

15BMMUNC

1
1
2
2
3
3
4
4
5
5
6
6
7
7
8
8
9
9
10
10
11
11
12
12
13
13
14
14
15
15
16
16
17
17
18
18
19
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x
IN RE MUNICIPAL DERIVATIVES
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

08 Civ. 2516 (VM)(GWG)

-----x

New York, N.Y.
May 11, 2011
11:15 a.m.

Before:

HON. GABRIEL W. GORENSTEIN,

Magistrate Judge

APPEARANCES

HAUSFELD LLP
Attorneys for Direct Class Plaintiffs
BY: MICHAEL D. HAUSFELD
MEGAN E. JONES

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiffs City of Oakland, et al.
BY: JOSEPH R. SAVERI

KING & SPALDING
Attorneys for Defendant Bank of America
BY: KEVIN R. SULLIVAN
SHANNON M. KASLEY

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN, Attorney General of
the State of New York
Department of Law
Attorney for Intervenor
BY: ELINOR R. HOFFMANN

15BMMUNC

1 (Case called)

2 THE COURT: We are here based upon a number of letters
3 that I asked, I guess four dated May 3 and another four dated
4 May 9.

5 Well, I'm in a little bit of a difficult situation
6 because Judge Marrero has not indicated in any great detail the
7 substance of what he expects would be included in the class
8 notice. He has issued an order, certainly, on the topic, the
9 March 1 order, and there is some words that everyone is trying
10 to parse there. And I think they provide some guidance but not
11 perhaps 100 percent guidance as to what is relevant here in
12 terms of the plaintiff's requests for discovery.

13 So I think what I want to try to do as a model is the
14 following. I don't know if it's going to work, but I'd like to
15 try it. And the model is that if there is some piece of
16 information or discovery that's not burdensome and that can be
17 supplied on a reasonable time frame, I'd like the plaintiffs to
18 get it, and then we can postpone the argument about its
19 relevance to the presentations that will be made to Judge
20 Marrero.

21 I guess my main point that I'd like Bank of America
22 and the Attorney General to keep in mind is that the mere fact
23 that the plaintiffs get some piece of information does not, by
24 any means, mean that I think it's something that should be
25 included in the class notice. For all we know, the class

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 notice, just as is written out, will be satisfactory to Judge
2 Marrero the way the defendants wrote it. I don't know. But
3 certainly any rulings that I make. Let's say that the
4 plaintiff should get some piece of information, assuming I make
5 such rulings, has no bearing on that question.

6 And I guess at the end of it we should probably set
7 the deadline for when the presentations are going to be made to
8 Judge Marrero, because right now I don't know that there are
9 any such deadlines. I don't even think he has put in a
10 deadline.

11 So with that in mind, I think what I'd like to do is
12 go through the categories of information. And if it's
13 something that Bank of America has, I would certainly turn to
14 them first. And then if it's something that only the Attorney
15 General has, then I will turn to the Attorney General's office.

16 I think I have worked off the letter from Ms. Jones of
17 May 3 for purposes of figuring out the categories, and I'm
18 limiting myself to what's identified as A through E in the
19 first paragraph of that letter, so I think I'd like to go
20 through that. I think that's the universe. I notice the word
21 inter alia is used. That's not very helpful. I am going to go
22 through those. And if for some reason the plaintiffs think
23 there is something else, I guess I would be willing to hear
24 from them on that point.

25 On question 1, to whom the state agreement is being

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 mailed, again, my ground rule here for the moment is, I don't
2 want to hear about relevance. I just want to hear about burden
3 and timeliness.

4 So limited to that question, I'll turn to Bank of
5 America because I know they offered some things and they said
6 they had some things, or maybe I should turn to plaintiff first
7 to see what they are missing.

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, Kevin Sullivan. I'm happy
9 to go through it and tell you what we have given them, and then
10 they can say if they don't have it or not. But it's up to you.

11 THE COURT: Go ahead.

12 MR. SULLIVAN: In terms of to whom the notice of state
13 agreement is going to be mailed, it is defined --

14 THE COURT: Are you repeating things, if I might ask,
15 that are in your letter? If you are, it might be better for
16 plaintiffs to say why it was inadequate. If this is something
17 completely new to them, go ahead.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: This is information we have identified
19 in our letters.

20 THE COURT: Then let's hear from them as to why it's
21 unsatisfactory.

22 I'll now turn to plaintiffs. They provided certain
23 information in their letters. Tell me what more you need or
24 why it's not satisfactory. Or maybe it's fine. I don't know.

25 People should remain seated because people are on the

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 telephone, and we need to be close to the microphones.

2 MR. HAUSFELD: This is Mr. Hausfeld, your Honor. The
3 description made by Bank of America is by category as opposed
4 to by identification of entity.

5 THE COURT: Do you want a list of the entities?

6 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes. And we would need an
7 identification of the definition of a covered derivative so we
8 have the identification of the products that are being covered
9 in terms of the entities that are being addressed.

10 THE COURT: List of entities and identification of the
11 particular product.

12 Talk to me about burden on that.

13 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, they have every entity that
14 comprises the universe of who is going to get the notice
15 because they have the same damage data that the AGs have.

16 In addition, they have --

17 THE COURT: Mr. Sullivan, if I'm speaking, it's really
18 important that you listen to me. You interrupted me once. If
19 I have got something in my mind, if you don't satisfy me, we
20 are never getting out of here.

21 Normally, in discovery disputes when people say they
22 already have it, I say, sorry, produce it again. Tell me what
23 the problem is with giving them the list of entities.

24 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, there is no problem with
25 giving them another set of the same database that they have,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 that have some of the entities in it.

2 In addition, we have agreed to give them a specific
3 list of addresses for counter parties that we have. And they
4 asked us for that information in connection with the Morgan
5 Stanley settlement. We said we would produce it based upon on
6 what they wanted it for. They then said they may want it for
7 other purposes. We are happy to produce it to them as long as
8 we know what they want to use it for.

9 The only thing we don't want them to use it for is to
10 go out and make separate contact with the eligible counter
11 parties before this process is over.

