1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION 3 JENNIFER L. MILLER, 4 Case No. 5:20CV1743 Plaintiff, 5 Akron, Ohio Monday, January 10, 2022 VS. 6 1:00 p.m. MICHAEL J. ANDERSON, ET AL., 7 Defendants. 8 9 TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN R. ADAMS 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 11 APPEARANCES: 12 For the Plaintiff: Jeroen Van Kwawegen Alla Zayenchik 13 Bernstein, Litowitz, Berger & Grossmann - New York 14 1251 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 15 (212) 554-1472 16 Thomas J. Curry Saxena White - Wilmington 17 Office 1265, Suite 1200 1000 North West Street 18 Wilmington, Delaware 19801 (302) 485-0480 19 Sara M. DiLeo 20 Saxena White - White Plains 10 Bank Street, 8th Floor White Plains, New York 10606 21 (914) 437-8551 2.2 Richard A. Speirs 23 Amy R. Miller Cohen, Milstein, Sellers & Toll 24 88 Pine Street, 14 Floor New York, New York 10005 25 (212) 838 7797

	2
1	John C. Camillus Law Offices of John C. Camillus
2	P.O. Box 141410 Columbus, Ohio 43214
3	(614) 992-1000
4	Marc H. Edelson Edelson Lechtzin
5	3 Terry Drive, Suite 205 Newtown, Pennsylvania 18940
6	(215) 867-2399
7	For Defendants Geoffrey J. Ritts Anderson, Demetriou, Robert S. Faxon
8	Johnson, Misheff, Jones Day - Cleveland O'Neil, Mitchell, 901 Lakeside Avenue
9	Pappas, Pianalto, Cleveland, Ohio 44114 Reyes, Turner, (216) 586-3939
10	Strah, Taylor: Marjorie P. Duffy
11	Jones Day - Columbus 325 John H. McConnell Boulevard, #600
12 13	Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 469-3939
14	For Defendant Jones: Carole S. Rendon Douglas L. Shively
15	Albert G. Lin Baker & Hostetler - Cleveland
16	127 Public Square, Suite 2000 Cleveland, Ohio 44114
17	(216) 861-7420
18	Jason J. Mendro Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher - Washington
19	1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20035
20	(202) 887-3726
21	For Defendant Reffner: Steven S. Scholes McDormott Will & Emory - Chicago
22	McDermott, Will & Emery - Chicago 444 West Lake Street, Suite 4000 Chicago Illinois 60606
23	Chicago Illinois 60606 (312) 372-2000
24	
25	

		3	
1	For Defendant	Tohn E McCaffroy	
2	Dowling:	John F. McCaffrey John A. Favret, III Tucker Ellis - Cleveland	
3		950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100	
4	,	Cleveland, Ohio 44113 (216) 592-5000	
5	For Defendant	Margalla I Iana	
6	Yeboah-Amankwah:	Marcella L. Lape Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &	
7		Flom - Chicago 155 North Wacker Drive, Suite 2700 Chicago Illinois 60606	
8		Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 407-0700	
9	For Nominal Defendant FirstEnergy:	John Gleeson	
10		Susan Reagan Gittes Debevoise & Plimpton 919 Third Avenue	
11		New York, New York 10022	
12	For Defendant Chack:	(212) 909–6000	
13		Morgan, Lewis & Bockius - Philadelphia 1701 Market Street	
14		Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (215) 963-5000	
15		Douglas M. Mansfield, Jr.	
16		Lape, Mansfield & Nakasian	
17		9980 Brewster Lane, Suite 150 Powell, Ohio 43065 (614) 763-2316	
18	(614) 763-2316 For Defendant Pearson: Timothy D. Katsiff		
19	for Delendant Pearson	Ballard Spahr - Philadelphia	
20		1735 Market Street, 51st Floor Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 (215) 864-8301	
21	Court Doportor.		
22	Court Reporter:	Caroline Mahnke, RMR, CRR, CRC Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse 2 South Main Street, Suite 568	
23		Akron, Ohio 44308	
24		(330) 252-6021	
25	_	by mechanical stenography; transcript -aided transcription.	

Monday, January 10, 2022

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, good afternoon.

This is Judge Adams. We're here today regarding Case Number 5:20CV1743. The case is captioned Jennifer L. Miller, derivatively on behalf of FirstEnergy Corporation, versus Michael Anderson and other numerous named defendants.

We're here for a status conference by telephone regarding the matter.

