

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

IN RE:

Case Number 7:23-CV-897

CAMP LEJEUNE WATER LITIGATION

JANUARY 9, 2026
STATUS CONFERENCE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT B. JONES, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Plaintiffs:

Jenna Butler, Esquire
A. Charles Ellis, Esquire
Mona Lisa Wallace, Esquire (Via Telephone)
Robin Greenwald, Esquire (Via Telephone)
Elizabeth Cabraser, Esquire (Via Telephone)

On Behalf of the Defendant:

J. Adam Bain, Esquire
Joshua Carpenito, Esquire
David Ortiz, Esquire
Giovanni Antonucci, Esquire
Bridget Bailey Lipscomb, Esquire (Via Telephone)
Sara Mirsky, Esquire (Via Telephone)
Elizabeth Platt, Esquire (Via Telephone)

Bobbie J. Shanfelder, RDR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
Bobbie_Shanfelder@nced.uscourts.gov

10:45:54AM 1 (Friday, January 9, 2026 at 11:00 a.m.)

11:07:15AM 2 THE COURT: Good morning and happy new year.

11:07:18AM 3 All right. Mr. Ellis or Ms. Butler, what do you have for us?

11:07:22AM 4 MR. ELLIS: Good morning, Your Honor. As you

11:07:24AM 5 know, Mr. Bell is unable to be here. He is at a required

11:07:29AM 6 Fourth Circuit scheduling mediation conference. He regrets

11:07:32AM 7 that he cannot be here. I do not think he's on the call.

11:07:37AM 8 So Your Honor, from the PLG's perspective, just

11:07:41AM 9 a few things. One is, as Your Honor knows, there was a

11:07:45AM 10 motion to reserve -- PLG has filed a motion to reserve

11:07:48AM 11 admissibility rulings and to expedite trials. That has been

11:07:53AM 12 briefed. The PLG stands by its argument set forth in that

11:07:58AM 13 brief. That is ripe for ruling as it's fully briefed. As

11:08:03AM 14 concerns the Muster Rolls dispute, Your Honor --

11:08:08AM 15 THE COURT: You all are working on something;

11:08:10AM 16 right?

11:08:11AM 17 MR. ELLIS: We were and progress has been made.

11:08:13AM 18 THE COURT: Very good.

11:08:14AM 19 MR. ELLIS: As Your Honor knows, the motion to

11:08:15AM 20 compel was filed. And PLG had a meet and confer with the DOJ

11:08:20AM 21 in mid December, I believe it was. Agreed to a framework for

11:08:26AM 22 a review of certain Muster Roll documents, records. Limited

11:08:34AM 23 access. And subject to a protective order.

11:08:37AM 24 Your Honor knows there's a protective order in

11:08:38AM 25 place but it needs to be amended in order to allow the

11:08:43AM 1 appropriate access by PLG to those Muster Rolls. So we have
11:08:48AM 2 had a joint motion that's been filed for a protective order.
11:08:51AM 3 That's pending. Once that is entered, Your Honor, PLG will
11:08:55AM 4 then review and DOJ will make those Muster Rolls records
11:09:02AM 5 accessible. PLG will review them.

11:09:05AM 6 Subsequent to that, we will have another meet
11:09:07AM 7 and confer to determine whatever the next steps would be
11:09:10AM 8 depending upon the review. And then we will report back to
11:09:13AM 9 the Court at that time.

11:09:15AM 10 THE COURT: Okay.

11:09:17AM 11 MR. ELLIS: The other issue is that there is
11:09:20AM 12 currently a PLG motion to strike the DOJ expert Julie
11:09:30AM 13 Goodman, her supplemental reports as being untimely and
11:09:32AM 14 improper. That motion, Your Honor, has been fully briefed.
11:09:36AM 15 It is ripe for review. Another issue is --

11:09:41AM 16 THE COURT: Now there's another one; right?
11:09:43AM 17 There's another motion to strike, I think, Bailey; is that
11:09:47AM 18 correct? Is that the Government's motion or is it your
11:09:50AM 19 motion?

11:09:50AM 20 MS. BUTLER: That's our motion, Your Honor.

11:09:54AM 21 THE COURT: While we are on that subject, I
11:09:56AM 22 think we would like to have a hearing on those. When would
11:09:59AM 23 you all be available for that hearing?

11:10:04AM 24 MR. ELLIS: Your Honor, Mr. Bell -- did you say
11:10:07AM 25 he's not on the call? We need to check with Mr. Bell. We do

11:10:11AM 1 know there was availability. He may be available to do it
11:10:14AM 2 before then. But we do know that for purposes of the next
11:10:15AM 3 status conference, he recommended the first week of February,
11:10:20AM 4 anytime that week. February 2nd, I believe it is. So we
11:10:25AM 5 know that's available. Otherwise we would need to get back
11:10:29AM 6 to you on some other dates as concerns.

11:10:33AM 7 THE COURT: I was looking at the week of the
11:10:35AM 8 19th or the 26th, the last two weeks of this month.

11:10:40AM 9 MR. ELLIS: Okay. With Your Honor's permission,
11:10:41AM 10 we will check.

11:10:42AM 11 THE COURT: I will leave it up to you all to
11:10:47AM 12 notify the Court. You can do that through email as to
11:10:55AM 13 availability for the next status conference as well as a
11:10:58AM 14 hearing on these motions, whether you want to do that in one
11:11:01AM 15 single day. I am happy to hear from you on that as well.

11:11:05AM 16 MR. ELLIS: Okay. Makes sense as we think about
11:11:09AM 17 it now. We will talk about that and make that decision and
11:11:12AM 18 email you. Another issue that the Court is aware of is the
11:11:21AM 19 issue with respect to the identifiers in Rubris.

