STATE OF CLEVELA!

* 1 0 4 3 3 2 2 1 8 4 *

FIL. IT INE

Office of the Court Clerk

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF CLEVELAND COUNTY APR 16 2019 STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel., MIKE HUNTER, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

- (1) PURDUE PHARMA L.P.;
- (2) PURDUE PHARMA, INC.;
- (3) THE PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY;
- (4) TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.;
- (5) CEPHALON, INC.;
- (6) JOHNSON & JOHNSON;
- (7) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (8) ORTHO-McNEIL-JANSSEN
 PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., n/k/a
 JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (9) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA, INC., n/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (10) ALLERGAN, PLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS PLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS, INC., f/k/a WATSON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (11) WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.;
- (12) ACTAVIS LLC; and
- (13) ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC., f/k/a WATSON PHARMA, INC.,

Defendants.

In the office of the Court Clerk MARILYN WILLIAMS

For Judge Balkman's Consideration

Case No. CJ-2017-816 Honorable Thad Balkman

William C. Hetherington Special Discovery Master

DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Come now the defendants and submit a proposed Schedule as directed by the Court. This filing is made on behalf of (a) the Teva and Actavis defendants and (b) the Janssen defendants. On April 16, 2019, the parties met and conferred on scheduling issues, but were unable to agree. The State will submit its proposal separately.

The defendants hereby renew their objections that this case cannot be ready for trial on May 28, 2019, and a continuance is necessary. Anticipating that the Court does not want to entertain further argument regarding the trial date in this brief, this brief turns to additional issues.

A. THE ATTACHMENTS

The defendants provide the Court with three attachments:

- 1. Exhibit 1 is a proposed Updated Scheduling Order. This proposal seeks to balance the goals of (a) getting the parties and the Court prepared for trial, (b) providing the parties with a meaningful opportunity to be heard, and (c) starting trial on May 28, 2019 as the Court has ordered.
- 2. Exhibit 2 is a blank Updated Scheduling Order. If the Court does not want to enter the order as set forth in Exhibit 1, the Court can interlineate the dates it wants on Exhibit 1 or use Exhibit 2 to set forth the schedule the Court wants to order.
- 3. Exhibit 3 is a calendar for April and May and notes the dates the parties had previously been informed by the Court were available for hearings in this case. This may assist the Court in analyzing the schedule.

B. CONDITIONS

The proposal below assumes the following conditions are acceptable to the Court:

- 1. The State, as it has previously announced twice, will not have Daubert motions.
- 2. The parties will email everything to each other the same day it is filed, and filings will be made on or before the due date.
 - 3. Exhibit lists will include bates numbers or copies of each exhibit.
- 4. At the hearing on April 11, the Court indicated that the parties' witness lists, including witnesses to be called live, would be due April 19 at 4:00 p.m. The context of the discussion regarding April 19 was the need for the parties to know which witnesses were coming live so they would not need to designate deposition testimony. The defendants' proposed schedule, Exhibit 1 attached, includes that deadline of April 19 at 4:00 p.m. for the witnesses to be called live, but also retains the original April 26 deadline for full scale final witness lists.

C. THE STATE'S PROPOSED ORDER

The State's proposed scheduling order is unworkable.

- 1. As previously briefed, Daubert and In Limine motions are important and can eliminate days of unnecessary testimony. Further, in the interest of providing a meaningful opportunity to be heard, the Court should take briefing and argument in advance, instead of having to decide such issues in the middle of a trial in a rushed atmosphere and in front of the cameras.
- 2. The State's proposal to not be limited to its exhibit list is also not tenable. The State's idea that it could just pull out in the middle of trial some document a defendant produced is unworkable, particularly since the State chose to obtain millions of pages during discovery. The trial by ambush envisioned by the State is exactly what the Discovery Code and modern pretrial practice is designed to prevent.
- 3. The State's proposal to strike virtually all of the pretrial hearings is also inappropriate. This case demands a meaningful opportunity to be heard in the pretrial process. In a trial of the size and complexity of the case the State chose to bring, it is particularly necessary that the Court and parties work together to get this trial prepared. Once again, trial by ambush should be avoided.