I've reviewed all of the various status reports that have been filed in the matter, and I know we have currently scheduled an in-person conference on January 31, if memory serves correct.

And so I am interested today in accomplishing two things. Number one, getting an update on the status of discovery. It appears there has been some issues.

Also to select a new date for the status conference, and I'll also hear from the parties regarding this proposed mediation.

Before you begin to speak, identify yourselves. If you're representing more than one party, please so indicate.

I know we didn't take roll before I began the conference simply because of the sheer number of counsel and parties.

Those are the topics for today's conference, and we'll hear from you in the order that appears in the Court's

docket.

Counsel for the plaintiff, can you give me an update from your persecutive at this time.

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

My name is Jeroen Van Kwawegen from Bernstein Litowitz.

With me on the line on behalf of plaintiffs are my colleague

Alla Zayenchik from my firm, Berstein Litowitz.

Also on the line for plaintiffs are Tom Curry, Sara DiLeo from Saxena White; Richard Speirs and Amy Miller, Cohen Milstein; John Camillus, and Marc Edelson.

Thank you, Your Honor for calling this status conference.

I have the same number of issues that Your Honor had, and also one housekeeping item in connection with the discovery.

So first, with respect to the update on discovery, we are working through — obviously there are numerous parties in this case. We're working through various issues. All parties have started rolling productions of documents.

As you would expect, when you get those documents and you have further discussions, there may be potential disputes about the scope of discovery going forward.

But quite frankly, Your Honor, those disputes have not ripened yet to the point where we felt it needed to be addressed by the Court. We're aware of your procedure where

we can raise issues and you are very responsive.

So at this point, I was not going to raise any particular issues with Your Honor. I'm happy to address any that Your Honor may want to talk about. But from my perspective there is nothing that is so urgent that we really need the Court's intervention with respect to the scope of discovery because I think we're still working through various issues with the various parties.

And, you know, from my perspective, I think we should give that a few more days. And if there are then really issues, then I would like to see if we can get the Court's guidance.

From the housekeeping perspective, we had asked Your Honor to enter the ESI protocol. It's ECF number 155-2. I don't know if Your Honor had a chance to look at it. I know Your Honor has particular views on these types of documents, but if it is permitted — if it is okay with Your Honor, we would like to enter that protocol so everybody is on the same page about how documents are being produced.

My understanding is people are already acting consistent with the protocol because it was a joint protocol, but I think from a housekeeping matter, it would be helpful if Your Honor can approve that.

And then the other point I was going to raise in connection with the status conference on January 31 and the

mediation, I don't know if Your Honor wants me to do that now or if you want to do that in a second round after we go through the topic of discovery with Your Honor and with the other parties on the line.

THE COURT: We can do it at this time if you would like. I think it's probably more productive that way.

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

So then just continuing on, thank you, Your Honor, for being open to rescheduling our in-person conference from January 31 to a later date. We will make ourselves available at the Court's convenience.

It is very helpful from our perspective because we have the mediation scheduled with the former Judge Layn Phillips on February 1 currently scheduled to be in person in his offices.

My understanding is that all defendants, or at least their counsel, have agreed to this mediation in person, and then all the insurance carriers are going to be present as well.

We hope that this is going to be a fruitful mediation. And from my perspective it makes sense to have a status conference with Your Honor not too long thereafter so we can update Your Honor about where we are and how we are proceeding. And if there is no settlement, obviously we are planning to proceed on the Court's schedule as we have

agreed and the Court has set.

THE COURT: Counsel, let me ask you a question that's causing me some concern.

How is it that we would undertake a mediation in this case before you've received all the written discovery, before you've conducted even one deposition?

So I'm more than concerned about the vigorous or adequate prosecution of this case if you haven't even done the most what I would characterize rudimentary things that you would need to undertake before what I think is somewhat of a mad rush to mediate this case.

I mean, I could understand mediation if you've come to me and said, Judge, we're going to be mediating this case sometime in June. We received all the written discovery.

The way I read the status reports, we don't know that you're going to get everything you have requested or not.

I don't know what you've gotten, what you may get, what you know, what you don't know. You've not deposed any one of the parties, the individually named parties, and yet you tell me, Judge, we need to mediate and we're going to mediate this case.

Any comments about that?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Yes, Your Honor. And I appreciate your comments, and I'm actually very happy that you raised them.

Because, as Your Honor knows, when you think about a case from the plaintiff's perspective or the defense perspective, what you do in every stage of the case is you are analyzing the potential risks to your case and also the potential rewards for the party that you represent.