11:11:26AM 20 Your Honor is aware there was an order requiring
11:11:30AM 21 all Plaintiffs who filed short form complaints to provide
11:11:34AM 22 information with respect to dates of birth and social
11:11:37AM 23 security numbers. A lot -- I say a lot. Some. A good
11:11:42AM 24 number of the Plaintiffs have not provided one or both.

11:11:47AM 25 And so PLG is working with DOJ, but PLG is

11:11:55AM 1 reaching out to those folks who those Plaintiffs who have not
11:11:58AM 2 provided complete information through their counsel if they
11:12:02AM 3 are represented by Plaintiffs, if they are pro se directly
11:12:05AM 4 with the pro se to encourage them to submit the missing
11:12:10AM 5 information. Progress is being made on that.

11:12:15AM 6 THE COURT: Okay.

11:12:16AM 7 MR. ELLIS: Similar to that, Your Honor, the
11:12:18AM 8 questionnaires that were sent to 2,500 or so of the
11:12:25AM 9 claimants, PLG is also working with Rubris at Rubris' request
11:12:31AM 10 to reach out to folks who are missing information in those
11:12:36AM 11 questionnaires.

11:12:37AM 12 Rubris will contact us, tell us this is a list
11:12:41AM 13 of folks who are missing information in the questionnaires
11:12:47AM 14 and here is the information the categories are missing. And
11:12:51AM 15 then PLG will reach out through a liaison. Will reach out to
11:12:56AM 16 those pro se Plaintiffs and encourage them to get the
11:12:59AM 17 information submitted.

11:13:01AM 18 In that same vein, I guess, Your Honor asked in
11:13:05AM 19 the past bring you up to date in terms of the communications
11:13:08AM 20 with the pro se Plaintiffs and claimants. Keep up on
11:13:15AM 21 activity in the case.

11:13:16AM 22 It's at least weekly or biweekly information
11:13:20AM 23 will be sent. Updates with documents that have been filed in
11:13:26AM 24 the case are sent to pro se Plaintiffs who have no access to
11:13:30AM 25 PACER, and weekly updates generally are sent. Certainly the

11:13:37AM 1 updates from the status conferences are sent to those pro se
11:13:40AM 2 Plaintiffs.

11:13:42AM 3 In addition, there's regular postings on the
11:13:45AM 4 Plaintiffs' website accessible not just to the pro se but
11:13:49AM 5 also to the Plaintiffs' counsel. And we continue to field
11:13:55AM 6 calls from pro se litigants and Plaintiffs' counsel almost
11:13:59AM 7 daily. Sometimes multiple times a day depending on what's
11:14:04AM 8 happening.

11:14:05AM 9 When something happens, that increases. And so
11:14:10AM 10 those communications are continuing to take place with
11:14:14AM 11 regularity and frequently. I will be glad to answer any
11:14:19AM 12 questions you have about any of that.

11:14:20AM 13 There is an offset of damages issue, the issues
11:14:23AM 14 with respect to discovery and briefing. And Ms. Butler is
11:14:27AM 15 front and center with that and is prepared to address that
11:14:30AM 16 with the Court's permission.

11:14:31AM 17 THE COURT: Okay.

11:14:33AM 18 MS. BUTLER: Your Honor, thank you.

11:14:35AM 19 First of all, as far as scheduling -- and I did
11:14:38AM 20 discuss this with Mr. Bain and his team ahead of time.
11:14:42AM 21 Currently so expert reports were initially served. The DOJ's
11:14:47AM 22 responsive reports were served, and our rebuttals are due on
11:14:50AM 23 January 19th which is the MLK holiday.

11:14:54AM 24 This has arisen with respect to support staff
11:14:57AM 25 not being available and things of that nature. And so we had

11:15:00AM 1 asked if I think in accordance with the rules we can roll
11:15:03AM 2 that over to January 20th. And Mr. Bain has indicated that
11:15:08AM 3 the Government does not have an objection to that. So with
11:15:11AM 4 your permission --

11:15:12AM 5 THE COURT: That's fine.

11:15:14AM 6 MS. BUTLER: Thank you. Also the parties are in
11:15:17AM 7 the process as noted in the status conference of conferring
11:15:21AM 8 about a briefing schedule for Daubert motions and summary
11:15:25AM 9 judgment motions.

11:15:26AM 10 THE COURT: On offsets?

11:15:27AM 11 MS. BUTLER: Yes. A couple of things I just
11:15:30AM 12 wanted to clarify on with respect to that. First of all, as
11:15:35AM 13 you may recall from the last status conference, I know it was
11:15:45AM 14 -- I know that status conference was over a month ago, but we
11:15:48AM 15 had a pretty robust discussion about the fact that there are
11:15:51AM 16 some threshold statutory interpretation type of issues having
11:15:57AM 17 to do with damages and offsets that we do think would benefit
11:16:00AM 18 both sides to have decided. And you had given us the green
11:16:03AM 19 light.

11:16:04AM 20 Let me back up. The Government had indicated
11:16:06AM 21 they just can't stipulate to statutory interpretation issues.
11:16:11AM 22 And you had given us the green light to file a motion on
11:16:15AM 23 threshold issues. We are in the process of preparing that
11:16:18AM 24 and hope to have that in the next couple weeks.

11:16:22AM 25 So this briefing schedule that is noted in the

11:16:25AM 1 status conference report has to do with admissibility of
11:16:29AM 2 experts, Daubert motions, and summary judgment but not the
11:16:33AM 3 threshold evidence.

