1 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 Friday, January 28, 2022 VS. 6 1:36 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 Bernstein, Litowitz, Berger & 13 Grossmann - New York 1251 Avenue of the Americas 14 New York, New York (212) 554-1472 15 For Defendants Geoffrey J. Ritts 16 Anderson, Demetriou, Jones Day - Cleveland Johnson, Misheff, 901 Lakeside Avenue 17 O'Neil, Mitchell, Cleveland, Ohio 44114 Pappas, Pianalto, (216) 576-3939 18 Reyes, Turner, Strah, Taylor: 19 Carole S. Rendon For Defendant Jones: 20 Baker & Hostetler - Cleveland 127 Public Square, Suite 2000 Cleveland, Ohio 44114 21 (216) 861-7420 2.2 For Defendant Reffner: 23 Steven S. Scholes McDermott, Will & Emery - Chicago 24 444 West Lake Street, Suite 4000 Chicago Illinois 60606 25 (312) 372-2000

	3. 3.23 3V 311 13 3V V B33 W.	2
1		
2		John F. McCaffrey Tucker Ellis - Cleveland 950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100
3		Cleveland, Ohio 44113 (216) 592-5000
4	For Defendant	Marcella L. Lape
5	Yeboah-Amankwah:	Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom - Chicago
6		155 North Wacker Drive, Suite 2700 Chicago, Illinois 60606
7		(312) 407-0700
8		John Gleeson Susan Reagan Gittes
9	FirstEnergy:	Debevoise & Plimpton 919 Third Avenue
10		New York, New York 10022 (212) 909-6000
11	For Defendant Chack: Laura Hughes McNally	
12	FOI Defendant Chack.	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius - Philadelphia 1701 Market Street
13	Philadelphia, Pennsylvani (215) 963-5000	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
14	For Defendant Pearson: Timothy D. Katsiff	
15		Emilia McKee Vassallo Ballard Spahr - Philadelphia
16		1735 Market Street, 51st Floor Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
17		(215) 864-8301
18	Court Reporter:	Caroline Mahnke, RMR, CRR, CRC Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse
19		2 South Main Street, Suite 568 Akron, Ohio 44308
20		(330) 252-6021
21		
22		
23		
24	D	
25	<del>-</del>	by mechanical stenography; transcript -aided transcription.

## Friday, January 28, 2022

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. This is Judge Adams. We're here today regarding Case Number 5:20CV1743. The case is captioned Jennifer Miller versus Michael J. Anderson. We're here today for a status conference regarding the matter.

I know there is a substantial number of counsel on the phone, so we would ask that each of you identify yourself before you speak.

I'll go through the best I can the docket and refer to counsel. If you represent more than one party, please state that as well for the record.

I did receive -- I think yesterday late evening there was a status report filed by the parties. The plaintiff, I believe, filed a status report.

And I previously received a report from the Nominal Defendant FirstEnergy.

So I have read those. So I'm familiar with what's been represented to the Court.

Counsel for the plaintiff, why don't you take a few moments and give me some detail of the status, etcetera, of the case, discovery, any knowledge of any disputes, things of that nature, please.

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

My name is Jeroen Van Kwawegen from Bernstein Litowitz on

behalf of the plaintiffs. Thank you for holding this conference.

I appreciate the fact that Your Honor has read our status report, docket number 258.

As Your Honor saw from the status report, the plaintiffs have been collectively working really hard at this case for the last 18 months, have defeated many motions, including in the Sixth Circuit, and in the meantime started working hard on discovery.

We have negotiated protocols -- and I'm talking about a few months ago now -- but we have negotiated protocols with all the defendants, including FirstEnergy, received more than 400,000 pages of documents, and we have a team of 30 attorneys working through, and have been working through, those document productions so that we will be ready to start depositions starting with Mr. Mitchell on February 10.

We are on track, Your Honor, to meet those deadlines and to continue with the Court-approved schedule.

As in any other large complex litigation, along the way issues will arise that need to be resolved. And what I can tell Your Honor is that along the way issues have arisen. They have been resolved so far every time, partially due to Your Honor's oversight of this case.

There were a number of issues that arose along the way where initially we got resistance, and when we said, look,

maybe we should just raise this with the Court, we ultimately were able to reach a satisfactory resolution.

And so as we have been going through this process over the last six to eight months, we have been able to resolve those issues.

We are now reaching the end, as Your Honor knows from the status report and from submissions, we're reaching the end.

And one of the final big pieces that needed to be resolved, quite frankly, was the privilege long, which as Your Honor probably can imagine also is going to be a significant issue in this case with a large number of documents.