And we are here representing the plaintiff. And because the motion to dismiss was denied and the Court found that the matter want futile, we are now prosecuting the claims on behalf of FirstEnergy against former and current directors and officers.

And when I think about the risks to the case and the potential upside to the case, one thing that I cannot ignore is the availability of insurance to pay for a meaningful recovery for the company for the harm that it suffered.

And as Your Honor probably also knows, the D&O policies are wasting policies, meaning that the defense costs are ultimately borne by the carriers.

During the last status conference, my understanding was that currently the company itself is bearing those costs which again is an expense to the company.

And so our intent is to do what's best for FirstEnergy at every stage of the litigation. And so we would never, ever, present a potential settlement to Your Honor that we would not feel fully confident that Your Honor would look at us and say, you know what, given this situation, this is an

excellent outcome because, quite honestly, that's not my business model, and Your Honor would reject that settlement.

So the fact that we are engaging in mediation is a multi-faceted process, clearly, but it also has to do with how do we maximize the recovery and minimize the loss for FirstEnergy that from our perspective these defendants have caused.

And it is true, Your Honor, you are right, that when we are looking at a typical case, having depositions and crystallize out who did what and who is responsible for what is a critical aspect. And I do not want to minimize that in any way.

But at the same time, in this case, Your Honor also knows that there is a deferred prosecution agreement and that a lot of these underlying facts have either been admitted or are, from an insurance perspective and a recovery perspective, not that difficult to establish.

So what I would ask Your Honor is your indulgence, quite frankly, your indulgence to see if we can have a mediation and present a settlement that is worthy of your praise, quite frankly.

And if we cannot, I don't even want to present it.

And if we do not, despite my best efforts, Your Honor will just say, sorry, counsel, this is not good enough.

But given all those considerations, I don't think it's

premature to at least try.

THE COURT: Counsel, I don't want to get into a debate back and forth with you. I guess maybe you and I are just going to have to agree to disagree because I don't see how you can assess the relative responsibility, alleged responsibility, of any officers or others without taking their depositions, without seeing all the paper discovery.

I candidly can't grasp the idea that you would know enough about this case against the relative -- again, the relative position of the defendants to in any way mediate, settle, assess responsibility, if any, liability, if any, on what you now know.

I don't get -- and I'll be candid with you. When I -- I need to hear from the others, but I have not yet appointed lead counsel in this case. I have informally done that in some ways intentionally so I could sort of get a gauge of how vigorously this is going to be prosecuted and all the other requirements that the rule requires.

So, I guess I have to give pause to whether I need to either back up and consider new lead counsel or appoint additional lead counsel because it just doesn't strike me as the kind of effort that would need to be undertaken before we come to a mediation.

Without having done what's -- I'm repeating myself, without having done all the things that one would want to

undertake to fully understand the claims, the value of them, the extent of them, in terms of allocating responsibility, if any, again, yet to be determined, among various defendants.

Some may have little or no responsibility. Some may have an extraordinary amount. And how you can do that without seeing the discovery and taking the depositions is really something I don't quite understand. So --

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: So Your Honor --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, counsel. I need to hear from the others. I think I've said what I had to say or want to say about this issue.

So what is the position of Michael Anderson and any other related defendants that counsel represents, please?

MR. RITTS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Geoffrey Ritts from Jones Day. I'm here along with my partners Marjorie Duffy and Robert Faxon on behalf of Defendants Anderson, et al., the current directors and current officers of the company.

Your Honor, we do not have any discovery-related issues to raise with the Court today.

We agree with the plaintiff in his desirability of conducting the mediation on February 1 and of putting off the January 31 conference date, and we appreciate the Court's entertaining the request to move that date.

And our view is that, is that a mediation is something that does make sense. And it makes sense for the parties to sit down and exchange views about the case and work with an experienced mediator who has done many, many, many cases of this sort and address the possibilities.

THE COURT: So, again, just thinking out loud here, so how is a mediator going to mediate this case if the mediator doesn't have the benefit of any discovery, meaning any paperwork — when I say paperwork, any of the discovery that's, much of which has not yet been produced, supposedly is due January 14, as I recall, or thereabouts, subject to other objections.

How is the mediator going to effectively mediate the case without knowing -- having the benefit of any depositions, etcetera?

I just don't find it to be a productive exercise at this point.