CONCLUSION

The Court's object should be to have a trial likely to be decided on the merits, not a trial decided based on which party benefits most from confusion and disorder. The defendants seek a schedule which (a) is commensurate with the size and complexity of the case the State chose to bring, (b) allows for meaningful consideration of the pretrial motions, and (c) provides a practical path for the lawyers and the Court to get this massive and complicated case ready for trial.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. McCampbell, OBA No. 10390

Nicholas ("Nick") V. Merkley, OBA No. 20284

Leasa M. Stewart, OBA No. 18515

Kyle D. Evans, OBA No. 22135

Ashley E. Quinn, OBA No. 33251

GABLEGOTWALS

One Leadership Square, 15th Fl.

211 North Robinson

Oklahoma City, OK 73102-7255

T: +1.405.235.3314

E-mail: RMcCampbell@Gablelaw.com

E-mail: <u>NMerkley@Gablelaw.com</u>

E-mail: LStewart@gablelaw.com

E-mail: JCurran@Gablelaw.com

E-mail: AQuinn@Gablelaw.com

OF COUNSEL:

Steven A. Reed

Harvey Bartle IV

Mark A. Fiore

Rebecca Hillver

Evan K. Jacobs

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1701 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921

T: +1.215.963.5000

E-mail: steven.reed@morganlewis.com

E-mail: harvey.bartle@morganlewis.com

E-mail: mark.fiore@morganlewis.com

E-mail: rebecca.hillyer@morganlewis.com

E '1 ' 1 O 1 '

E-mail: evan.jacobs@morganlewis.com

Nancy L. Patterson

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1000 Louisiana St., Suite 4000

Houston, TX 77002-5006

T: +1.713.890.5195

E-mail: nancy.patterson@morganlewis.com

Brian M. Ercole

Melissa M. Coates

Martha A. Leibell

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

200 S. Biscayne Blvd., Suite 5300

Miami, FL 33131

T: +1.305.415.3000

E-mail: brian.ercole@morganlewis.com
E-mail: melissa.coates@morganlewis.com
E-mail: martha.leibell@morganlewis.com

Collie T. James, IV

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

600 Anton, Blvd., Suite 1800 Costa Mesa, CA 92626

T: +1.714.830.0600

E-mail: collie.james@morganlewis.com

Tinos Diamantatos

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

77 W. Wacker Dr. Chicago, IL 60601

T: +1.312.324.1000

E-mail: tinos.diamantatos@morganlewis.com

Steven A. Luxton

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20004

T: +1.202.739.3000

E-mail: steven.luxton@morganlewis.com

Attorneys for Defendants Cephalon, Inc., Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Watson Laboratories, Inc., Actavis LLC, and Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharma, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was emailed this 16th day of April, 2019, to the following:

Attorneys for	Mike Hunter, Attorney General	Michael Burrage			
Plaintiff	Abby Dillsaver, General Counsel	Reggie Whitten			
	Ethan Shaner, Dep. Gen. Counsel	J. Revell Parrish			
	ATTORNEY GENERAL'S	WHITTEN BURRAGE			
	OFFICE	512 N. Broadway Ave., Ste. 300			
	313 N.E. 21st Street	Oklahoma City, OK 73102			
	Oklahoma City, OK 73105				
	Bradley Beckworth	Robert Winn Cutler			
	Jeffrey Angelovich	Ross E Leonoudakis			
	Lloyd Nolan Duck, III	NIX PATTERSON & ROACH			
	Andrew G. Pate	3600 N. Capital of Texas Hwy.			
	Lisa Baldwin	Suite B350			
	Brooke A. Churchman	Austin, TX 78746			
	Nathan B. Hall				
	NIX, PATTERSON & ROACH				
	512 N. Broadway Ave., Ste. 200				
	Oklahoma City, OK 73102				
	Glenn Coffee				
	GLENN COFFEE & ASSOCIATES, PLLC				
	915 N. Robinson Ave.				
	Oklahoma City, OK 73102				