12 THE COURT: It sounds like you're willing to give them
13 the lists of entities. And what about the identification of
14 the product?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: The identification of the product is in
16 the database they have. We can give them the list of the
17 entities with the trade number. They can run that against the
18 database they have and figure out exactly what product that
19 entity traded with that, and they will have all the
20 information.

21 THE COURT: Does that make sense to you on this side?

22 MR. HAUSFELD: Not really, your Honor. The proposed
23 settlement agreement covers -- includes covered derivatives
24 with no definition of what a covered derivative is so that a
25 participating entity, all of whom would also be members of the

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 class, would not know which derivatives are being included
2 within the proposed settlement.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, the covered derivatives are
4 defined in the agreement with the AG as agreements that are
5 covered by what's called attachment A. Attachment A then
6 provides more information about what those covered derivatives
7 are. The eligible counter party that received the notice will
8 get a specific amount, will be told exactly how much money they
9 are eligible to receive. The plaintiffs will know who those
10 counter parties are because we would have told them. They will
11 know --

12 THE COURT: Told them when?

13 MR. SULLIVAN: They have the full list now. We will
14 give them the addresses which has the specific list from 1998
15 to 2003 that Bank of America considers the group. The Attorney
16 General will make the final decision as to who actually gets
17 the notice, not Bank of America. So if there is information
18 that the Attorney General needs to give, they can ask them.
19 But they will have the list of the eligible counter parties and
20 their addresses and they will have all of the information about
21 the trades that they did.

22 MR. HAUSFELD: Sounds to me, your Honor, as if the
23 Attorney General should be providing that information. For
24 example, in attachment A to which Mr. Sullivan refers,
25 municipal derivatives is defined as municipal derivatives that

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 are purchased by a particular entity. That's not a sufficient
2 definition to understand what type of municipal derivative --

3 THE COURT: You know for each particular entity what
4 derivative?

5 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

6 THE COURT: Do you have that or only the Attorney
7 General has that?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: The Attorney General makes the final
9 decision as to who gets this notice.

10 THE COURT: Has that decision been made yet?

11 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, that decision has not been
12 made with finality yet. We are still addressing the criteria
13 in the agreement.

14 I do want to point out that the notice also defines
15 the covered derivative, and the information upon which we base
16 our list of addressees database is the same database that I
17 believe plaintiffs have. We do not have a definite list of the
18 addressees yet.

19 THE COURT: When are you going to have it?

20 MS. HOFFMANN: We are hoping soon.

21 THE COURT: Meaning tomorrow or a month from now?

22 MS. HOFFMANN: I hope within a week from now, but I
23 don't know for sure.

24 THE COURT: Can you provide it to them in a week from
25 now? Can you do it?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, our position is that we are
2 not subject to discovery at all. Whether we do that, I would
3 have to take that up with my group, because to some extent it's
4 a policy decision within each person's office. But I would be
5 concerned about --

6 THE COURT: Are you not going to be providing it to
7 Bank of America?

8 MS. HOFFMANN: Yes. Bank of America will --

9 THE COURT: They could provide it, if that makes you
10 feel better.

11 MS. HOFFMANN: I would be concerned, as Mr. Sullivan
12 was, about the purpose for which these addresses are going to
13 be used.

14 THE COURT: That I could limit through an order saying
15 they can only be used for purposes of making a proposal as to
16 the content of the class notice, be limited to those two.

17 I assume you couldn't object to that, right?

18 MR. HAUSFELD: We would probably agree to it, your
19 Honor.

20 THE COURT: It sounds like you are going to have this
21 in a week to Bank of America to turn it over to plaintiffs.

22 MS. HOFFMANN: We hope to. We are talking with Bank
23 of America. There are some deals that we can't match to make
24 sure they correctly belong in the group, and we are working
25 through that.

15BMMUNC

1 THE COURT: I don't want to rush you because you folks
2 are the ones with the greatest incentive to move this along.

3 MS. HOFFMANN: We are trying to move it along as
4 quickly as possible. We are working diligently to do that. I
5 think Bank of America has been diligent also in working with us
6 on that issue, and we are trying to finalize the list. Again,
7 I'm not in a position to agree to produce it.

8 THE COURT: I'm not asking you to agree. I'm just
9 asking when you are going to be giving it to Bank of America.

10 MS. HOFFMANN: Again, I'm hopeful it will be done in
11 the next week. It has taken longer than we expected.

12 THE COURT: Is this going to include the
13 identification of the product that we have been talking about?

14 MS. HOFFMANN: Our list will not include the precise
15 identification of the product, I don't believe. I have to go
16 back and check. But I think that can be easily determined from
17 the trade numbers associated with them.

18 THE COURT: So is this going to do it?

19 MR. HAUSFELD: It's difficult to say, your Honor,
20 because we also need the allocation formula in order --

21 THE COURT: I haven't gotten to that yet. Is it
22 related?

23 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

24 THE COURT: Go ahead.

25 MR. HAUSFELD: In the complaint that was filed by the
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 class plaintiffs, there is a definition of covered derivatives
2 and there are seven types of derivative products. In general
3 discussions with the bank it's been their position that there
4 were overcharges on some but not all of those derivative
5 products. We would need to know how the bank and the states
6 reached agreement as to which derivative products they were
7 making restitution on to be able to advise our clients and for
8 potential putative class members to understand which derivative
9 products they purchased. They were receiving restitution, yet
10 were being required to give releases on all derivative
11 products.

12 THE COURT: It seems to me, unless I'm
13 misunderstanding you, that what a particular party needs,
14 perhaps, is the amount of money that they are getting. It
15 covers -- they are going to give up a claim against any
16 possible product they have with respect to Bank of America,
17 right?

18 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes. But that's the problem. There
19 are seven different products that could have been purchased.
20 The payment may only go to one or two.

21 THE COURT: But surely the party knows what product it
22 has, or doesn't it?

23 MR. HAUSFELD: It will know what products it
24 purchased. It will not know what products the restitution is
25 being made on and what products for which there is no

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 restitution.

2 THE COURT: That's what I don't understand. What does
3 it matter? They are getting the sum of \$100,000. If they
4 purchased four of the seven products and whether their formula
5 discounted one particular product as zero or get paid three
6 cents on the dollar for another one, what does it matter? They
7 know what they are getting to cover everything.