But I'm not going to stop the parties. I will tell you now. I am going to revisit the issue of lead counsel, definitely. I'm going to see whether or not we need either additional or perhaps new lead counsel because I just cannot come to grips with the idea that we're going to mediate this case after having conducted the case management conference, having listened to what would be the needs of the plaintiff in terms of depositions and discovery. And then now we see,

well, Judge, we want to mediate the case before we even have the benefit of any of it, which doesn't strike me as productive or proceeding with something that would -- maybe I need a set of fresh -- maybe fresh eyes need to look at this and determine if this is the way to proceed.

So, counsel, who is next up? On behalf of the -- counsel on behalf of Mr. Jones, I think, is next in line here.

MS. RENDON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's
Carole Rendon from Baker Hostetler. I am on with some of my
colleagues from Baker Hostetler and also some counsel from
Gibson Dunn, including Dan Warren, Doug Shively, and Albert
Lin from Baker Hostetler, and Jason Mendro from Gibson Dunn.

And Jason, I don't know if there is anybody else who is on from Gibson Dunn. If so, would you please state their presence.

MR. MENDRO: It's just me this afternoon. Thank you, Carole, and thank you, Your Honor.

MS. RENDON: So Your Honor, we actually have a couple, two issues, that I want to raise, both of which we discussed with plaintiff's counsel.

The first is really sort of an administrative issue, and that's a due date issue.

So under some of the current scheduling, we have documents and written discovery due on January 17 which is

MLK day. And as you know, Your Honor, the courts are closed. Baker Hostetler is closed.

We think under the federal rules, Rule 6, that in fact the deadline therefore falls onto January 18.

But after talking to plaintiff's counsel about it, we thought it would be best to make sure that we are correct about that with the Court.

THE COURT: The 18th is fine given the fact the 17th is obviously a holiday.

MS. RENDON: Great. Thank you so much, Your Honor.

The second issue is an issue that involves data retention, an issue that we're still in the very preliminary stages of figuring out. But we notified plaintiff's counsel and actually all defense counsel as well, and I just want to make sure that I flag it for the Court so you're aware of it.

After Mr. Jones was terminated from FirstEnergy, he purchased his own iPhone and iPad. So these are devices that he did not have before his termination. These are devices that he obtained long after any issues relevant to the case had taken place.

Those devices all remain with FirstEnergy. They belong to FirstEnergy. They're in FirstEnergy's possession.

And the relevant information from those devices, I believe,

has already been produced and/or FirstEnergy is in the process of producing it.

These are devices that he purchased after the fact.

Unbeknownst to Mr. Jones and to counsel, when he purchased these devices, there was an auto delete function that was set for text messages. So text messages were being auto deleted after 30 days.

It does not impact in any way records of phone calls that were made. And we do have some data, both going back for a period of 90 days and then text logs that we've been able to identify.

This is all very preliminary, Your Honor. We're working with a forensic expert vendor to try to recover as much of the data as we can.

But so far preliminarily it looks like there is very little, if anything, that would have any relevance to this case that would be on these devices.

So far, for example, we've identified only a single potentially relevant text message. And the recipient has that text message. So it hasn't been lost. It's just not on both devices. It's only on one.

And we've also reviewed preliminarily some extensive call logs. And there is very little, virtually no communication with anybody relevant to the matters at hand as you would expect, since this is all long after Mr. Jones

was represented by counsel and also after he had been terminated from FirstEnergy.

But I just wanted to make sure. We told plaintiff's counsel that we would make you aware of it. We're working with plaintiff's counsel, working with a forensic expert, doing everything we can to recover any data that might be available and are continuing to communicate with plaintiff's counsel about it.

Counsel for the plaintiff, do you have any concerns or are you going to hold in abeyance your positions, or what is your views on this issue?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Your Honor, Jeroen Van Kwawegen from Bernstein Litowitz.

We do have concerns, and obviously Mr. Jones is a very critical party in this case.

The reason I said there is no issue for Your Honor to decide yet is because counsel is correct. They raised this issue with us. And we have a specialized vendor working with the defendant's vendor to analyze really the scope of this problem. That's proceeding quickly. And so I expect that we can give Your Honor an update in the next couple of days about how that is proceeding.

We're also and have also subpoenaed the telecom providers to understand better the scope of this problem. So we are working really hard at finding out what extent

that is a problem.

And if your question is, are you concerned? The answer is yes, Your Honor, and that's why we are working hard to address it.

But I'm not sure that this is done where I could say to Your Honor, please order Mr. Jones to do X, Y, Z because our vendor is in touch with their vendor and we are working through this issue diligently.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, hopefully it doesn't become a problem.