11:16:33AM 4 THE COURT: Not the threshold.

11:16:36AM 5 MS. BUTLER: Correct. So we are working on that
11:16:38AM 6 threshold motion. And because of that, the briefing schedule
11:16:43AM 7 for damages and offsets should be limited really to
11:16:47AM 8 admissibility of experts and also any summary judgment
11:16:53AM 9 motions that might still remain after the motion in limine,
11:16:57AM 10 the threshold issue motion is decided. So I don't think it
11:17:01AM 11 will be as robust of a briefing situation as has occurred in
11:17:07AM 12 other phases.

11:17:09AM 13 In addition, consistent with our motion to
11:17:11AM 14 expedite trials, those admissibility determinations on those
11:17:15AM 15 experts, as we have suggested for other experts, can be
11:17:20AM 16 reserved for determination at the trial. And any summary
11:17:24AM 17 judgment issues could be decided during the trials as well or
11:17:32AM 18 do not need to be completed as far as briefing because
11:17:35AM 19 damages and offsets will come toward the end of those trials.

11:17:38AM 20 So any damages and offset briefing schedule that
11:17:43AM 21 we will be proposing to the Court for admissibility of expert
11:17:49AM 22 motions like Daubert motions and summary judgment motions
11:17:52AM 23 should in no way prevent the Court from scheduling these
11:17:56AM 24 trials expeditiously. We do not see that as any reason for
11:17:59AM 25 delay.

11:18:00AM 1 And we believe that that briefing could even be
11:18:03AM 2 going on at the same time as the trials commence depending if
11:18:07AM 3 the Court starts with one disease or all diseases. And
11:18:12AM 4 consistent with our motion to expedite, I wanted to note
11:18:15AM 5 that, for example, we have proposed that one disease go
11:18:19AM 6 forward first. And we have used kidney as an example.

11:18:24AM 7 Similar to what we have argued in that motion to
11:18:27AM 8 expedite which I understand we are not arguing today but any
11:18:32AM 9 issues that might arise with damages and offsets in the
11:18:35AM 10 kidney situation would be crosscutting across diseases. So
11:18:40AM 11 again, it would serve as an exemplary basis for the other
11:18:45AM 12 trials.

11:18:45AM 13 So I just want to be abundantly clear that any
11:18:50AM 14 proposed briefing schedule for admissibility of expert
11:18:53AM 15 motions and summary judgment motions on damages and offsets
11:18:58AM 16 should be no cause for delay in setting trials.

11:19:01AM 17 And we will be getting this threshold motion
11:19:05AM 18 filed very soon, we hope, so that the kind of threshold
11:19:10AM 19 statutory interpretation issues like what evidence should be
11:19:13AM 20 precluded or allowed can be determined in advance.

11:19:17AM 21 THE COURT: In advance of?

11:19:18AM 22 MS. BUTLER: Even completion of expert
11:19:21AM 23 depositions because they are evidentiary issues and statutory
11:19:25AM 24 interpretation issues. They don't rely on expert testimony.

11:19:29AM 25 THE COURT: And that's a decision for the entire

11:19:31AM 1 Court; right?

11:19:32AM 2 MS. BUTLER: I would think so because it's, I
11:19:35AM 3 mean, it's statutory interpretation.

11:19:37AM 4 THE COURT: It's going to affect every case;
11:19:40AM 5 right?

11:19:40AM 6 MS. BUTLER: Yes, Your Honor. And not just --

11:19:43AM 7 THE COURT: May have different damages in each
11:19:45AM 8 case but the interpretation --

11:19:47AM 9 MS. BUTLER: The issues that we will be raising
11:19:49AM 10 in this threshold motion are crosscutting against all
11:19:52AM 11 diseases and all tracks.

11:19:54AM 12 THE COURT: Okay.

11:19:55AM 13 MS. BUTLER: So that was the first thing. And
11:19:57AM 14 we do have a meet and confer scheduled for Monday. And they
11:20:02AM 15 have gotten us a proposed motion on the Daubert and summary
11:20:07AM 16 judgment briefing schedule, and we need to get back to them.

11:20:11AM 17 We just haven't had a chance to do that yet, but
11:20:14AM 18 we are in the process. But I just wanted to be very clear
11:20:17AM 19 that that does not include this threshold motion which we are
11:20:20AM 20 preparing expeditiously.

11:20:22AM 21 THE COURT: When do you think that will be
11:20:23AM 22 filed, your threshold motion?

11:20:25AM 23 MS. BUTLER: We are hoping by the week of the
11:20:28AM 24 26th, if not before. We were hoping to get it filed around
11:20:34AM 25 the same time as our rebuttal reports are served which is the

11:20:39AM 1 20th. But I can't make any promises because there's a lot
11:20:44AM 2 going on right now. But that week I would anticipate that
11:20:49AM 3 week of the 19th.

11:20:56AM 4 THE COURT: Okay.

11:20:58AM 5 MS. BUTLER: So that's the first issue. Second,
11:21:05AM 6 we had noted in the status report -- and it is not an issue
11:21:09AM 7 that I am bringing before you. It's an issue that I am
11:21:11AM 8 forecasting could be a problem. We are continuing to get
11:21:16AM 9 additional offset data.

11:21:20AM 10 In the status report for the December 3rd
11:21:25AM 11 conference and, again, in this status report, the DOJ has
11:21:28AM 12 stated that they are still in the process of updating certain
11:21:33AM 13 previously gathered offset information.

11:21:35AM 14 THE COURT: What's the nature of that
11:21:36AM 15 information?