8 MR. HAUSFELD: It matters because of the mix of
9 products that purchases may be more weighted for those products
10 for which they are not getting any restitution. And the
11 participating entity may wish not to release all its claims and
12 to pursue those claims because it had larger purchases in the
13 nonrestituted products.

14 THE COURT: You still lost me. Because they have to
15 give up all the claims, regardless. They have to give up their
16 claims on everything, regardless.

17 MR. HAUSFELD: That's a choice that they need to make.
18 And in making that choice, if in fact they have greater
19 purchases in products for which they are receiving no
20 restitution, they may decide that it's not worth it to take two
21 cents on 2 percent of their sales when they have, you know,
22 maybe dollars on 98 percent of their sales.

23 THE COURT: Let me try it one more time. I bought
24 seven products, A through G. I'm being given \$100 to
25 extinguish my claims against Bank of America. What does it

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 matter if in Bank of America or in the Attorney General's mind
2 \$98 is being allocated to product F? You come back when I ask
3 you that question and you say, well, it might matter because
4 they feel that product A, in fact, is worth a whole lot of
5 money and they are only being paid 50 cents on product A. I
6 keep saying to you, they are giving up their claim for A
7 through G for \$100. And if they think product A is worth a
8 thousand dollars, then they won't do it.

9 MR. HAUSFELD: There is not ability of a potential
10 claimant to make that assessment, your Honor, given the fact
11 that all they are talking about in the notice and in the
12 settlement is an aggregate of derivative products. If I only
13 bought one of product A, but 99 of products B through Z, and
14 I'm getting \$2 for product A, I may not want to opt into a
15 settlement where the greater portion of my purchases deal with
16 a product for which I'm not receiving any allocated
17 restitution.

18 THE COURT: I feel we are having the same conversation
19 literally three times. Can anybody help us here? Am I missing
20 something?

21 MR. SULLIVAN: You've stated it exactly correctly.
22 The notice gives them a specific amount they are entitled to.
23 They know what transactions they have done with Bank of
24 America. The notice tells them that others, including the
25 class plaintiffs here or the Oakland plaintiffs, feel they can

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 get them more, and they were -- also, they might end up getting
2 less. They have the information from which they can then make
3 a judgment. If they have a question, if they have options,
4 they can call the Attorney General in their state if it's one
5 of the working group members, they can consult --

6 THE COURT: You're straying. I don't want you to
7 stray.

8 MR. SULLIVAN: They have options. They have the basic
9 information. They know what transactions they have entered
10 with Bank of America. And they know what they would have to
11 release. Whether they have done five or ten or one transaction
12 with Bank of America, they can -- they have enough information
13 to make a reasoned judgment as to whether this makes sense to
14 them. And if it doesn't make sense to them or they are
15 confused and do nothing, they lose no rights. They don't give
16 up their claim.

17 THE COURT: Again, we are getting outside the areas.
18 I know all this. I'm still in exactly where I were before.
19 Nothing you said, unfortunately, Mr. Hausfeld, has explained
20 the relevance of this.

21 As an aside, I know I said I wasn't going into
22 relevance, but for some of these I think I am going to because
23 I have to understand in order to even allow discovery on it.

24 Did someone else have an idea?

25 MR. HAUSFELD: Can I try this, your Honor. If the
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 list is being composed of those entities which purchased
2 covered products, and notice is being sent to those who are
3 deemed qualified by the state AGs, based on purchases that the
4 state AGs are connecting with regard to this settlement, that
5 information is readily available. And if that information is
6 not only possessed by the states but is the nexus for the
7 states sending out not only the notice but the amount, it would
8 seem not burdensome to provide us with the same information
9 which provided the basis for the state's decision as to who
10 gets the notice and what amount of money they are getting,
11 based on the transactions that the state believes are covered.

12 THE COURT: I am not sure I followed what you just
13 said. Try it again. What is it you want? We already talked
14 about your getting a list of entities and the products when
15 they have finished doing this task. Are the amounts included,
16 too?

17 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, in the list --

18 THE COURT: They can derive the amounts?

19 MS. HOFFMANN: In the notice -- the notice will
20 clearly state the amount to which each entity is entitled to.

21 THE COURT: I think they are looking for -- are you
22 looking for the amount in advance, or not necessarily?

23 MR. HAUSFELD: My understanding is, the notices will
24 contain an amount in advance.

25 THE COURT: I know the notice will have an amount.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 I'm talking about whether you in discovery are looking for the
2 amount for each particular entity.

3 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

4 THE COURT: And was that part of what we had
5 previously agreed you were going to be giving to Bank of
6 America and Bank of America was going to be giving to
7 plaintiff?

8 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, we were not planning to do
9 that, no.

10 THE COURT: Our discussion had been the list of
11 entities and some number that would allow them to derive the
12 products that were involved.

13 MS. HOFFMANN: That's right. There has been reference
14 to the transactions.

15 THE COURT: When I then turn to you and said, what
16 more are you looking for, you started talking about allocation.
17 We started going down the road where I said the same thing five
18 times and you said the same thing five times, we made no
19 progress. I am not sure where we are right now.

20 MR. HAUSFELD: We would like to be in the same
21 position that the state AGs are in in terms of understanding
22 not only who gets the notice, but what transactions prompted
23 the state AG not only to send the notice to that entity, but
24 the amount that the state AGs ascribing to that entity, and
25 then the products that were purchased by that entity that the

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 state AGs have determined are eligible for restitution.

2 THE COURT: Again, you still have not persuaded me
3 even as to relevance to this. I don't know if you want another
4 shot at it, but I feel like we have done this a bunch of times.
5 If you have nothing more to add, tell me and we will go on.

6 MR. HAUSFELD: If I could try it this way. I am not
7 sure it's adding, but hopefully clarifying. We would like to
8 be in the same position as the state AGs are in with respect to
9 the knowledge as to not only who is being solicited to opt in,
10 but why they are being solicited to opt in, and the basis for
11 the decision by the state AGs as to which products the state AG
12 is allocating a restitution and the amount. All of that
13 information --

14 THE COURT: I guess my response to that is, I need to
15 know why that is going to enable you to make comments or
16 propose language in the class notice that you wouldn't have
17 otherwise been able to do?