It sounds like those are text messages, whatever there may have been, are something that's going to need to be explored one way or the other.

So don't wait. You'll obviously want to clear that issue up before his deposition. So don't wait.

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: I agree, Your Honor.

MS. RENDON: Absolutely, Your Honor.

Just so Your Honor is aware --

THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Rendon.

MS. RENDON: Just so Your Honor is aware, we have retained not one but two forensic experts to work with us on this issue. And we have been talking with plaintiff's counsel about it since this issue came to light.

And counsel for the plaintiff is correct. The two forensic experts are, with our agreement, in connection with

one another. We are also working with plaintiff's counsel on other mechanisms to try to obtain this information.

But I do want to emphasize, Your Honor, just so you understand the context, that this has nothing to do with any of the devices that Mr. Jones possessed during the relevant time period. These are only devices that he purchased personally after he was terminated by FirstEnergy.

So nothing having to do with any of the timeframe that is discussed or described in the DTA. Nothing having to do with any communications while he was employed at FirstEnergy. These are only communications, and then only text message communications, on devices that he purchased after he was already terminated from FirstEnergy, long after he also had counsel in place.

So we'll continue to work on it diligently, Your Honor, of course. And we're cooperating cooperatively with plaintiff's counsel. And we'll make sure we keep the Court apprised of anything that is relevant.

THE COURT: I appreciate it. Hopefully it doesn't become an issue.

Although, hypothetically I could see post-termination text messages being relevant. Depending on who the messages are with or between or who they're directed at, it could be relevant. So hopefully it won't become an issue.

Anything else?

MS. RENDON: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate 1 2 it. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Let's make sure -- next defendant is Mr. Misheff. 4 5 Counsel. 6 MR. RITTS: Your Honor, this is Geoffrey Ritts. 7 I represent Defendant Misheff along with Anderson, Demetriou 8 Johnson, Mitchell, O'Neil, Pappas, Pianalto, Reyes, Turner, 9 Strah, and Taylor. And I don't have anything further 10 relating to Mr. Misheff. 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 12 On behalf of Mr. Reffner then I believe is next. 13 MR. SCHOLES: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Steve 14 Scholes, S-C-H-O-L-E-S, on behalf of Mr. Reffner. 15 And we do not have anything to add in substance in 16 addition to those of counsel for -- Mr. Ritts and counsel for Mr. Jones. 17 18 THE COURT: Thank you. 19 On behalf of Mr. Dowling is next in line, counsel. 20 MR. MCCAFFREY: Judge Adams, on behalf Mr. 21 Dowling, John McCaffrey and John Favret from Tucker Ellis in 22 Cleveland. 23 Your Honor, we would encourage that the Court enter 24 the ESI protocol order so that we can begin our discovery 25 production post haste.

We also agree with proceeding with mediation for the reasons that have been outlined by both plaintiff's counsel and so far Mr. Ritts.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

On behalf of the -- I don't want to mispronounce -- I'll use the first name so I don't mispronounce the last.

On behalf of Ebony, please, counsel.

MS. LAPE: Hi. This is Marcie Lape on behalf of Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah. We do not have any discovery issues to bring to the Court's attention and have nothing to add in substance to that that was already set forth by Mr. Ritts.

THE COURT: Thank you.

FirstEnergy as a nominal defendant, is there counsel appearing here?

MR. GLEESON: Yes, Judge. Thank you. This is
John Gleeson from Debevoise and Plimpton. On the phone with
me is my partner Susan Gittes.

And just a report, Your Honor. We were in your courtroom about two months ago. The special litigation committee was already up and running and working hard investigating these claims, which, as you know, we were investigating on behalf of the committee's exercising the company's authority with regard to these claims that have

been brought on behalf of the company.

We've continued that. We're very far along.

I do want to say this, Judge. The only -- I think potentially the only value add I have here is to tell you that, first of all, we're grateful you let us -- you've given us a break on January 31 so we can go to mediation.

And Your Honor, you know, I'll elaborate on it to the extent I can if you want me to, but I assure the Court we think that it's possible that mediation in front of Layn Phillips could be productive and there is enough grist for the mill.

We hear what you're saying about depositions, but we believe, and I represent to the Court, there is plenty of information on which meaningful mediation proceedings can go forward. And so we're grateful you're going to give us that opportunity.

THE COURT: So when is the committee, special committee, going to take any action here?

I'm thinking June or July you asked for six months. As you have a right to do, you took that issue up to the circuit, said, Judges, we need another six months.