11:21:37AM 16 MS. BUTLER: Well, so for example, just this
11:21:40AM 17 week on the 7th, we received a whole new Excel for Medicare.
11:21:49AM 18 The problem is that we have -- it's been -- we have gotten
11:21:53AM 19 this big Excel that has all these names and data and it's
11:21:58AM 20 incumbent now on us because we haven't received any
11:22:02AM 21 indication as to what's new and what's old.

11:22:05AM 22 We are having to compare it against their last
11:22:07AM 23 production, and that's very burdensome on us while we are
11:22:10AM 24 still in the process of preparing rebuttal reports. After
11:22:13AM 25 the last status conference on December 5th, we received

11:22:18AM 1 similar information for TRICARE.

11:22:20AM 2 THE COURT: These are payments made by Medicare
11:22:22AM 3 and TRICARE?

11:22:23AM 4 MS. BUTLER: Yes. For example, for TRICARE,
11:22:25AM 5 there was a Plaintiff that had been inadvertently per the DOJ
11:22:31AM 6 inadvertently left off but we still we received all this
11:22:35AM 7 information. And we had to go through and say, okay, is this
11:22:37AM 8 the only new information.

11:22:39AM 9 THE COURT: These are just the Track 1; right?

11:22:42AM 10 MS. BUTLER: Correct.

11:22:43AM 11 THE COURT: So it's what now? 22?

11:22:48AM 12 MS. BUTLER: Yes. 21. How many do we have?
11:22:53AM 13 22. Sorry. Yes, 22. So anyway, we are working with what
11:23:00AM 14 they are giving us. I just wanted to note that it concerns
11:23:02AM 15 us that they say they are still -- and I think we have
11:23:06AM 16 indicated that we would like to have a discussion with them
11:23:09AM 17 about deadlines for damages and offset information.

11:23:13AM 18 They have indicated they want deadlines for
11:23:15AM 19 damages information. But, I mean, offsets should
11:23:18AM 20 correspondingly be cut off at some point, too. So I am just
11:23:23AM 21 forecasting this. We are working with what we have received.

11:23:26AM 22 We hope that perhaps these are the only two big
11:23:31AM 23 additional data sets we are going to receive. But the status
11:23:36AM 24 report kind of indicates otherwise, and so I am just kind of
11:23:39AM 25 noting for the Court that we may have to bring this before

11:23:42AM 1 you but we hope not. We hope we can discuss with them and
11:23:45AM 2 work things out as we have on a number of issues.

11:23:49AM 3 THE COURT: Okay.

11:23:50AM 4 MS. BUTLER: So I think those were the primary
11:23:54AM 5 issues that I wanted to bring before the Court on damages and
11:23:57AM 6 offsets. And, of course, if there's anything additional, I
11:24:00AM 7 will be glad to answer any questions.

11:24:01AM 8 THE COURT: Is it just payment information? Is
11:24:03AM 9 that what the nature of all of this supplementation is?

11:24:07AM 10 MS. BUTLER: So, for example, if you have
11:24:10AM 11 TRICARE, it's their billing data.

11:24:12AM 12 THE COURT: Which is what?

11:24:13AM 13 MS. BUTLER: Which is this Plaintiff came in for
11:24:16AM 14 this procedure and here is the amount that was billed for
11:24:23AM 15 that visit. But it's these big Excel spreadsheets primarily.
11:24:27AM 16 It's data extractions that they have had agencies pull
11:24:32AM 17 running ICD-9, ICD-10 codes, social security numbers, and
11:24:36AM 18 Plaintiff names.

11:24:39AM 19 So they are these big data sets that like, for
11:24:44AM 20 example, it would have been nice if we had only received that
11:24:48AM 21 one Plaintiff instead of the whole data set again because
11:24:51AM 22 then we had to go back and try to compare. Anyway, we will
11:24:55AM 23 discuss that with them and hopefully these are limited
11:24:58AM 24 circumstances and we can work this out.

11:25:01AM 25 THE COURT: So you don't know whether it's new

11:25:02AM 1 information. You know it's information. You don't know if
11:25:06AM 2 it's new information or whether it's new information plus
11:25:10AM 3 previously produced information.

11:25:12AM 4 MS. BUTLER: And to date it appears that it's
11:25:14AM 5 the old plus some new. And they can clarify.

11:25:20AM 6 THE COURT: What you are doing is comparing a
11:25:23AM 7 document, a bill, to one you received previously.

11:25:27AM 8 MS. BUTLER: We are comparing the data extract
11:25:30AM 9 they had produced previously with the new data extract they
11:25:33AM 10 are sending to us. And these are big data extracts, and it
11:25:37AM 11 is beyond my capability to tell you how we are going about
11:25:39AM 12 that, but we have somebody going about that.

11:25:42AM 13 And point being that hopefully we are not going
11:25:46AM 14 to be receiving a lot more new information and hopefully when
11:25:49AM 15 we do receive it, it's in a kind of more narrow category of
11:25:54AM 16 so and so had an appointment a month ago and here is some
11:25:59AM 17 additional billing. Because we understand that treatment is
11:26:05AM 18 ongoing. I mean, we have the same issue with damages.

11:26:08AM 19 THE COURT: Billing doesn't always keep up with
11:26:11AM 20 treatment.

11:26:12AM 21 MS. BUTLER: Correct. It comes later sometimes.

11:26:14AM 22 THE COURT: Billing comes the day of and then
11:26:16AM 23 maybe a few months later.

11:26:19AM 24 MS. BUTLER: I think that's part of the problem
11:26:20AM 25 is that it's all ongoing and obviously these are very sick

11:26:26AM 1 individuals who are increasing in age and have ongoing
11:26:30AM 2 treatment. And so this is a continuing issue that we both
11:26:36AM 3 need to deal with and discuss.