And Your Honor saw that FirstEnergy had requested a short extension, which Your Honor granted, to resolve that issue.

And that issue has now been resolved, and so we will soon receive the privilege log. And we will obviously comb through this and raise any issues first with FirstEnergy and otherwise with the Court.

So I'm not saying that all issues have been resolved, Your Honor. But what I will say is that any issues that needed to be resolved have been resolved and that we are still working through some final issues with the various parties to make sure that those are resolved as well,

knowing that the Court is available.

I'm happy to go party by party or issue by issue. But I wanted to give this broader overview for Your Honor first and see if Your Honor has any questions specifically to any of the issues. And I'm happy to give you further detail.

THE COURT: A couple.

Are you still planning on trying to attempt to mediate this case on Monday?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Your Honor, all the plaintiffs and all the defendants collectively have agreed to try and mediate the case on Tuesday.

THE COURT: And who plans on attending that mediation?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: All parties, Your Honor, all parties before this Court, all parties before the Southern District of Ohio, all parties in the related state case.

THE COURT: So they'll be attending in person?

Or how are they going to attend?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: No, Your Honor. This is going to be by Zoom. Due to the pandemic, travel is very difficult, as Your Honor knows.

In addition to that, Your Honor is also aware there is a large number of parties and attorneys, and we collectively deemed it advisable not to be all in the same room.

So it's going to be by Zoom.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I think I've already expressed my views about mediation and what may or may not be accomplished. So I'm not going to restate how I feel about that at this point other than make sure that everyone's aware, I know I have the deposition schedule in front of me, make certain everyone's well aware and prepared to proceed by way of deposition.

Given the Court's schedule, do you have -- do you plan on using the court facilities for purposes of deposition, given the number of parties, the Court's courtroom, or we have a spare courtroom I believe that may be available? Is that something you still intend to do?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: So Your Honor, we thank Your Honor for that offer. Plaintiffs would like to take you up on that offer, but ultimately we would have to discuss that obviously with defendants because they need to come. But we would be perfectly happy to take Your Honor up on that offer for the reasons that you just expressed.

THE COURT: Well, I think it might be more productive that it be done in person. And if the witnesses appear here, that way if there is any objections or anything that might impede the deposition going forward, then I can be available and address it then at the time rather than having delay and have more filings and more possible continuation of the deposition, etcetera.

So if need be, I'll put up an order and we'll do that, do the depositions here so everyone can be present. The Court can be available should there be any issues.

I think that also, bluntly, would be productive, more productive, since I would hope or anticipate there is going to be a substantial number of documents that the parties are going to utilize or may wish to utilize in the course of the examination.

Am I mistaken? Am I in error in that thought?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Your Honor, you are not mistaken, and we appreciate Your Honor's views on this and we agree with them. And so we thank Your Honor for that.

And I think it makes sense what Your Honor is saying also because we are working — we haven't set a trial date, Your Honor, but we are working with the understanding that Your Honor would like to have this case ready for trial by August.

And we are -- we think that it could make sense, to avoid further delays and the continuances that Your Honor mentions, to have those depositions take place in Akron in your courtroom.

THE COURT: Do you anticipate any amendment of the complaint?

I don't know if there is going to be any future change of circumstances, etcetera. None of us can predict that, of

course, but based on what you have now in terms of the documentation, do you anticipate any amendment to either add or delete various claims or parties?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Not at this time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let's turn then to

counsel -- I'll try to do this in the order they appear on

the docket just due to the sheer numbers here.

On behalf of Mr. Anderson, counsel?

MR. RITTS: Yes, Your Honor. This is Geoffrey
Ritts from Jones Day. I represent Defendants Anderson,
Demetriou, Johnson, Misheff, Mitchell, O'Neil, Pappas,
Pianalto, Reyes, Turner, Strah, and Taylor; that is, the
independent directors and the two defendants who are current
officers of the company.

We don't have any discovery disputes or issues to bring to the Court's attention today.

As plaintiff's counsel said, there are a number of issues on both sides that we're continuing to work through and I expect that we'll continue to work through over the coming days and weeks.

We did, Your Honor, yesterday, submit an unopposed motion asking for the outside director/current officer defendants to be excused from personal attendance at the status conference on February 7 for a number of reasons explained at more length in that motion. I just note that

that motion is there and is pending.

THE COURT: Is your client prepared to -- perhaps you don't represent Mr. Mitchell. I'm sorry.

In terms of the witnesses that are noticed for deposition next February and March, are they all prepared to appear in the courthouse for deposition?