18 MR. HAUSFELD: Because with respect --

19 THE COURT: And if the answer is, you want to judge
20 whether they did a good job of coming up with the amount of
21 money, that's going to be a very tough road for you to hoe. I
22 don't know that that's something that you're entitled to know.

23 MR. HAUSFELD: Despite the absence presently of the
24 reference to detailed findings and conclusions by the Court in
25 a separate opinion, the Court expressed three essential

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 concerns.

2 THE COURT: You're talking about Judge Marrero?

3 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

4 THE COURT: Go ahead. Unfortunately, the one thing I
5 didn't bring was the most important thing, which was the letter
6 that had all the documents attached to it. But I happen to
7 have a copy of the --

8 MR. HAUSFELD: He identified as page 3 three essential
9 concerns about this process. And just before the paragraph
10 that's labeled ordered, he identified that it was necessary to
11 protect the interests of the putative class members, to protect
12 the Court's jurisdiction, and to preserve the Court's ability
13 to render meaningful relief on the claims before it.

14 Clearly, the information we requested is extremely
15 relevant to that last of the Court's concerns because what
16 relief may be obtained now will clearly affect the relief that
17 the Court can render to the rest of the class under the
18 remainder of the claims because this is a matter involving
19 joint and several liability, at a minimum.

20 THE COURT: But if I'm an entity and I'm deciding
21 whether to opt into this or not, what I need to know is how
22 much I am getting, and then make a judgment about whether I can
23 do better in the class action.

24 MR. HAUSFELD: That would only be, your Honor, if
25 you're getting either something for everything. But if you're

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 getting something for less than everything that you did,
2 another aspect of what you would need to decide is what it was
3 that you purchased and whether or not you think that what
4 you're getting is sufficient to release your claim for
5 everything when the greater portion of what you purchased may
6 not be compensated for at all.

7 THE COURT: I'm getting a single number to cover
8 everything. This is the same thing we did five times. I don't
9 know if I want to do it six times.

10 MR. HAUSFELD: I don't disagree with your Honor's
11 present position, but it's a position in a class that occurs
12 inherently when there is a number of items that are purchased.
13 If I purchase ten different items and I purchase item one only
14 once, but I purchase the other nine a thousand times, it may
15 not be worth it to me to take a settlement as a single sum for
16 all the purchases if all I'm getting is a penny on the one item
17 that I bought. If, however, it may be, your Honor, that it's a
18 penny for all ten items, then I could understand that my claim
19 may not be worth that much in the aggregate.

20 THE COURT: What do you care what's going on in the
21 mind of a person who is offering you? If they are offering you
22 \$100, what does it matter if in their mind the hundred is
23 allocated all to item A or all to item G? What does that
24 matter? You are giving up A through G, regardless.

25 MR. HAUSFELD: Because it may make a difference to me

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 if I have greater purchases in the items for which I'm not
2 being offered any restitution, and I may decide that I want to
3 pursue my claims for those products.

4 THE COURT: We have now done it seven times. That's
5 it. We are done. I keep saying the same thing and your answer
6 just doesn't make any sense to me, Mr. Hausfeld. I know you
7 are trying to explain it to me. I know you are doing a
8 good-faith effort. But you have not persuaded me that this
9 even meets the relevance standard that I would need to require
10 production of information on it.

11 We need to go on to another category. You are going
12 to have your opportunity, presumably before Judge Marrero when
13 you write a letter saying that I have denied you this thing.
14 If he disagrees with me, maybe he will send it back.

15 Let's go on.

16 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

17 The next area, though --

18 THE COURT: We may have covered other things.

19 MR. HAUSFELD: I was about to get exactly to the next
20 area. The allocation formula is something that we would want
21 to know.

22 THE COURT: This is the same issue, in my mind, right?
23 This is the same principle that is at issue.

24 MR. HAUSFELD: It's without the detail. It's the
25 overview. What formula was used to make the allocation on an

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 individual entity.

2 THE COURT: As between particular entities.

3 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

4 THE COURT: As opposed to how we came up with the 65
5 million, which is what more of our discussion was going to and
6 why I should or should not accept my piece of the 65 million.
7 This is the question of -- how many potential opt-ins are
8 there, approximately? 5,000, 50,000?

9 MR. SULLIVAN: I can give a guesstimate of that.
10 There were approximately -- just one second. There are well
11 over 3,000 trades in the entire damage database. The number of
12 counter parties in the '98 to 2003 time period would be a
13 subset of that, so it's a significant number.

14 THE COURT: Let's pretend it's 4,000. So what you're
15 asking, of the 65 million, how did they pick a number for each
16 of those 4,000 people?

17 MR. HAUSFELD: What formula, if any, was used to
18 derive the amount that each would get?

19 THE COURT: Unfortunately, I need to pose the same
20 question to you, which is to say, I, as an entity, am going to
21 learn that my share is \$100,000. Why will it matter to me
22 whether the municipality next door got 50,000 or 150,000, or
23 whatever it might be?

24 MR. HAUSFELD: If there is no rational basis for it,
25 you may decide that this is nothing that you want to accept.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 It is a standard requirement in any settlement of collective
2 claims, multiple claims dealing with the same wrong that class
3 plaintiffs always identified to the Court and to the class.
4 And here there is no difference between soliciting opt-ins or
5 sending out a notice to a class where they can opt out if they
6 choose not to participate. You need to include the formula of
7 allocation so everyone understands that you weren't treated
8 disparately from someone else in the same position.

9 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, may I address that?

10 The first thing I'd like to say is that we believe
11 that the notice as drafted provides a description of the
12 allocation formula that's consistent with notices that we
13 reviewed even in class actions, even ones that Mr. Hausfeld set
14 out. We believe that's already provided.

15 THE COURT: Just remind me what paragraph that's in.

16 MS. HOFFMANN: Yes. If the Court has a copy of our
17 question and answer packet, our proposed question and answer
18 packet.

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 MS. HOFFMANN: It's the answer to question 12, I
21 believe.

22 THE COURT: Famous independent expert economist.
23 Okay. Go ahead.

24 MS. HOFFMANN: We believe that's addressed. If the
25 Court believes that it should be addressed to a greater extent,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 we will certainly consider language that's more fulsome,
2 subject to not revealing any confidential information or
3 economic analysis that we need that's essentially our work
4 product.