Attour our for	John H. Sparks	Charles C. Lifland
Attorneys for Johnson,	<u> </u>	Jennifer D. Cardelus
•	Benjamin H. Odom	Wallace M. Allan
Janssen	Michael W. Ridgeway	
Pharmaceutica, Inc.,	David L. Kinney	Sabrina H. Strong
		Houman Ehsan
Pharmaceuticals,	2500 McGee Drive, Suite 140	Esteban Rodriguez
Inc., and Ortho-	Norman, OK 73072	Justine M. Daniels
McNeil-Janssen		O'MELVENY & MEYERS
Pharmaceuticals,		400 S. Hope Street, 18th Floor
Inc. N/K/A Janssen	Address of the second of the s	Los Angeles, CA 90071
Pharmaceuticals,	Stephen D. Brody	Daniel J. Franklin
Inc.	David Roberts	Ross B Galin
	Emilie K. Winckel	Desirae Krislie Cubero Tongco
	O'MELVENY & MEYERS	Vincent S. Weisband
	1625 Eye Street NW	O'MELVENY & MEYERS
	Washington, DC 20006	7 Times Square
		New York, NY 10036
	Amy R. Lucas	Jeffrey A. Barker
	Lauren S. Rakow	Amy J. Laurendeau
	Jessica L. Waddle	Michael Yoder
	O'MELVENY & MEYERS	O'MELVENY & MEYERS
	1999 Ave. of the Stars, 8 th Fl.	610 Newport Center Drive
	Los Angeles, CA 90067	Newport Beach, CA 92660
	Larry D. Ottaway	
	Amy Sherry Fischer	
	Andrew Bowman	
	Steven J. Johnson	
	Kaitlyn Dunn	
	Jordyn L. Cartmell	
	FOLIART, HUFF, OTTAWAY &	& BOTTOM
	201 Robert S. Kerr Ave., 12th Fl.	
	Oklahoma City, OK 73102	

Attorneys for Purdue Pharma, LP, Purdue Pharma, Inc. and The Purdue Frederick Company Sheila L. Birnbaum Mark S. Cheffo Hayden Adam Coleman

Paul LaFata Jonathan S. Tam Lindsay N. Zanello Bert L. Wolff

Mara C. Cusker Gonzalez

DECHERT, LLPThree Bryant Park
1095 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036

William W. Oxley

DECHERT LLP

U.S. Bank Tower

633 West 5th Street, Suite 4900 Los Angeles, CA 90071

Britta E. Stanton
John D. Volney
John T. Cox, III
Eric W. Pinker
Jared D. Eisenberg
Jervonne D. Newsome

Ruben A. Garcia Russell Guy Herman Samuel Butler Hardy, IV

Alan Dabdoub David S. Coale

LYNN PINKER COX & HURST

2100 Ross Avenue, Suite 2700

Dallas, TX 75201

Erik W. Snapp **DECHERT, LLP**

35 W. Wacker Drive, Ste. 3400

Chicago, IL 60601

Meghan R. Kelly

Benjamin F. McAnaney

Hope S. Freiwald Will W. Sachse **DECHERT, LLP** 2929 Arch Street

Philadelphia, PA 19104

Jonathan S. Tam Jae Hong Lee **DECHERT, LLP**

One Bush Street, 16th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104

Robert S. Hoff

WIGGIN & DANA, LLP

265 Church Street New Haven, CT 06510

Sanford C. Coats Joshua Burns

CROWE & DUNLEVY

324 N. Robinson Ave., Ste. 100 Oklahoma City, OK 73102

The state of the s

Robert G. McCampbell

S504376

EXHIBIT 1

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF CLEVELAND COUNTY STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel., MIKE HUNTER, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA,

Plaintiff.

v.

- (1) PURDUE PHARMA L.P.;
- (2) PURDUE PHARMA, INC.;
- (3) THE PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY;
- (4) TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.;
- (5) CEPHALON, INC.;
- (6) JOHNSON & JOHNSON;
- (7) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (8) ORTHO-McNEIL-JANSSEN
 PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., n/k/a
 JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (9) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA, INC., n/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (10) ALLERGAN, PLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS PLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS, INC., f/k/a WATSON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (11) WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.;
- (12) ACTAVIS LLC; and
- (13) ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC., f/k/a WATSON PHARMA, INC.,

Defendants.