MR. RITTS: Your Honor, the directors live all over the country and so it would, I would suggest, not be optimal for the depositions of the directors who live in a distance to have them in the courthouse.

Mr. Mitchell, for example, lives in southeastern Georgia, and he is of an age where travel during this time probably would not be advisable for him.

We have not conferred with the plaintiffs about the modalities of any of the depositions so far as either whether the depositions are going to be in person or hybrid or remote or just what, or if they're going to be in person, where the depositions are going to occur.

I suggest that it would make sense for us to confer with the plaintiffs and the other parties about what makes sense in terms of the most efficient and safest way to hold these depositions.

And I expect, as with most other things in this case, the parties will probably be able to work something out.

THE COURT: I think, with all due respect,

counsel, I think I contemplated from the very beginning, from our early discussions in the case, that depositions would be held here so that — again, for the reason I've already noted, the number of parties, the number of witnesses, the number of counsel, more to the point, along with should there be any disputes, any objections to any of the answers, those can be cleared up right then and there rather than the Court having to wait for the transcript to be prepared, rulings made, answers given at a later date and time.

A lot more efficient if everyone's present so we don't have those particular problems.

So I'll hear from everyone else, but that's been my thinking all along. This is a case -- FirstEnergy is based in Akron. All of the parties that are named here come to Akron, I suspect, as part of their duties.

So travel to Akron shouldn't be difficult. They should be familiar with the area, familiar with the community, the airport, etcetera. I don't, quite frankly, see it as any undue hardship.

But having said that, counsel for Mr. Jones is next in line. What update would you like to provide the Court?

MR. RITTS: Your Honor --

MS. RENDON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. RITTS: This is Geoffrey Ritts again. Just one other point about the travel issue.

FirstEnergy has not held board meetings in Akron in person for quite some time now due to the pandemic. All of their board meetings during 2021 have been conducted virtually with just one exception.

So the director defendants, in fact, have not been traveling to Akron for business purposes related to FirstEnergy.

That's in our motion that we filed yesterday. I just wanted to make that clear, though.

THE COURT: Well, counsel, I guess my -- I don't want to debate it with you. I don't want to tell you what I think we should do and how to do it.

I'm talking about travel over the years during the time frame the allegations here are made. They occurred well before the pandemic occurred.

And we don't need to debate it. People are traveling all the time through airports for other purposes, for vacations, for sporting events, what have you. So travel is not as restrictive as one might think.

So, again, I'll hear from everyone else, but as I've already discussed how I think this is going to be appropriate to conduct these depositions.

The courthouse is safe. We have protocols in place,

masks, and rooms are sanitized, and what have you.

So it's not as difficult as one might think.

So counsel for Mr. Jones, your position, please, or your update?

MS. RENDON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's Carole Rendon from Baker & Hostetler on behalf of Charles Jones.

So Your Honor, I don't have any specific issues to bring to the Court's attention. Everything that I would have addressed was addressed in the plaintiff's status report. So no particular items to address.

I would echo that it would be helpful to have an opportunity to talk to plaintiff's counsel about deposition locations with respect particularly to Mr. Jones who is not in Ohio. He is in Florida. And he has some pretty significant health issues.

So if you would, Your Honor, if we could just have an opportunity to try to resolve some of this stuff offline and get back to Your Honor perhaps as early as the status conference and discuss it further because it may work for some. It may not work for all.

And Your Honor, with respect to the status conference, we do plan to file a motion, as long as Your Honor doesn't object, to also excuse Mr. Jones from attending that status conference in person. And we'll get that on file this

afternoon.

THE COURT: All right, counsel. What about your discovery requests? Can I ask why it appears that you didn't initiate any discovery in the case until what,

July -- excuse me, January, January 12?

Is there some reason why you went that period of time without any discovery being requested by Mr. Jones or Mr. Dowling?

MS. RENDON: So Your Honor, with respect to the discovery requests, in part we were looking to see what was going to be produced already by some of the other parties so that we wouldn't have to duplicate effort.

And as we have been reviewing the documents that have come in and some of the written discovery responses, we identified some places where we thought that there were holes in what has been produced. And so we wanted to target very specific and limited questions to those places where we thought that there was discovery that was relevant that was missing as opposed to just issuing blanket duplicative discovery requests and wasting a lot of time and energy.

So that was the reason behind that. And we're working through all of those issues with counsel for the other parties and expect that we won't have any problem getting the information that we need.

THE COURT: What about the phones? How far along

is the forensic examination?