5 Your Honor, I also want to, if I can, draw a
6 distinction between this settlement and class settlements. Our
7 settlement is a settlement among sovereign states and the Bank
8 of America. We have chosen to make the settlement fund
9 available for claims of restitution from injured parties. We
10 thought that was important thing to do. Our settlement is not
11 a Rule 23 settlement and it's not subject, our position is, to
12 any sort of a fairness inquiry.

13 THE COURT: I know all that. I think you are also in
14 a situation where Judge Marrero has already decided that there
15 is not going to be a fairness inquiry and that all that's going
16 to happen is that there is going to be an opportunity for the
17 plaintiffs to propose changes, additions to the notice, and
18 that Judge Marrero is reserving the right to approve that
19 notice. I understand that.

20 But I guess it would be worth somewhat addressing the
21 question of why for purposes of Judge Marrero approving that
22 notice he might not want the option of requiring that the
23 particular opt-ins understand how their share was calculated as
24 opposed to being just told, don't worry, we have some economist
25 that did it.

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

15BMMUNC

1 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, we certainly would be
2 amenable to making the language better.

3 THE COURT: It's not a language problem. It's a
4 substance problem.

5 MS. HOFFMANN: Or adding more substance to the
6 description.

7 THE COURT: Are you willing to add a substance to the
8 allocation formula? What kind of substance are you talking
9 about?

10 MS. HOFFMANN: We could add more detail to the
11 description, perhaps. I would like to talk to my colleagues.
12 But what I don't think is necessary is discovery.

13 THE COURT: Let's talk about what the form of that
14 discovery is. I'm not asking you to agree to anything or to
15 admit that you're subject to the Court's jurisdiction.

16 But going back to my first principle, when I walked in
17 here, assuming I found that this has enough relevance for me to
18 require discovery, what is the problem from your point of view
19 with providing the actual analysis that is leading to the
20 allocation formula?

21 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, that analysis includes some
22 work product and economic analysis that we are applying
23 elsewhere in our investigation, and we would not want to reveal
24 that.

25 THE COURT: Because you feel that there would be what?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 MS. HOFFMANN: We believe that it would be damaging to
2 our investigation and to our ability to negotiate effectively
3 with other participants in the industry that we are
4 investigating.

5 THE COURT: And that would be because if they found
6 out the formula, what would happen?

7 MS. HOFFMANN: Well, there are elements in the formula
8 that relate to the economic analysis that our economists are
9 using to calculate damages, overcharges on particular type of
10 instances.

11 THE COURT: I couldn't follow that at all. What is
12 going to be the harm if other people learned about this
13 formula? I should add, I don't know that they would ever have
14 to since I could make this a confidential production. I still
15 don't understand what the harm is.

16 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, my recollection of the
17 allocation formula is complex. It includes elements of the way
18 the economists looked at particular instruments and determined
19 overcharges. And I don't think it would be appropriate to
20 reveal that at this stage in our investigation.

21 THE COURT: That's a little conclusory, so I don't
22 know that it's going to carry much weight.

23 MS. HOFFMANN: Again, we are willing to look at our
24 language in the notice and determine if we can make that more
25 detailed to provide greater insight into the allocation

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 formula.

2 THE COURT: If we were to order production, what is
3 the format of which this is in right now? Is there some report
4 that identifies the allocation formula?

5 MS. HOFFMANN: No, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: What is there?

7 MS. HOFFMANN: There is really nothing except
8 exchanges among us and our economist regarding work product.

9 THE COURT: There is no report or paper or discussion
10 of what formula should be used?

11 MS. HOFFMANN: I don't think there is anything that I
12 would call a report, no.

13 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, may I?

14 THE COURT: Sure.

15 MR. SAVERI: This is Joe Saveri from Lieff Cabraser.

16 It would seem to me that if there is nothing written
17 down and it's all in the heads --

18 THE COURT: She didn't say that. She said it's in the
19 form of e-mails.

20 MR. SAVERI: To the extent there is a writing, it
21 would seem to me that there is some description. It doesn't
22 have to be the arithmetic, but it could be some kind of
23 description about how you value certain claims, how you
24 distinguish certain claims, and how the \$67 million is going to
25 be allocated between different types of people, potential

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 opt-outs or opt-ins. If that information exists, I haven't
2 really heard much about why it would be burdensome to produce
3 that.

4 THE COURT: It's not burdensome. There is another
5 point which I accept as part of the burden, which is that there
6 is some confidentiality work product.

7 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, with respect to that, it
8 seems to me that there are mechanisms that we could adopt to
9 specifically allay those concerns. At this point we are
10 talking about access to the information. We are not talking
11 about whether the information that there is a confidentiality
12 concern about would be put in the notice.

13 THE COURT: Let's pretend you get the formula,
14 hypothetically. What do you then do with it in terms of making
15 a proposal to Judge Marrero regarding --

16 MR. SAVERI: Now we are talking about the relevance of
17 the material. We are not talking about the burden. But --

18 THE COURT: I haven't yet decided all this.

19 MR. SAVERI: I understand. Your question is what will
20 we do with the information. And what we do with the
21 information is we would look at it. And with respect to the
22 notice, we would ask or make sure that to the extent that the
23 notice describes what the individual recipient of the notice's
24 share would be, whether that's fairly and accurately described.

25 I mean, your Honor, if the notice just says, you are
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 going to get \$100,000, that would be the lump sum and I
2 understand that maybe that would be enlightening because the
3 recipient knows how much they bought, and this is how much they
4 are getting. But, I mean, my experience in having done a
5 number of these cases is that one of the questions that someone
6 will ask when they are trying to make an informed decision
7 about whether to accept that or not is how is that calculated?
8 What was the math? I think that's --

9 THE COURT: Now we are going back to the same problem.
10 That's why I am shaking my head.

11 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, I think to the extent there
12 is a plan of allocation and it provides a basis for a
13 description of how an individual share was calculated either by
14 type, by some general description, that's information that we
15 would say needs to be accurately described in adequate detail.
16 It is simply not enough, we would argue, to say, there is a
17 plan of allocation, your claim has been calculated pursuant to
18 a plan of allocation, and that information is useful to
19 determine for any individual recipient of the notice whether to
20 opt in and accept it or not. They are going to ask that
21 question.