For Judge Balkman's Consideration

Case No. CJ-2017-816 Honorable Thad Balkman

William C. Hetherington Special Discovery Master

UPDATED SCHEDULING ORDER

Event	Deadline
Daubert motions for April 26 hearing due	April 16, 2019
Parties to exchange list of witnesses to be called live to testify in court including whether the parties will have a representative witness available during the opposing party's case in chief, with copy to Court	April 19, 2019 at 4:00 p.m.
Responses due for Daubert motions to be heard April 26	April 23, 2019
Dispositive motions deadline	April 23, 2019
Any additional Daubert motions due	April 23, 2019

Hearing	April 26, 2019
Witness lists deadline	April 26, 2019
Motions in limine deadline	April 26, 2019
Responses to remaining Daubert motions due	April 30, 2019
Responses to in limine due	May 3, 2019
Responses to dispositive motions due	May 3, 2019
Deposition Designations due	May 3, 2019
Hearing	May 6, 2019
Exhibit lists deadline	May 6, 2019
Hearing (Afternoon Only)	May 9, 2019
Deposition counter designations and objections to initial designations due	May 13, 2019
Stipulations to be filed by the parties	May 13, 2019
Hearing	May 14, 2019
In limine based on Exhibit and Witness lists due	May 15, 2019
Hearing	May 15, 2019
Hearing	May 16, 2019
Hearing	May 17, 2019
Objections to deposition counter designations due	May 17, 2019
In limine responses (Exhibit and Witness lists) due	May 21, 2019
Trial briefs due	May 21, 2019
Hearing	May 23, 2019
Hearing	May 24, 2019
Trial	May 28, 2019

IT IS SO ORDERED April, 2019.	
,	
	JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT

EXHIBIT 2

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF CLEVELAND COUNTY STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel., MIKE HUNTER, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA,

Plaintiff.

For Judge Balkman's Consideration

v.

- (1) PURDUE PHARMA L.P.;
- (2) PURDUE PHARMA, INC.;
- (3) THE PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY;
- (4) TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.;
- (5) CEPHALON, INC.;
- (6) JOHNSON & JOHNSON;
- (7) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (8) ORTHO-McNEIL-JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., n/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (9) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA, INC., n/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (10) ALLERGAN, PLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS PLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS, INC., f/k/a WATSON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (11) WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.;
- (12) ACTAVIS LLC; and
- (13) ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC., f/k/a WATSON PHARMA, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. CJ-2017-816 Honorable Thad Balkman

William C. Hetherington Special Discovery Master

UPDATED SCHEDULING ORDER

Event	Deadline
Daubert motions for April 26 hearing due	
Parties to exchange list of witnesses to be called live to testify in court including whether the parties will have a representative witness available during the opposing party's case in chief, with copy to Court	
Responses due for Daubert motions to be heard April 26	
Dispositive motions deadline	
Any additional Daubert motions due	

Hearing	
Witness lists deadline	
Motions in limine deadline	
Responses to remaining Daubert motions due	
Responses to in limine due	
Responses to dispositive motions due	
Deposition Designations due	
Hearing	
Exhibit lists deadline	
Hearing (Afternoon Only)	
Deposition counter designations and objections to initial designations due	
Stipulations to be filed by the parties	
Hearing	
In limine based on Exhibit and Witness lists due	
Hearing	
Hearing	
Hearing	
Objections to deposition counter designations due	
In limine responses (Exhibit and Witness lists) due	
Trial briefs due	
Hearing	
Hearing	
Trial	

IT IS SO ORDERED April, 2019.	
	JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT

EXHIBIT 3

April 2019

Hearing Schedule

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11 HEARING • Severance	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26 hearing	27
28	29	30				

May 2019

Hearing Schedule

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
			1	2	3	4
5	6 HEARING	7	8	9 HEARING Afternoon Only	10	11
12	13	14 HEARING	15 HEARING	16 HEARING • Pretrial Conference	17 HEARING	18
19	20	21	22	23 HEARING	24 HEARING	25
26	27	28 TRIAL	29	30	31	