When I say phones, I don't mean just phones. I mean all the other electronic devices, Apple watches, all of that.

MS. RENDON: Yes, of course, Your Honor. Happy to address that.

So that is well underway. A tremendous amount of work has been done. We have our forensic expert, two of them actually, in place. They have been in contact with plaintiff's forensic expert.

We have reported back to the plaintiff in detail the information that has been identified.

And I would just say, Your Honor, that it substantiates what I expected and mentioned to Your Honor when I raised this with you at our last status conference. And that includes the following: We have now data on thousands of telephone calls and text messages. There is nothing of any relevance that we have found that is missing and cannot be located. But we're continuing to work through all of those processes.

I do also want to make it clear, Your Honor, that we are working cooperatively with the plaintiff to try to address this issue and also to make sure, Your Honor, that you understand — and I mentioned this at our last status conference as well — that this was a setting that was on

Mr. Jones's phone without his knowledge. He didn't do anything to manipulate the phone to have that particular setting in place. And as soon as it was identified, it was corrected.

And so, you know, we are working really hard and in good faith, but at this point we have identified a grand total of four text streams with anyone on the extensive list of people who we agreed to search for that the plaintiff's had put together.

Three of those text streams have already been produced, but none of them are relevant to the case, and we're still working on the fourth.

THE COURT: Well, I'm sure the plaintiff's counsel will be delving into this, I would certainly hope.

These are all Apple devices?

MS. RENDON: That is correct, Your Honor. These are all devices that were purchased after Mr. Jones was terminated, so after all of the events at issue in the case.

It was an iPhone that was purchased, I believe, the day after his termination. That is now being used by his wife and has been searched.

Mr. Jones used that phone for a matter of a couple of weeks and then got a different phone. And that phone has been searched.

There is also an iPad.

And as indicated in plaintiff's status report, we've identified a couple of other devices which nobody expects will have any relevant information on them. There is a Garmin golf watch and an Apple watch. But out of an abundance of caution, those are all being reviewed as well.

In addition, all of Mr. Jones's computers, any computers that were in his home, are being reviewed.

There is no indication that there was ever a backup within the relevant time period from Mr. Jones's phone to any of those computers. But we're triple checking just to make sure.

So every place where we could look for potentially relevant data we are looking.

But again, I just want to make sure that I'm clear, that there is no expectation that there is any data that was relevant to the issues in this case that has been lost.

But we are running down every lead and will continue to keep the Court informed as we continue through that process.

THE COURT: Well, I suppose counsel might wish to depose those other individuals that, when you look at text messages and other communications from other individuals that are referenced or related to the case, perhaps as part of the -- part of the current prosecution agreement, there is certain individuals who are named there. Certainly

public officials A, B, etcetera, I would think that perhaps those phones are either being searched or very well may be subject to a search so you can get information that additional way if need be.

Plus, counsel, the way I read it, Verizon has been asked to reproduce various text messages, etcetera, I seem to recall reading in one of the reports.

MS. RENDON: That's correct, Your Honor. The plaintiff has issued a subpoena to Verizon for any information that we might be able to get directly from the carrier.

But Your Honor, you made an excellent point just now, which is why this really isn't, you know, it's not an issue of tremendous concern. And that is that if a text message is sent or received, it's not just located on one phone. It's located on two.

So, for example, there was a text message between Mr. Jones and Mr. Dowling. We were able to identify that the text message had been sent but couldn't produce the content of it. But Mr. Dowling was able to.

So the plaintiffs know exactly what that text message said. It has been produced to them. And it has really no relevance to the case. But it was produced anyway.

And so that is another layer of protection to ensure and to confirm that nothing of any relevance to this

litigation is no longer available to the plaintiff. 1 2 THE COURT: So you've joined in the plaintiff's 3 request -- or do you join in their request to obtain information from Verizon? 4 5 MS. RENDON: Yes, Your Honor. In fact, we 6 actually drafted that subpoena for them so that we would 7 make sure that they were capturing everything that could 8 possibly be relevant. 9 So yes. We've been working very cooperatively with 10 them, Your Honor, and they have been working very 11 cooperatively with us. 12 So we are all trying to resolve this issue so we can 13 put it behind us and focus on the matters that are really 14 relevant to the case. 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 16 MS. RENDON: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. Let's see. Is it Mr. -- I'm sorry, Ebony, and her 18 19 last name I apologize. I know I'm not going to pronounce it 20 properly, so I'll just refer to her by her first name. 21 What if any update from your perspective, please? 22 MS. LAPE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is 23 Marcie Lape on behalf of Defendant Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah. 24 We do not have any discovery disputes to bring to the 25 Court's attention. We've been working with plaintiff along

the way.