22 MR. HAUSFELD: Your Honor, if I may, as pointed out by
23 counsel for the Attorney General, there is a specific question
24 in the notice packet that starts off in the heading, how was my
25 share calculated? So, obviously, that is a question that they

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 anticipate is important to being answered. And the answer
2 starts with: Your share was based on a formula. What we are
3 asking for is the formula.

4 THE COURT: I understand it's an unsatisfactory answer
5 for many reasons, but that doesn't mean that it's necessarily
6 going to be relevant because it may be that that's an
7 appropriate -- sometimes the answer is, how was my share
8 calculated? Answer: We are not going to tell you that. Just
9 decide based on the amount of money you got and you decide
10 whether you want to do this. That could be an adequate answer.
11 Just because the question is in here, that doesn't mean we have
12 to give all the information on it.

13 MR. HAUSFELD: Your Honor is absolutely correct. If
14 they said, it's none of your business, I would calculate what
15 you got. That's not what they said. They said it's based on a
16 formula.

17 THE COURT: Mr. Hausfeld, if it said, that's none of
18 your business, we would still be here saying, we'd like to know
19 how you did it anyway.

20 MR. HAUSFELD: I am not so sure. If they were candid
21 in saying to their potential solicited opt-ins, how we
22 calculated, it is none of your business, that would be an
23 accurate description of what they did.

24 THE COURT: I think that's tantamount to what they
25 have done right now. They have essentially said that's none of

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 your business. They just did it in the polite lawyerly way.

2 MR. HAUSFELD: I respectfully differ, your Honor. If
3 someone says to me something is none of my business, I
4 understand that. If they say to me, hey, your allocation was
5 based on a formula --

6 THE COURT: Which we are not going to tell you because
7 it's none of your business.

8 MR. HAUSFELD: Put that in.

9 THE COURT: I don't think we are going to solve this
10 by putting in, this is none of your business. It's obvious
11 they think it's none of their business because, otherwise, they
12 would have put the formula in or they would even tell you.

13 MR. HAUSFELD: Your Honor, if I may, this is a
14 settlement which, in essence, is intended to be class wide.
15 You're soliciting an entire group of people that did business
16 with a particular defendant that had already been sued before
17 any state investigations by private parties, over which this
18 Court has jurisdiction. Judge Marrero indicated he is
19 concerned that this potential class type settlement is going to
20 affect the Court's jurisdiction as well as his ability to
21 confer meaningful relief on the remainder of the class and the
22 remainder of the claims.

23 THE COURT: We are going over old area. I would just
24 point out, it's not of the magnitude of concern that you had
25 impressed upon me. If it was, he would have a fairness hearing

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 on it. It's something less than that.

2 MR. HAUSFELD: Your Honor, again, I respectfully
3 disagree. Without the Court's statement of findings, reasoning
4 and conclusions, as you started this hearing, it is a little
5 unclear exactly what was bothering the Court and what he wanted
6 to do about it.

7 And one of the things that we had asked at the
8 beginning of this process, not with you, but with the bank and
9 the state AGs, was to wait for the issuance of those findings
10 and reasoning and conclusions which would have helped formulate
11 responses more intelligently and rationally.

12 THE COURT: The ones from Judge Marrero?

13 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

14 THE COURT: I wouldn't count on your getting much more
15 out of that. I've got a feeling that might be limited to the
16 legal basis for the order. I don't know that it's going to
17 elaborate on the content of the order. There is no point in
18 waiting.

19 MR. HAUSFELD: In that respect then --

20 THE COURT: There may be a point in my doing my
21 rulings and you're objecting and taking it to Judge Marrero.
22 That's a different question. But we are not going to wait on
23 anything.

24 MR. HAUSFELD: In that respect, when the Court raises
25 concerns about actions which would undermine the Court's

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 jurisdiction, and which might impede the Court's ability to
2 render meaningful relief on the remaining claims before it, I
3 think all of these questions are significant and material to
4 those concerns.

5 What makes this entire process unprecedented is the
6 existence of a prior claim asserted in this court under federal
7 jurisdiction which preceded by a year or more any state
8 investigation, and clearly by more than a year of any attempted
9 state settlement of the same claims that were sought to being
10 settled by the class plaintiffs and to which this Court
11 appointed a special master for settlement purposes.

12 All of those factors have to be put in context as to
13 why the Court was bothered at all to do anything with respect
14 to states that basely said then, as they say now, this Court
15 has no right to oversee anything that I do. They have lost
16 that. That's gone. Judge Marrero has taken some jurisdiction
17 over this.

18 THE COURT: I feel we are repeating long-ago battles,
19 not even battles from earlier today, but ones from February.

20 Here is my problem. I have concern about the Attorney
21 General's work product issues and matters they deem
22 confidential and matters that may affect other settlements. So
23 I have now focused once again on the relevance point, and I
24 feel I'm back in the same boat as I was with respect to our
25 discussion regarding the particular amounts and how the amount

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 was derived for. I have the same issue for the allocation as
2 between the parties. I know you disagree. I know you think
3 that's very important. And you are welcome to object to my
4 failure to provide discovery when you provide your comments to
5 Judge Marrero. Okay?

6 MR. HAUSFELD: I respect your Honor's decision, and we
7 will preserve our rights to think about it on appeal.

8 THE COURT: What's left in terms of the discovery
9 requests that isn't covered by what I've already said here?

10 MR. HAUSFELD: Three essential elements. One dealing
11 with the economic analysis, or the determination of the
12 settlement amount in the first place.

13 THE COURT: The 65 million?

14 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes. The issue simply is was there
15 such an economic analysis done independently by the State
16 Attorney General's economist. And if there was, is it
17 burdensome to produce that analysis.