11:26:38AM 4 But we were surprised to receive these two big
11:26:42AM 5 data set productions recently, and we are hopeful that we are
11:26:48AM 6 not going to keep receiving these big productions where it's
11:26:51AM 7 old information combined with possibly some new and that we
11:26:55AM 8 can limit it to something similar that we have been doing
11:26:58AM 9 with the DPPF forms where we update just with more recent
11:27:03AM 10 information that we have acquired.

11:27:06AM 11 THE COURT: Okay.

11:27:09AM 12 MS. BUTLER: If that makes sense.

11:27:12AM 13 THE COURT: Yes.

11:27:13AM 14 MS. BUTLER: I was just flagging that.

11:27:14AM 15 Hopefully it's not anything we have to bring before you
11:27:17AM 16 again.

11:27:17AM 17 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

11:27:19AM 18 MS. BUTLER: And I think that addresses the
11:27:22AM 19 issues. We hope to be getting you that motion on the expert
11:27:27AM 20 motion and summary judgment briefing schedule. But again, I
11:27:31AM 21 just want to reiterate that it is the PLG's position that
11:27:34AM 22 none of that should prevent trials from being set.

11:27:37AM 23 THE COURT: How should the Court consider those
11:27:39AM 24 proposed deadlines, the Daubert on the experts? How should
11:27:46AM 25 the Court consider those proposed deadlines and the briefing

11:27:52AM 1 that you are going to be doing, the parties will be doing on
11:27:54AM 2 the threshold issue?

11:27:55AM 3 MS. BUTLER: So the threshold issues, as you
11:27:59AM 4 noted, are --

11:28:01AM 5 THE COURT: How does the threshold decision
11:28:02AM 6 affect your deadlines on the Daubert?

11:28:08AM 7 MS. BUTLER: It should not affect those
11:28:10AM 8 deadlines, although we would hope to have a determination on
11:28:13AM 9 the threshold issues before that briefing because
11:28:18AM 10 determination on the threshold issues could preclude a lot of
11:28:21AM 11 that briefing.

11:28:22AM 12 THE COURT: Yeah. That's what I am asking. All
11:28:26AM 13 right.

11:28:26AM 14 MS. BUTLER: That's the hope, and that's the
11:28:27AM 15 reason we want to file this threshold motion because we think
11:28:30AM 16 it could save a lot of judicial time and time and expense of
11:28:34AM 17 the parties. And that was the point that was argued the last
11:28:37AM 18 time and the green light that was given because these
11:28:41AM 19 evidentiary issues could really prevent a lot of waste of
11:28:46AM 20 resources.

11:28:47AM 21 THE COURT: Okay. Is that it from PLG?

11:28:51AM 22 MR. ELLIS: Yes, Your Honor.

11:28:52AM 23 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bain?

11:28:55AM 24 MR. BAIN: Your Honor, I am glad that Ms. Butler
11:28:56AM 25 said that resolution of evidentiary issues could save

11:29:01AM 1 resources of the parties. That is exactly the reason that we
11:29:04AM 2 are opposing their motion to expedite trials and upset the
11:29:08AM 3 Court's determination of threshold issues on water
11:29:09AM 4 contamination and general causation first before trials on
11:29:16AM 5 individual cases.

11:29:17AM 6 As Plaintiffs have suggested, their motion to
11:29:23AM 7 expedite trials has been fully briefed. The Daubert motions
11:29:26AM 8 on Phase II and Phase III have been fully briefed and are
11:29:29AM 9 before the Court. And we think that those should proceed as
11:29:32AM 10 the Court has planned to deal with the threshold issues, the
11:29:35AM 11 water contamination, and general causation before proceeding
11:29:39AM 12 to trials.

11:29:42AM 13 With respect to the motions for Dr. Goodman and
11:29:46AM 14 Dr. Bailey, we weren't prepared to address those today but we
11:29:49AM 15 are certainly prepared to come to a hearing within the next
11:29:51AM 16 few weeks. Those experts are incredibly important for the
11:29:55AM 17 opinions that they offer.

11:29:57AM 18 We could be available any time during the week
11:29:59AM 19 of January 19th. Unfortunately, the 28th and 29th will not
11:30:04AM 20 work for me but we can confer with the Plaintiffs on the best
11:30:09AM 21 date for that particular hearing.

11:30:12AM 22 I'd like Mr. Ortiz to address the damages issues
11:30:16AM 23 that Ms. Butler just addressed.

11:30:20AM 24 MR. ORTIZ: David Ortiz on behalf of the United
11:30:23AM 25 States. Your Honor, just on the supplementation piece, Your

11:30:26AM 1 Honor will recall there were two data sets as Ms. Butler
11:30:30AM 2 described, TRICARE and Medicare. TRICARE was produced in
11:30:35AM 3 early December, on December 5th, and then an ESI protocol
11:30:41AM 4 conversion on December 9th. So that was out in December.

11:30:45AM 5 THE COURT: So that's been produced. Is it
11:30:47AM 6 current?

11:30:47AM 7 MR. ORTIZ: Correct. It is with the caveat so
11:30:51AM 8 as Ms. Butler described, as a general matter, these folks we
11:30:56AM 9 will need to supplement both damages and offsets generally
11:31:00AM 10 before trial. And we are happy to and welcome an opportunity
11:31:05AM 11 to discuss with Plaintiffs some sort of final supplementation
11:31:10AM 12 date for both damages and offsets.