We are planning, however, Your Honor, to also file a motion later this afternoon to excuse any personal attendance from the status coming up on February 7 as well.

THE COURT: Is there some reason why?

MS. LAPE: A combination of reasons, Your Honor.

She is employed and working that day and has some work obligations as well as issues with respect to, you know, concerns with health reasons as well. And we'll be putting the reasons for that request in the motion that we file.

THE COURT: I'm just curious because unbeknownst to me she was part of a jury pool in this courtroom for voir dire on a jury here not too long ago.

MS. LAPE: Yes, I'm familiar with that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So it's just interesting that she's not available to us.

Mr. Chack, I believe, is -- actually, listed next in the docket is FirstEnergy, Nominal Defendant FirstEnergy Corporation. What would you like to tell us at this time?

MR. GLEESON: Judge, this is John Gleason, and I'm on the phone with Susan Gittes, Debevoise & Plimpton, counsel for the litigation committee. We have nothing to report to the Court.

THE COURT: So the six months has passed and the

special litigation committee has nothing at all to offer or 1 2 give us an update at all? MR. GLEESON: Not today, no. We didn't realize 3 4 the Court was expecting that. 5 THE COURT: I'm simply asking. I know back in 6 July you asked for six months, and that obviously wasn't 7 granted. But that period has passed, and I thought we would 8 receive some update as to what the committee is doing. 9 Last I heard they were following up on this matter, so I'm curious. 10 11 MR. GLEESON: Okay. Well, it actually hasn't 12 passed. We asked in late July for a six-month period to 13 begin at the commencement of the first order granting a 14 stay. And the deny, it got denied later. 15 But still, we've worked very hard. We're heading into 16 a mediation that we hope is successful. But today, on this 17 status conference, I've got nothing to report on behalf of 18 the SLC. Thank you, Judge. 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel. 20 You asked for it in July. Let's put it that way. All 21 right. 22 Well, yeah. We'll just note that you're working 23 diligently, I take it. 24 So with regard to the next party in the case, let's

see. Who is next in line? Mr. Pearson, counsel?

25

MR. KATSIFF: Yes, Your Honor. This is Tim 1 2 Katsiff from Ballard Spahr on behalf of Mr. Pearson. And 3 also on the line with me is my colleague, Emilia McKee 4 Vassallo. 5 Your Honor, we've been working cooperatively with the 6 plaintiffs, and we don't have anything to report currently 7 with respect to discovery. 8 We will also, Your Honor, be filing a motion to 9 request that the Court excuse Mr. Pearson from attendance at 10 the status conference, as he is in Florida, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Okay. He's coming back for the 12 deposition, I take it, on February 16? 13 MR. KATSIFF: Well, Your Honor, we would like the 14 opportunity to talk to plaintiffs about that as well. When 15 we agreed to the 16th -- which he is obviously prepared to 16 be deposed on the 16th, Your Honor -- it was our 17 understanding that it was going to be in Florida. 18 But we would like to, you know, have the opportunity 19 to confer with the plaintiffs about that. 20 THE COURT: Well, let's clear it up right now. 21 Counsel for the plaintiffs, where would you prefer the 22 depositions be conducted? 23 MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Your Honor, ultimately -- this 24 is Jeroen Van Kwawegen from Bernstein Litowitz. 25 Ultimately what we really want is what is best for the

case. And that means that the deposition take place and it take place as scheduled and that there is no delay in the schedule and that we can actually do it effectively.

For the reasons that Your Honor outlined earlier today, you know, one option certainly is Your Honor's courtroom. But there are a large number of defendants, and they all present potentially individual issues.

And so if the question is, you know, will it actually happen in your courtroom or will that mean that it's going to be delayed and it's causing delay in the schedule, that is a difficult question.

So if someone has specific health concerns and they would say I can do it in Florida on that day, and you can do it in person, but I cannot travel because of X, Y, Z, because, you know, we have -- and counsel for defendant is correct. We haven't had these conversations yet.

But if there is a real reason that people cannot travel, which I cannot foresee, but if there is, I would much rather do it in Florida than have a delay in the case because I say it must be in Your Honor's courtroom.

Having said all that, I think it is very helpful to know that Your Honor's courtroom is available. And I think it should be available and used, certainly for anybody who can make it to Your Honor's courtroom. But I can't oversee that right now.

THE COURT: Let me just interject then, folks.