18 THE COURT: What's your position on that?

19 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, that goes to the heart of
20 our work product in this investigation, and we will not produce
21 it. We cannot produce that and maintain the integrity of our
22 investigation and our work product on a going-forward basis.
23 We believe that this is not at all addressed to compliance with
24 the March 1 order. It has nothing to do with the language --

25 THE COURT: I just wanted to hear about burden,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 though.

2 This is even a step removed from what we are talking
3 about here in terms of what is important for plaintiff to know.
4 They know they are getting a hundred thousand dollars. How the
5 Attorney General evaluated the claim that led to them getting
6 \$100,000 is even less pertinent than knowing the formula for
7 the \$100,000. I think if you lose on the first thing a
8 fortiori, you're losing on this one. I assume you can't make
9 an argument that's more relevant than that.

10 MR. HAUSFELD: Your Honor, this has been instructive
11 in this respect. It's becoming clear, from what's being said,
12 that this is a settlement that's being offered to entities to
13 opt in to take in the literal black box. They don't know the
14 formula. They won't know the analysis. As long as we are in a
15 position now, given those admissions and acknowledgements, we
16 will be able to comment in a notice to Judge Marrero, and then
17 Judge Marrero can decide in the context of the concerns he has
18 already expressed whether that's appropriate.

19 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, I just need to make one
20 statement here. This was an investigation undertaken by the
21 state in the public interest. We entered into a settlement
22 with Bank of America that encompassed many, many factors. We
23 believe that it's a settlement that's in the public interest
24 and in the interest of the parties that are going to be able to
25 elect to claim restitution if they wanted to.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 And I really have a problem with Mr. Hausfeld's
2 assertion that this settlement is in some sort of black box and
3 done in an obfuscatory manner that will injure parties that
4 were hurt by the conduct of the conspirators.

5 THE COURT: I thought the black box analogy was
6 perfectly appropriate, but that's just me.

7 MR. HAUSFELD: Thank you, your Honor.

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, if I can interject. The
9 implication of the black box is, I think -- it has connotations
10 that could be misleading.

11 The negotiation was undertaken between the Bank of
12 America and the states in good faith over a significant period
13 of time with a substantial volume of information and data
14 exchanged and provided at the same time, the same data and
15 analysis was provided to the class plaintiffs. There was full
16 discussion, full disclosure of what Bank of America's position
17 was with respect to settling this matter, detailed information
18 was provided, volumes of information was provided to the class.
19 Bank of America suggested that the class and the AGs and the
20 Attorneys General worked together. The Attorneys General chose
21 not to. They have every right to make that position.

22 The notice that's going to go out will not give a
23 formula that's based on work product. No notice in the class
24 that has been presented in this matter has included such a
25 formula. One of the more recent notices that Mr. Hausfeld

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 participated in makes no mention at all of a plan of allocation
2 in a five-page notice. And there are other examples like that.

3 So I think while we are happy to have this discussion
4 about whether the formula should or shouldn't be provided in
5 the notice with Judge Marrero, I don't think discovery is
6 necessary to get us to that point.

7 THE COURT: I don't know why we are going over this
8 again.

9 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, first of all, we represent
10 individuals to whom Mr. Sullivan never produced the information
11 that he described. I don't think that's really the point of
12 why we are here today.

13 My clients are going to ask me, when they receive the
14 notice, what this number is, what it represents, and how it was
15 calculated. What we are asking for in terms of discovery is
16 the kind of information in a notice and in the material that's
17 provided to people who received that to make an informed
18 decision, and that's why we are here today. If that
19 information is not going to be provided, we understand that.
20 But it means that our clients are going to have a very
21 difficult time in making an informed decision about the letter
22 that they received. And having done class action work for a
23 number of years, this kind of notice would not comport with
24 ordinary standards and the kind of due process notice that's
25 required. But we understand your Honor's position. But why we

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 are here and why we asked is to get that kind of information in
2 the notice that ordinarily people, entities, sophisticated
3 businesses need to make the decision. That's the kind of
4 simple request. I haven't heard very much about burden. I
5 have heard about confidentiality. We understand your position.
6 I just wanted to make that clear.

7 THE COURT: This is a policy decision, I guess, that
8 Judge Marrero is going to have to make which is, is this going
9 to be like the class notice? Is that what it's going to look
10 like? Or is it something far less than that? And if there
11 was -- I go back to what I said at the beginning. If it was
12 something simple and nonburdensome, I would say just give it
13 and at least it could be presented in a little more detail to
14 Judge Marrero as to what you would be proposing to put in.
15 When issues of work product are raised and they are not
16 frivolous, I feel I have to put it over, as it were.

17 MR. HAUSFELD: Your Honor, if I may, I believe you
18 have accurately described the dilemma. It is to some extent a
19 policy decision. And without further guidance or without
20 preguidance from the Court it makes it even more difficult at
21 this point to select out what type of notice Judge Marrero was
22 thinking of and what were underlying his concerns that he
23 expressed in his March 1 order.

24 There are two other areas that we wish to go into, but
25 I think that they are already kind of covered in the discussion

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 we have. We are going to want to see the basis for the
2 statement of allegations. And in terms of burdensomeness, if
3 they have that, will they turn it over to us in a meaningful
4 manner. That is tied with your Honor's considerations of
5 relevance and possibly that's -- that is a decision, as your
6 Honor has said, that needs to be left to the Court.
7 THE COURT: You're referring to what letter, letter C?
8 What are you talking about, the basis for the allegation?
9 MR. HAUSFELD: There is in the notice --
10 THE COURT: No.
11 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes, it is C, your Honor.
12 THE COURT: Letter C, which is characterized as the
13 representations made by Bank of America to the Attorney
14 Generals to support the settlement amount.
15 MR. HAUSFELD: Right. There is a running, several
16 multi page statement of what the state AGs are prepared to
17 prove at a trial, and we would like to see the basis for that.
18 THE COURT: You're asking what Bank of America told
19 them, not --
20 MR. HAUSFELD: It's unclear whether it was Bank of
21 America or it was more than Bank of America.
22 THE COURT: I'm reading your letter. You asked for
23 representations of Bank of America. Now you want something
24 else?
25 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes. Because based on what
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 Mr. Sullivan has said, I take that the bank has provided
2 nothing differently to the state AGs than they had already
3 provided to the class plaintiffs.

4 But what the state AGs have said in their statement to
5 the class is they have information that they have gathered in
6 their investigative efforts, which they do not limit to Bank of
7 America, which support the allegations by the states that there
8 has been collusive conduct in the market for derivatives
9 generally, not just those engaged in by Bank of America.
10 Either they have those documents and we are asking for them to
11 be turned over, or it's too burdensome to produce them. We
12 don't want any notes or any work product.