11:31:11AM 13 So we don't have another TRICARE data set in
11:31:16AM 14 coming down the works. But generally, yes, it will need to
11:31:20AM 15 between now and the appropriate time need to be supplemented
11:31:24AM 16 so that the Court has the most current data at the
11:31:27AM 17 appropriate time.

11:31:28AM 18 And then with respect to the Medicare data, we
11:31:32AM 19 got that out as soon as we could earlier this week as soon as
11:31:36AM 20 it had been received. And it is a large data sheet. So for
11:31:43AM 21 Medicare, we became aware that there were a couple Plaintiffs
11:31:48AM 22 who had enrolled in Medicare and had Medicare claims after we
11:31:53AM 23 had previously gathered that data. So that's why we went
11:31:56AM 24 back and refreshed that data, so to speak.

11:31:59AM 25 THE COURT: Is that current?

11:32:00AM 1 MR. ORTIZ: It is.

11:32:01AM 2 THE COURT: As far as you know.

11:32:03AM 3 MR. ORTIZ: Yes, yes. And same caveat but it is
11:32:06AM 4 and it includes there were originally 10 Plaintiffs who were
11:32:11AM 5 enrolled in Medicare and had Medicare claims and then there
11:32:14AM 6 were 3 more who had enrolled since we originally identified
11:32:18AM 7 those 10. So those are on there as well.

11:32:21AM 8 Some of that information was a little bit
11:32:24AM 9 duplicative of records that the PLG had produced to us,
11:32:29AM 10 billing records and such. But that is current.

11:32:31AM 11 THE COURT: Can you point out to them when you
11:32:33AM 12 make a production that this information, this part, Pages 1
11:32:40AM 13 through 80 may be duplicative of what you already have?

11:32:45AM 14 MR. ORTIZ: We will have to discuss that. I
11:32:47AM 15 don't know technically if we can. I certainly understand the
11:32:49AM 16 concern, and it's not something on our part where we are
11:32:52AM 17 trying to burden them unnecessarily.

11:32:54AM 18 THE COURT: I mean, I think you do under the
11:32:56AM 19 rules; right? When you produce documents, you have the
11:32:59AM 20 burden of identifying what it is you are producing.

11:33:02AM 21 MR. ORTIZ: I believe that's correct, Your
11:33:04AM 22 Honor, and we would be welcome to have that discussion with
11:33:06AM 23 them about ways we can do that. Perhaps similar to DPPF as
11:33:12AM 24 well as a final supplementation date and not just for damages
11:33:16AM 25 but for all expert issues as well and we have that I believe

11:33:19AM 1 in the joint status report for some time.

11:33:23AM 2 And then with respect to the briefing schedule,
11:33:26AM 3 I don't think we disagree with what Ms. Butler outlined. I
11:33:31AM 4 think we would note that the motion on threshold statutory
11:33:35AM 5 interpretation issues would fall as a non-discovery motion.
11:33:39AM 6 And so our understanding was it would be subject to the
11:33:45AM 7 default rules for time to respond.

11:33:48AM 8 THE COURT: That's a good point. You all have
11:33:50AM 9 been talking about this. This is not a new, novel issue, I
11:33:53AM 10 would imagine.

11:33:55AM 11 MR. ORTIZ: The statutory interpretation issues?
11:33:58AM 12 Correct. Yes. And I think under the --

11:33:59AM 13 THE COURT: It's a novel statute, but you all
11:34:02AM 14 have been talking about it for a while.

11:34:04AM 15 MR. ORTIZ: Correct. We know what some of those
11:34:05AM 16 are, and we don't know exactly what they will raise. And we
11:34:08AM 17 are evaluating ourselves whether we want to file something on
11:34:11AM 18 similar lines. But under the local civil rules, it would be
11:34:16AM 19 three weeks to respond and two weeks for any replies.

11:34:21AM 20 THE COURT: Do you have an opinion whether that
11:34:22AM 21 should be shortened?

11:34:24AM 22 MR. ORTIZ: I don't think we have discussed it.
11:34:28AM 23 I think we would be happy to discuss it. I think we want to
11:34:33AM 24 make sure those issues are adequately briefed. They are
11:34:38AM 25 really important to the issues and the scope of the statute,

11:34:40AM 1 so we would be happy to discuss that.

11:34:42AM 2 THE COURT: I have no doubt that you can
11:34:47AM 3 advocate effectively in a motion. I don't know that you need
11:34:54AM 4 two weeks to do that. Again because it sounds like you all
11:34:58AM 5 have been discussing this already.

11:35:03AM 6 MS. BUTLER: Your Honor, we have proposed
11:35:04AM 7 stipulations on two occasions, and those stipulations largely
11:35:09AM 8 address a lot of the issues that will be in our motion. And
11:35:13AM 9 it is because of their inability to stipulate that this
11:35:17AM 10 threshold motion is --

11:35:18AM 11 THE COURT: I understand. But my concern is the
11:35:20AM 12 time.

11:35:21AM 13 MS. BUTLER: Right.

11:35:21AM 14 THE COURT: My concern is the time.

11:35:23AM 15 MS. BUTLER: I was just looking. So let's just
11:35:25AM 16 say we get our motion filed by the 23rd. I mean, three weeks
11:35:32AM 17 would be February 13 and then two weeks for reply it would be
11:35:36AM 18 all briefed by the end of February.

11:35:37AM 19 THE COURT: But if it's going to affect your
11:35:39AM 20 proposed schedule.

11:35:41AM 21 MS. BUTLER: I agree.

11:35:41AM 22 THE COURT: I want to be mindful of the
11:35:44AM 23 schedule.

11:35:44AM 24 MS. BUTLER: I think we can shorten those
11:35:46AM 25 deadlines and tighten them up.