I think that the parties have disavowed themselves of the idea that they're never coming to court, they're never coming to Akron, and that the parties are going to be required to fly all around the country to take depositions or engage in discovery, etcetera.

The events in question in this matter, very serious, all arose, most of them, here in the Northern District of Ohio as it relates to FirstEnergy.

So you ought to suggest to your clients, in the absence of, oh, I'm positive with the virus, I'm in the hospital, or I'm sick, that they're going to need to travel.

Now, I don't know this firsthand, I suspect any number of the plaintiffs may have summer homes or winter homes and may live in Florida in the winter, live in Ohio in the summer, back and forth, travel back and forth, etcetera.

So you need to advise your clients we are going to be traveling to Akron in the absence of something extreme.

February 11th the Court's general order will expire. We will start jury trials again later this month.

We conducted trials, at least I did, from May until November, approximately ten jury trials. Jurors come to the courthouse.

Now, if jurors are going to come, average citizens are going to be able to come to the courthouse and do their duty

and help the Court proceed with trials, and a backlog of trials, these defendants as well as these plaintiffs will come to Akron.

So you better suggest to your clients, you better make sure you have travel plans made to come to Akron and be deposed. Period.

To be done effectively, there should be one central location. And the cases are based out of the Northern and Southern District of Ohio. All the ties, the allegations, etcetera, are out of Ohio.

So you better get on the phone with your client and say, look, you're going to need to be in Akron, Ohio, on this date. February 10. Or February 14. Or what have you.

And that's how we're going to proceed.

So I hope there is no -- no one has any confusion.

Back when we talked about this case, way back when, I said to you, the best way of conducting these depositions, given the sheer volume of documents that are going to be presented, maybe hundreds, maybe thousands, to do a deposition properly, it's going to need to be in person.

And this is the best location. We'll have staff available. And again, I'm repeating myself. I don't want to have to go back and read a deposition where someone objects, instructs their client not to answer, and then I'm going to have to go back and deal with that issue at a later

time after I hear arguments from counsel in writing, 1 2 etcetera. Not going to do it that way. If there is a 3 problem, I'll deal with it right then and there. 4 If any of you read the media, you know that last year 5 was a record-setting year for the Northern District in 6 criminal matters. This year is likely to be the same, if 7 not more. So we have busy dockets. 8 And so we will do the depositions here. I'll make 9 sure that we have rooms available so that anyone who wants 10 to come and attend and participate may do that. 11 Is that clear? 12 Let your clients know. 13 Now, who is next in line? Just give me a moment, 14 please. 15 Mr. Taylor, I believe is next. 16 MR. RITTS: Your Honor, this is Geoffrey Ritts. 17 I already spoke on behalf of Mr. Taylor. I represent Mr. 18 Taylor. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Reffner, counsel for Mr. Reffner. 20 MR. SCHOLES: Steve Scholes, Your Honor. 21 S-C-H-O-L-E-S. 22 We have no disputes with respect to the discovery that 23 we have served. 24 Mr. Reffner's deposition is scheduled for March 7, and

we have heard Your Honor, let me assure the Court, loudly

25

and clearly with respect to the Court's view on the 1 2 depositions. And we will certainly discuss those views with 3 our clients and conduct ourselves appropriately due to the Court's desires. 4 5 THE COURT: Counsel, I'll interject again. 6 there is any confusion, you can all come next Monday and 7 I'll tell your clients directly. They can all fly in. They 8 can all be here. I can stress to them how important this 9 case is and how they're going to be required to be here for 10 depositions. We can all do it that way. Very simple. 11 Period. 12 Counsel on behalf of the intervenor, what would you 13 like to add, please? 14 MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Your Honor, this Jeroen Van 15 Kwawegen from Bernstein Litowitz. 16 The only thing I would add is we hear you loud and 17 clear, Your Honor, and plaintiffs will be made available in 18 Akron. 19 THE COURT: Couple other questions -- anybody 20 else? Have I missed anyone, please? 21 MR. MCCAFFREY: Your Honor, John McCaffrey --22 MS. MCNALLY: Laura McNally --23 THE COURT: I'm sorry. One at a time. 24 Who spoke first, please? 25 MR. MCCAFFREY: Go ahead.