So that time has come and passed. So you're working diligently. With all due respect, so when are you going to expect that you'll conclude this work?

MR. GLEESON: Judge, I can't give you a date. I

can say that with respect to the principal components of our investigation, we're wrapping it up.

There are other components that we've yet to address, but we think this mediation represents in some respects like a major potential step forward towards resolving at least some of the potential claims that the company could bring.

So I can't -- honestly I can't give you a date. Not because we're not working our tail off, Judge, but only because it's kind of a sprawling matter.

And you're right. We did ask for the six months. We asked for it in the circuit. We didn't get it. But we worked as though we weren't going to get it, and we've very far along.

We're going to prepare for a fruitful mediation. I don't think it's going to get resolved in a day, but I think we've got -- and we've got a substantial likelihood that we can make progress in resolving the derivative claims, if not in their entirety, in substantial part.

As you know, you never know for sure, but, you know, I think the parties are hungry to get before a very accomplished mediator who has got a track record of being able to help resolve issues as complex as this.

And, you know, we're hopeful.

THE COURT: Well, counsel, I hate to be this opinionated, and I speak my mind sometimes too frequently.

But if someone was cynical, they would say, well, you definitely want to try to mediate this case before the parties have to come and sit down and be deposed and be questioned and this entire matter be fully reviewed.

That's sort of the cynic's view. I wonder if there isn't other counsel who might want to take a different look at it and see whether or not mediation is appropriate before you've done all the background work you need to do to really understand the case and understand everyone's possible role in the events in question here. That's what I can't quite block out of my mind.

MR. GLEESON: Well, Judge, can I make one comment in that regard?

THE COURT: Yeah, sure.

MR. GLEESON: To help you understand at least where we're coming from.

And I speak only on behalf of the special litigation committee. I carry no brief for the shareholders, derivative shareholders' counsel you've heard from.

But you know, the one thing that he said that I would like to emphasize is these are claims that are brought on behalf of the company. You know, it's not a class action against the company.

And among the things the company properly needs to consider in determining whether to bring these claims, and

if so how to resolve them, is the potential harm to the company that the pursuit of these claims could threaten in connection with securities class actions, RICO actions, regulatory, other governmental investigations.

So whereas it may well be in the company's interest to advance a claim, that interest has to be weighed against the potential harm that a deposition might cause for the company.

So it's a delicate -- it's a delicate step of considerations. And it's not necessarily in the interest of the special litigation committee to have depositions go forward because of the harm those depositions might threaten with regards to claims against the company.

Again, we're pursuing, as is counsel for the shareholders, pursuing claims in which the company is a victim and pursuing claims on behalf of the company.

But those other claims out there against the company have to be taken into account. And that's the reason why, Judge, it's not necessarily advantageous to have the depositions now.

I hope -- you know, I hope the Court understands that.

THE COURT: I understand that, but I guess you and I will just fundamentally disagree because when you're trying to assess the relative culpability, if any, alleged culpability of those in leadership positions with the

company, trying to assess whether or not they're responsible, their financial responsibility for some of the harm, that's an important part of this process as well.

Talk about harm to the company, you know, who allegedly — I use the word "allegedly" because I don't know. I know what I've read in the agreement between the government and the United States, or the United States and FirstEnergy, readily admitting bribery here and other actions that give one pause.

So without doing the kind of discovery that's necessary and assessing whether there is individuals who are culpable for the harm -- I don't know how you can possibly mediate the case appropriately or do it effectively.

There is other components of this claim that are nonmonetary, that are important as well, I would think.

But I'm repeating myself. I'm repetitive. I don't know how we're going to deal with it. But I just can't fathom mediating the case without having — even at this point, the window of time between production of documents, not knowing what you're going to receive, I mean, that's even extraordinary.

Production is going to be January 14 and 17. There will be no depositions. And then you're going to mediate a case where you will have no more than two weeks, plaintiff's counsel, to review thousands of pages of documents, the way

I read it.

So that strikes me as just not something that you would see done in the ordinary course of a diligent vigorous prosecution, trying to represent the company in assessing responsibility, if any, among all the individual defendants.

That strikes me -- strikes me as just in some respects common sense.

I can't think of a litigator who would say, well, I don't know what I'm going to get in terms of the paper discovery, but I know I'm going to get something or some things subject to dispute resolution, on the 14th and the 17th. And then I'm going to turn around and in maybe less than two weeks agree to mediate a case of this magnitude.

It gives me real pause and real concern. Period.