11:35:48AM 1 THE COURT: It's their brief; right?

11:35:50AM 2 MS. BUTLER: Well, they are talking about also
11:35:52AM 3 filing one so which is the first I heard of that. So I guess
11:35:57AM 4 it might run both ways. But yes, as proposed right now, we
11:36:03AM 5 are working on a motion. We will be filing a motion. So the
11:36:06AM 6 response to that motion would be theirs. Yes, Your Honor.

11:36:11AM 7 MR. ORTIZ: If I may, Your Honor, I agree
11:36:13AM 8 certainly these issues aren't novel. There are many damages
11:36:18AM 9 depositions that are probably going to all be clustered into
11:36:23AM 10 February. So there's a lot going on, and I would be
11:36:25AM 11 concerned to make sure that's fully and adequately briefed.

11:36:30AM 12 THE COURT: Keep in mind these are briefs that
11:36:35AM 13 four different chambers are going to be reading and there are
11:36:42AM 14 four different Judges weighing in on it, not just one. So
11:36:45AM 15 that may take some time.

11:36:50AM 16 MR. ORTIZ: Understood, Your Honor.

11:36:53AM 17 MS. BUTLER: We will try to file our motion as
11:36:56AM 18 quickly as possible. I do think the deadlines could be
11:37:01AM 19 tightened up. But again, as you noted, if they don't file a
11:37:07AM 20 motion, it's their response. If they do file a motion, we
11:37:10AM 21 will also have a response. We are working very hard to try
11:37:14AM 22 to get this motion filed as quickly as possible.

11:37:20AM 23 THE COURT: What kind of motion would it be?

11:37:22AM 24 MS. BUTLER: So we have looked at a motion in
11:37:24AM 25 limine which is what was used for vapor intrusion to exclude

11:37:29AM 1 evidence, for example --

11:37:30AM 2 THE COURT: And you saw how long that took.

11:37:32AM 3 MS. BUTLER: Well, that's a concern, of course.

11:37:37AM 4 THE COURT: That involved recommendations. I
11:37:40AM 5 don't know that this would.

11:37:42AM 6 MS. BUTLER: Right. But we are looking at the
11:37:43AM 7 motion in limine vehicle to exclude evidence, for example, of
11:37:47AM 8 TRICARE as an offset because the statute does not allow for
11:37:51AM 9 TRICARE as an offset. That's an example.

11:37:56AM 10 THE COURT: So it would be an exclusion motion.

11:38:04AM 11 MS. BUTLER: For example, we will be asking that
11:38:09AM 12 the Court exclude evidence of future disability payments as
11:38:13AM 13 an offset because the statute says that offsets are allowed
11:38:18AM 14 for disability awards or payments provided which we believe
11:38:22AM 15 means already provided at the time and does not extend to the
11:38:27AM 16 future.

11:38:28AM 17 So, for example, if the Court were to agree with
11:38:30AM 18 us, that would exclude which they are now claiming offsets
11:38:38AM 19 for future disability. We also have other issues with regard
11:38:43AM 20 to even trying to calculate future disability given the
11:38:48AM 21 fluctuations and lack of reliability in doing that. But the
11:38:52AM 22 threshold issue would be is it even allowed under the
11:38:55AM 23 statute.

11:38:56AM 24 THE COURT: So the parties need clarification on
11:38:58AM 25 what is and what are, what are not damages so that they can

11:39:04AM 1 most effectively depose their experts.

11:39:09AM 2 MS. BUTLER: It's really what offsets are
11:39:10AM 3 allowed. And then if an offset is allowed, it is our
11:39:15AM 4 position that that thereby is proof of the corresponding
11:39:22AM 5 damage and they should wash out.

11:39:23AM 6 So if all of that is ruled upon and the Court
11:39:30AM 7 agrees with our interpretation, it does away with a lot of
11:39:34AM 8 the evidence and the time and the expense that we are going
11:39:39AM 9 through right now because if an offset is allowed and we
11:39:46AM 10 believe it shows because proof of an offset means that the
11:39:50AM 11 Government has reliably proven that that amount was incurred
11:39:55AM 12 for the medical care of the Plaintiff, that same proof should
11:40:01AM 13 demonstrate that the Plaintiff incurred that medical care.

11:40:06AM 14 And, therefore, those numbers should wash. And,
11:40:10AM 15 in fact, the parties are in the process that particular past
11:40:14AM 16 medical care example which also applies to disability but the
11:40:18AM 17 past medical care we are still working on trying to find some
11:40:22AM 18 stipulations on those issues because it should be a wash.

11:40:26AM 19 And we are still in communication and I think
11:40:34AM 20 the Government would agree that we are still trying really
11:40:38AM 21 hard to reach agreement on that. But because we haven't so
11:40:41AM 22 far, we really want to get those issues before the Court.
11:40:46AM 23 Because if it's all a wash, it saves a lot of time and
11:40:49AM 24 expense.

11:40:50AM 25 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Ortiz, back to you.

11:40:53AM 1 MR. ORTIZ: Your Honor, we did receive some
11:40:55AM 2 proposed stipulations, as Ms. Butler referenced, earlier this
11:40:59AM 3 week, Wednesday evening. So we are looking at those. Your
11:41:03AM 4 Honor might recall there was some discussion about what we
11:41:05AM 5 could stipulate to. And our position is we can't stipulate
11:41:09AM 6 to pure questions of statutory interpretation. Those are for
11:41:14AM 7 the Court.

