility or you might argue that and therefore wanted to make sure.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

That was at least a little bit of my thinking.

MR. BROCK: I was just going to say in our discussions, I think we are in agreement that Judge Gerber's December opinion that held that New GM did not assume the liability for punitives is still the law of the case and that we would go forward on that basis, so I appreciated that decision was not appealed and so for the Cockram case, New GM would continue to not be responsible at least from a punitive perspective for old GM conduct.

THE COURT: All right. I think it's the November decision, not December, but that's neither here nor there. MR. BROCK: Yes, sir, maybe November. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Hilliard.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HILLIARD: We agree with that, Judge. That issue
wasn't appealed. That's why I invited Ms. Fornecker to be on
the call just in case I had misstated or forgotten the date.
Mr. Brock, I believe, is right.
THE COURT: Great. Then it may be that there isn't

THE COURT: Great. Then it may be that there isn't much to discuss here, but better safe than sorry.

Anything else from plaintiffs' side? MR. HILLIARD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: What about from New GM's side? MR. BROCK: That's it for us, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, that made it easy. I will continue wading my way through the motions and get you decisions as I can make them, and I will see you a week from Thursday where we will have our broader discussion about the implications of the Second Circuit's ruling not to mention my own ruling on Friday. Sorry to dump that on you right before the weekend, but I was relieved to get it off my hands.

MR. BROCK: Still a lot of work, your Honor, by the way. That was quite an effort.

THE COURT: I don't know whether I got it right or wrong, but it certainly did involve a lot of work. That's something that probably can be said for everybody in this case.

All right. I will see you a week from Thursday. Thank you very much.

(Adjourned)

6