THE COURT: Mr. McCaffrey, you have something you 1 2 want to say? 3 MR. MCCAFFREY: Your Honor, good afternoon. 4 McCaffrey on behalf of Michael Dowling. I have nothing to 5 add, Your Honor, other than just point of clarification. 6 I know the courtroom is located in a federal building. 7 And are there any restrictions on hours or the ability to 8 store documents at the courthouse for depositions? 9 While we have all the parties on the line, I thought I 10 would raise that issue just to see if the Court could give 11 us some advice on that. Thank you. 12 THE COURT: We have several witness rooms off the 13 courtroom we can use effectively for depositions -- excuse 14 me, for document storage. 15 And you're from the Northern District, so what I 16 anticipate is using Judge Dowd's old courtroom for the 17 deposition. That room is vacant, I believe. 18 And if there is any issue there, then we will use my 19 courtroom if need be. 20 I'm working through a trial schedule now, so the way I 21 see it, I think I'll be able to work around these 22 depositions in my own courtroom if need be because we're 23 starting up trials on February 22, is the first one 24 tentatively being scheduled to begin.

So does that answer your question?

25

MR. MCCAFFREY: What about access to the building? The hours?

You know, I understand that, you know, there is entry into the building, out of the building. Sometimes depositions can go on.

THE COURT: Normal business hours. I think the CSO's leave at potentially 5:00 or 6:00. So we have a full compliment of court security officers here.

We're not the only agency in the building. I believe there is others in the building, certainly from the U.S. Attorney's Office, certainly from Social Security. There is — the building is open. We're not closed down formally. We've just taken certain steps with regard to safety protocols, etcetera. Masks are required, etcetera. The courtroom has plexiglass so that there is safety protocols in that regard.

So turning to -- I'm sorry. One other counsel wanted to make a comment, please, before I called on Mr. McCaffrey?

MS. MCNALLY: This is Laura McNally, counsel for Defendant Dennis Chack, and I have nothing further to add other than what's already been said. And I hear you loud and clear on the location of the depositions.

THE COURT: Thank you.

With regard to other matters, I just reviewed the protocol you submitted to the Court here. I think it was

filed on the 27th, the privilege log supplement, the joint protocol.

I have a question regarding page 5, the very last provisions here, about — the provision that states, "Provided, however, FirstEnergy shall not be required to individually log privileged advice or work product regarding irrelevant PUCO proceedings, irrelevant issues involving FirstEnergy subsidiaries or affiliates, or the FES bankruptcy."

Can you just tell me what is contemplated by that provision? Having read the third prosecution agreement, it seems like there is a great deal in this agreement related to at least FES and perhaps others.

MS. MCDONALD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Ann McDonald of Schiff Hardin, counsel for Nominal Defendant FirstEnergy.

We've been serving a role as facilitating discovery in this matter, Your Honor. I can speak to Your Honor's question on that point.

That sentence you noted was not intended to exclude any information related to the DPA, but because of the broad nature of plaintiff's requests, certain documents in the case call into and bring into the scope of potential production unrelated issues in front of the PUCO or involving the FES bankruptcy, mentioning entities that might

also be mentioned in the DPA but not at all relating to the subject matter of it or the underlying conduct at issue here.

So if there was, for example, a totally unrelated 2016 filing on a particular rate issue that's not at all mentioned in the DPA, that provision is just noting that those irrelevant materials can be treated differently.

THE COURT: And who determines what's irrelevant, not irrelevant?

MS. MCDONALD: We have been in very close contact, Your Honor, with plaintiffs. And the parties have agreed to take a broad interpretation of what's relevant.

To the extent it goes to conduct that's referenced in the DPA, the underlying issues with H.B. 6 and anything related to it, you know, we've been treating that as relevant and have been coordinating closely.

When we've come across documents we don't think are relevant, we'll discuss those with plaintiffs and confirm the parties are on the same page.

THE COURT: All right. Any other issues regarding that matter that you would like me to touch upon here?

MS. MCDONALD: No, Your Honor. We appreciate your concern you've shown of the protocol and would appreciate if it could be entered to facilitate FirstEnergy

providing the privilege log materials to the plaintiff as soon as possible. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Counsel for the plaintiff, has there been any -- I shouldn't even ask about settlement discussion because I've already indicated to you I don't know how you could possibly settle this case at this stage of the proceedings without further discovery or certainly detailed discovery.

But why don't you tell me what you contemplate by way damages just so I'm aware. How are you going to go about calculating, if you were to prevail, and what arguments are you going to make regarding damages in the case?

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

And by way of reference for the Court, under Your Honor's rules, we made a settlement demand as required by Your Honor's rules back in October of last year.

And we indicated various what I would call sources of damages and sources of harm in that settlement demand. I'm happy to go over those.