So let's turn to the next defendant.

Do we have an intervenor, Mr. Katz? Does counsel wish to be heard?

Maybe he's not participating.

Do we have Employee Retirement System of the City of St. Louis, counsel?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Your Honor, Jeroen Van Kwawegen from Bernstein Litowitz on behalf of all plaintiffs.

Would you allow me just to respond to some of the points you made a second ago because I want to make sure

that the Court understands that we have received more than 300,000 pages of documents. We have 25 lawyers working around the clock reviewing those documents, getting ready for depositions.

So I just want to make sure that Your Honor understands that we have all the productions to the Department of Justice. We have text messages. We have all the board minutes and all the board materials. We have a lot of documents. We are running full speed to get ready for depositions.

So I don't want Your Honor to think that we haven't received documents, that we don't have enough to prepare for depositions.

What we're really working with, when you think about January 14 and January 17, are the remaining document productions, and there will be, but it's not the case that we don't have document productions and that we haven't been working really hard to prepare for these depositions, which, and I agree with Mr. Gleeson, will go forward because, most likely go forward, because it is unlikely that the case settles in just one day.

So I just want to make sure that the Court is aware that we are not sort of waiting around waiting for documents to be produced.

We have a team of 25 attorneys and have had a team of

25 attorneys go through those documents already as we are preparing this case.

The other thing I wanted to make sure that Your Honor knows -- go ahead. Sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, are you mediating the cases in the Southern Direct?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Your Honor, the answer is yes and no. The mediation is independent of the Southern District or the Northern District. But it was always our intent to do this in connection with Your Honor, okay.

We want to make sure that Your Honor is pleased ultimately. If -- and there may not be a settlement. But if there is a settlement, we want Your Honor to be pleased with that settlement.

And in connection with that, you know, when you think about some of the largest recoveries in history in derivative cases — those are the Wells Fargo case in the Northern District and the recent Boeing case in Delaware Chancery. Both of those cases were ultimately settled before depositions.

The last one, the Boeing case, was a recovery of 237 and a half million dollars for the company. There were no depositions. And it was mediated by the same judge, former judge, Judge Phillips, that is mediating this case.

And so all I'm asking Your Honor is to know that we

are working really hard with a large team of attorneys to get ready for these depositions, and to give us a chance that if we -- and I'm not saying we will -- but that if we have a mediation that is successful, that Your Honor looks at this settlement and thinks about it.

And my final point on that is all plaintiffs counsel, in this case, but also in the state case, have agreed to give this a chance to see if we can get the kind of historic settlement that Your Honor would say, you know what, I had my reservations, but this is really unbelievably good given the monetary recovery and the government's improvements.

That's all I'm asking, Your Honor, beside the fact to just know that we are working really, really hard to be up to speed and to be up for the depositions and to have an informed mediation ultimately because we agree with that on Your Honor's account as well.

Of course it needs to be an informed mediation, but we're working really hard to make that happen.

THE COURT: I guess we're going to go back and forth. But I don't see how I can be informed, whatsoever, without the benefit of some detailed discovery, depositions, particularly of the major players here that are alleged to have engaged in some misconduct and the challenges that that's going to pose.

But -- again, you and I are just going to agree to

disagree. And maybe I need another counsel to either come on the case or, you know -- I'm reluctant to remove anyone, but appoint, perhaps, additional counsel who can take a look at it, somebody who is, perhaps, more well-known here in the Northern District to take a good look at this case and assess whether or not they need to undertake depositions, do discovery, do the kind of work that needs to be done.

Who knows? You may come here, make an offer, or come with some proposed settlement. I don't know whether it's good or bad or otherwise. I don't know whether it incorporates or includes responsibility of others that are directly involved in this case.

I don't know any of those things. I don't know what the relevant culpability may be in terms -- if any. Again, subject, if any.

And I'm, candidly, concerned FirstEnergy is -- I hope they're not dragging their feet. FirstEnergy is claiming that they have this committee that's doing this work and attempting to ferret out, resolve these issues.

But after six months, we're well beyond six months. I don't know what they've done. I don't know what they're doing.

So I'm concerned --

MR. GLEESON: Judge --

THE COURT: I'm very concerned about this rush to

mediation without having all the work that I think needs to be done before effective mediation can be done and when any mediator can look and say, well, how many parties are at issue here? How many parties need to participate in settlement, if any? How many need to pay money? If there is all this money coming, where — is it all coming from FirstEnergy, so to speak? Where is it coming from?