11:41:14AM 8 This is a little bit different. It's along the
11:41:16AM 9 lines we've been inviting for some time so we certainly
11:41:20AM 10 welcome engaging in that process for PLG to try to narrow the
11:41:24AM 11 issues while remaining faithful to the text of the statute.
11:41:29AM 12 So I agree on that. We are still working hard on
11:41:32AM 13 stipulations there.

11:41:35AM 14 THE COURT: Okay.

11:41:38AM 15 MR. ORTIZ: I don't know that we disagree about
11:41:39AM 16 a motion in limine being an appropriate vehicle for these
11:41:43AM 17 statutory interpretation questions. We definitely agree they
11:41:48AM 18 are important questions about the scope of the statute and
11:41:50AM 19 its text and its purpose that should be resolved and would be
11:41:54AM 20 beneficial, mutually beneficial to the parties if it were.

11:42:00AM 21 THE COURT: Okay.

11:42:01AM 22 MR. ORTIZ: I am happy to address any other
11:42:02AM 23 questions Your Honor may have.

11:42:05AM 24 THE COURT: No. I just have a concern about
11:42:09AM 25 timing. All right. Continue to confer and see if you can

11:42:15AM 1 reach some agreement on these so that you wouldn't have to
11:42:22AM 2 spend time filing a motion and the Court delaying the case.

11:42:27AM 3 MR. ORTIZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

11:42:28AM 4 MS. BUTLER: Yes, Your Honor.

11:42:30AM 5 THE COURT: Anything else?

11:42:33AM 6 MR. CARPENITO: Your Honor, if I may, Joshua
11:42:34AM 7 Carpenito for the United States. With respect to the Muster
11:42:37AM 8 Rolls, I generally agree with the update that the Plaintiffs
11:42:40AM 9 provided. There are a couple of details that I want to
11:42:42AM 10 ensure that the Court is aware of.

11:42:44AM 11 Plaintiffs have agreed to carry the cost and pay
11:42:47AM 12 for any of the downloading of these records. They have also
11:42:51AM 13 agreed to produce to the United States any of the records
11:42:53AM 14 that are downloaded pursuant to the ESI protocol at the time
11:42:59AM 15 they go in and do this initial records review to essentially
11:43:03AM 16 determine if and how they want to use these documents.

11:43:06AM 17 We will need to confer on a separate and
11:43:09AM 18 subsequent amendment to the protective order depending on
11:43:12AM 19 PLG's proposed use and disclosure of those records.

11:43:19AM 20 THE COURT: You are waiting on a protective
11:43:21AM 21 order; right? From this Court?

11:43:23AM 22 MR. CARPENITO: That's correct.

11:43:24AM 23 THE COURT: But that's not the one you are
11:43:25AM 24 referring to.

11:43:26AM 25 MR. CARPENITO: That is correct.

11:43:26AM 1 MS. BUTLER: That's correct.

11:43:29AM 2 MR. CARPENITO: Your Honor, that's all that I
11:43:30AM 3 have. Thank you.

11:43:33AM 4 MR. BAIN: The other things I would like to
11:43:35AM 5 bring up, Your Honor, is that with respect to all this
11:43:38AM 6 discussion about damages, the United States would be prepared
11:43:41AM 7 to go forward with an evidentiary hearing on Phase I if the
11:43:44AM 8 Court deems that's necessary while this damages discovery and
11:43:48AM 9 briefing is going on to keep moving this case forward.

11:43:51AM 10 So I wanted to make it clear that we are still
11:43:54AM 11 able to go forward with that hearing expeditiously to try to
11:43:59AM 12 move this case along. We believe that resolution of the
11:44:01AM 13 water contamination will -- contamination issue will greatly
11:44:04AM 14 assist in global resolution.

11:44:07AM 15 The other thing I wanted to mention with respect
11:44:09AM 16 to global resolution was that you may recall Mr. Bell
11:44:14AM 17 requested at the last hearing that a Navy representative come
11:44:18AM 18 to the court and discuss the Elective Option process with
11:44:21AM 19 you. We mentioned that such individual would be available at
11:44:24AM 20 the mediation that we had. So that did occur on December
11:44:27AM 21 17th.

11:44:29AM 22 We had a mediation with PLG and the settlement
11:44:33AM 23 masters. The head of the Camp Lejeune Claim Unit came to
11:44:38AM 24 that virtually and discussed many statistics with respect to
11:44:44AM 25 the Elective Option process and how it was going with respect

11:44:47AM 1 to different injuries and different law firms and the
11:44:50AM 2 substantiation that they were providing.

11:44:53AM 3 The Plaintiffs Leadership Group was offered the
11:44:55AM 4 opportunity to ask questions and did so for an extended
11:44:59AM 5 period of time. So I just wanted to inform the Court that
11:45:02AM 6 that had taken place.

11:45:04AM 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Anything else?

11:45:19AM 8 MR. ELLIS: No, sir.

11:45:19AM 9 THE COURT: Let's look at the week of the 19th,
11:45:21AM 10 the week of the 26th for a date that we can have another
11:45:30AM 11 status conference and a hearing on those motions to strike.
11:45:32AM 12 And if you would just email Mr. Sotelo with available dates,
11:45:38AM 13 of course, keeping everybody on the email chain. Okay?
11:45:45AM 14 Thank you very much.

11:45:55AM 15 (The status conference concluded at 11:45 a.m.)

16 C E R T I F I C A T I O N

17

18 I certify that the foregoing is a correct
19 transcript from the record of proceedings in the
20 above-entitled matter.

21

22 /s/ Bobbie J. Shanfelder

23 Bobbie J. Shanfelder, RDR, CRR

24 Official Court Reporter

25 Date: January 12, 2026