But clearly when we are thinking about this case, the harm that was caused by the defendants by breaching their fiduciary duties to the company — because remember, we are obviously trying to recover damages that were incurred by the company because of the breach of the fiduciary duty by

the senior executive officers, former senior executive officers and directors -- there are a number of categories of damages in there.

That includes, for example, the fine that was paid in connection with the DPA. It also includes the money that was expended, FirstEnergy money that was used to pay in this pay to play scheme. That was approximately \$60 million plus approximately \$4.3 million to Mr. Randazzo.

And it also includes a number of sources of harm that have not fully crystallized yet, and that would cause me to create an estimate.

As Your Honor is aware, there is a related securities class action pending where the class is claiming damages due to a stock drop when the underlying conduct was revealed.

And that class case is still at the motion to dismiss stage.

Chief Judge Marbley has not ruled on the pending motion to dismiss just yet.

But, of course, we believe that the harm caused by, or at least the damages caused and recovered in that case were also attributable to the misconduct here.

So that's a long way of saying there are a number of different sources of damages caused by the misconduct and the breach of the fiduciary duty here.

I don't have a hard number because of some of the estimates that it would require me to make.

I hope that answers Your Honor's question, but I'm happy to give more background or detail if Your Honor would like.

THE COURT: No. That's fine.

Are you going to seek disgorgement of profits? Again, subject to, obviously it's a matter of proof, and if your allegations carry out the day, you're going to be apportioning liability among the various defendants, seek disgorgement of any profits or gains made by this alleged misconduct?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Yes, Your Honor. Obviously that is on the table. We proceed through trial. The jury finds that breach and misconduct has been proven, disgorgement is certainly on the table with respect to each defendant where the jury would find that those breaches of duty occurred. And then there would be an apportionment.

But yes, absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you doing discovery regarding that issue?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: The answer to that is yes, Your Honor. And, you know, there are two issues there, right.

One is the merits discovery to determine which defendant did what. And, you know, not that we are now, as plaintiffs, make a determination because that would not be

for us, that would be for the Court, of relative fault, but clearly the merits discovery bears on that question.

And the second thing is we are pursuing discovery with respect to the defendants' net worth. That is one of the open issues yet to be resolved because there is some case law that makes it not self-evident to get that discovery prior to trial and prior to a finding of liability. But that is something that we are still working through with defendants because we believe that this is a unique situation.

If we cannot resolve that -- and I think we have a strong legal basis for pursuing it -- I will bring it to Your Honor's attention, of course. But that is one of the issues that we have not resolved yet because of the uncertainty surrounding that.

THE COURT: Doesn't that make settlement somewhat difficult as well?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: Not really, Your Honor.

Obviously I don't want to get too much into the detail there because, A, there may not be a settlement. And I don't want to disclose our strategies or thinking as we are pursuing discovery and as we are preparing for trial.

And B, you know, the mediation may or may not be successful, and that would be a negotiation. And it would not be very helpful for me to express my views in detail

there either.

But to put a finer point on it, we know from the public record a fair amount of how much the various defendants received from FirstEnergy as they were serving their different roles at FirstEnergy. And I believe that that's a very good first start because they were remunerated by the company, as we allege — that's not been proven yet — but as we allege, breached their fiduciary duty to the company.

THE COURT: Stock sales, things of that nature?

MR. VAN KWAWEGEN: That's correct, Your Honor.

Stock options, executive compensation, things of that
nature.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else wish to make any presentation to the Court?

All right. My career law clerk is Jonathan little. He'll be your facilitator, if need be, regarding depositions and location, etcetera. And we'll continue to work with our clerk's office, make sure everything is organized.

So please give us information regarding, starting -- the first is on the 10th. So give us the details regarding who is going to be appearing and so that we can make sure we know how many individuals will be in the courthouse and what we can do to make your stay more comfortable and provide you whatever assistance you might

need.

In terms of court reporters, etcetera, I don't know whether our -- one of our official court reporters are -- I guess they're not permitted to assist. So that is off the table. So make sure you have court reporters available, etcetera.

And if need be, we'll try to make copiers available. Hopefully you'll bring enough copies for everyone who intends to appear. All those housekeeping matters you can work out among yourselves.

And I'll let you know by next Monday, unless -- anyone else have any objection to any other matter we addressed here today?

All right. Having heard nothing from anyone, I appreciate it. Everyone stay safe and enjoy the weekend. Hopefully you're not here in the snow and the cold.

So we'll look forward to seeing you in the not too distant future. Take care.

(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)

## CERTIFICATE

I certify that the forgoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

S/Caroline Mahnke 1/28/2022

Caroline Mahnke, RMR, CRR, CRC Date