All those kinds of things that I think would justify that this mediation is being done with all of the adequate discovery information needed and necessary.

So I have to give pause as to whether I look for other counsel.

MR. GLEESON: Judge, it's a small point. This is

John Gleeson from Debevoise again on behalf of the special

litigation committee.

But just so the Court is aware, we are not beyond the six months. We asked for six months in July, and had we gotten it, it would not yet have expired. Just so the Court knows.

We are working hard. I represent that to the Court.

And we have made a ton of progress before early November and since. So just so the Court is aware.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I mean, one would hope that given the -- knowing how the various litigation and other aspects of this, that they would be working

diligently and would have, would, I would hope, quickly, timely, come up with some recommendations.

So, counsel, we'll set another date. If there is any discovery issues, I need to know about it immediately so we can set other dates.

And I will let you know, counsel, about how I go about deciding who I'm going to appoint as either co-lead counsel or what steps I'm going to take in that regard. But I think that's going to be, with some reluctance, I guess going to be necessary.

I just can't -- I don't have any confidence that diligent prosecution is being undertaken here when I hear what I've heard here about this rush to mediation.

And I call it rush because I just -- I'm somewhat -- I don't want to use the word shocked, but I'm somewhat, I'll say, more than surprised that you want to mediate before you've done all the necessary work.

In any kind of litigation, in my experience, depositions are essential, depositions to know and understand, take testimony under oath, find out and determine who knows what, who, what, when, where, and how, and why.

Board minute are just board minutes. They don't tell you the details of the meeting.

So we'll set another date. I'll let you know how I'm

going to go about selecting other counsel. 1 2 Anyone else? 3 MS. MCNALLY: Excuse me, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 MS. MCNALLY: Your Honor, this is Laura McNally 6 from Morgan, Lewis, and Bockius. I'm joined by Doug 7 Mansfield from Lape, Mansfield, and Nakasian. We're counsel 8 for Dennis Chack, and I just wanted to note our presence for 9 the record since we didn't get called on. 10 We don't have anything to add in substance other than 11 what everyone else has stated. 12 THE COURT: You're on behalf of who again, 13 please? 14 MS. MCNALLY: Dennis Chack. 15 THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. I'm going through 16 the docket here, trying to see how I missed you. If I did, 17 I apologize. I'm trying to find -- I thought I went 18 through everyone in turn. So my apologies, counsel. 19 Are you sure there is nothing else you want to add? 20 MS. MCNALLY: Correct, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: All right. Anyone else wish to be 22 heard before I set up the dates? 23 MR. KATSIFF: Yes, Your Honor. Just to note our presence for the record. This is Timothy Katsiff of Ballard 24 25 Spahr, and we represent Mr. Pearson.

But there is nothing additional that we need to be heard on.

THE COURT: All right, counsel.

We will set a date for any discovery disputes to be brought to my attention. As I read the status reports, everything is due -- back up. We'll put up the ESI order so you have it.

In terms of discovery, it's my understanding the 18th is the day that everything is due, so -- by all parties, as I understand it.

So let's take a look at the calendar. We'll set another date. If there is going to be issues, hopefully by that time I can explore how we go about selecting other counsel or additional counsel as the case may be to review the matter and perhaps act as cocounsel here, particularly before the depositions start.

Just a moment while I find a new calendar for the year here.

Friday the 28th is a -- you're going to go forward with your mediation. That's entirely up to you.

The 28th, Friday, at 1:00 we'll conduct a telephone conference. If there is no issues, if you're able to clear up any discovery disputes or issues, let me know, and I won't conduct the conference.

If there is some issues that I need to address, again,

bring them to my attention immediately. We'll use that date and time to hear from the parties regarding any possible disputes and resolutions, etcetera.

As I indicate, by that time, I don't know if time will permit us to determine who else we are going to consider as additional counsel in the case.

I will do that. And, again, I'm reluctant to remove counsel, appoint new lead counsel, delay that further, but again, that's something I have to contemplate here.

Anyone else?

2.2

All right. 1:30 on the 28th we will speak to everyone at that time again.

Excuse me one second.

We'll reset the in-person on the 28th so that we have a clear understanding of what's going to happen here.

Our Court put up a general order which stays all trial proceedings until after the 11th of February. So after that, depending on the pandemic, if it's ramping up again, the trial, because of pending cases, so we will speak with you about the date and time on the 28th or the next status conference regarding the matter.

Any questions on behalf of the plaintiff?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: No, Your Honor.

MR. RITTS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else has any