13 THE COURT: This would presumably come exclusively
14 from the AG, because you got whatever it is from the Bank of
15 America.

16 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

17 THE COURT: I'll hear from them on burden.

18 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, my understanding of this
19 request is that the class counsel are requesting essentially
20 all of the information compiled during the three-year
21 investigation that we have conducted in this industry pursuant
22 to our subpoena power.

23 Let me say two things about that. One is, we believe
24 that class counsel now have a considerable amount, if not all
25 of that information, not including work product, because they

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 have access to things like audiotapes and documents and e-mails
2 and data from many of the participants in the industry. That's
3 my understanding of the correspondence I have seen on the
4 docket relating to discovery in this matter.

5 And apart from that, your Honor, again, this is part
6 of our investigatory file, class plaintiffs have served our
7 office with a Freedom of Information law request, which we are
8 addressing and will respond to in due course, consistent with
9 the policies of the office. But we are not prepared to turn
10 over our investigatory files voluntarily to the class.

11 THE COURT: So it's burden, it's work product. What's
12 the problem?

13 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, it's a confidential
14 investigation, and we don't believe it's relevant to the
15 notice.

16 I should also point out --

17 THE COURT: So there is no burden. It's work product?

18 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, it would be enormously
19 burdensome.

20 THE COURT: Ms. Hoffman, I'm trying to get you to
21 answer my question. I hope you won't feel put upon if I just
22 ask you to state on the record whether it's burden or work
23 product or both.

24 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, I apologize. It's both.
25 And, your Honor, I also want to mention, we have reviewed,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 although we do not believe that our settlement is subject to
2 the same kind of scrutiny as the Rule 23 settlement, we have
3 reviewed notices in class actions, and none of them revealed
4 the basis for allegations in terms of documentation to a group
5 of plaintiffs before they have chosen whether they are going to
6 opt in or opt out of the settlement.

7 THE COURT: I'll accept the representation on burden,
8 that this would be very burdensome. Of course, I can see a
9 work product issue. Again, this fits into this larger picture
10 problem of what their vision is of what's required to be
11 disclosed in the notice.

12 In light of the burden and the work product issue, I
13 am not going to order discovery at this point at this time.

14 What's left?

15 MR. HAUSFELD: Your Honor, with respect to the burden
16 generally and work product, normally, in order to assert a work
17 product privilege, it can't be asserted in the abstract. We
18 have not heard any particulars as to what specific information
19 is deemed to be work product so we can challenge that. Could
20 we get a log?

21 THE COURT: Not from a nonparty who has not even had a
22 subpoena or anything else. That would be burdensome in and of
23 itself. I think it's better for the big picture to be decided
24 before we get to that point.

25 MR. HAUSFELD: I don't disagree, your Honor. I think
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 it is a situation where the big picture is to be clarified by
2 the Court because for the Court to accept at face value, and it
3 may be correct, though, that the production, for example, of a
4 formula upon which it's represented they base the allocation on
5 involves work product, is a little stretch.

6 Normally, traditionally, there would be an ability to
7 test, what is work product separate from the formula? Can the
8 formula be produced without the work product? With regard to
9 burdensome, that would normally be a request, for example, to
10 provide an index or an inventory. That shouldn't be
11 burdensome.

12 THE COURT: We are in a little bit of a streamlined
13 process here. This is not typical discovery. This is our
14 effort to quickly determine what we can get to allow you to
15 give comments on a notice that's not part of this case and for
16 which there are reasons not to delay. I don't think that these
17 typical requirements of Rule 26 discovery are necessary.

18 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, I would just say, at a
19 minimum, if there is a burden claim, it must be particularized
20 at some level, and the simple affirmation, that, yes, it is
21 burdensome, I would submit, respectfully, is insufficient.

22 THE COURT: And which burdensome affirmation did you
23 feel was insufficient, the one as to every document that
24 supports their allegations?

25 MR. SAVERI: I don't want to rewind the tape, but with
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 respect to the plan of allocation, I didn't think that there
2 was a particularized showing of --

3 THE COURT: I didn't think there was any burden
4 showing on that.

5 MR. SAVERI: Excuse me, your Honor?

6 THE COURT: I think the showing that I accepted was
7 that it was confidential and work product rather than burden.

8 MR. SAVERI: Excuse me, your Honor. Maybe I didn't
9 hear that correctly. But with respect to the last point, it
10 seems to me --

11 THE COURT: The last point meaning every document that
12 supports --

13 MR. SAVERI: We are talking about the particular
14 statements and information that may have been provided by Bank
15 of America and others.

16 THE COURT: No, no, no. Not Bank of America, because
17 I think everyone agreed they had that. It was the non Bank of
18 America documents, wasn't it?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor is correct.

20 THE COURT: And then the Attorney General said, now
21 you're asking us to talk about every subpoena we issued as part
22 of this three-year investigation. That seems so obvious that
23 would be work product and burdensome and they would have a
24 confidentiality interest in not revealing the scope of their
25 investigation. I didn't require anything further. If there is

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 some particular question you want asked, I don't mind seeing if
2 we can use this opportunity to get an answer.

3 MR. SAVERI: No, your Honor.

4 MR. HAUSFELD: Your Honor, for purposes of the record,
5 if I may, your Honor has expressed that this request for
6 discovery and this search for information is, I think the words
7 you used are not part of this case.

8 THE COURT: It's not part of the claims in this case,
9 the merits of the claims, which is what Rule 26 applies to, the
10 claims or defenses in this case.

11 MR. HAUSFELD: I respectfully differ, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Hold on. Stop. If you would like to
13 obtain this discovery for some other purpose, which is to prove
14 your claims in this case, we will have a very different track
15 for that and it will not be expedited. It will involve
16 subpoenas and document requests and the need to be consistent
17 with my prior order. That's fine. I'm not saying -- I'm not
18 making any ruling as to the relevance or burden or
19 producibility of any of this material with respect to your
20 claims or defenses in this case.

21 MR. HAUSFELD: There is an aspect of what has occurred
22 which Judge Marrero clearly took note in his March order.
23 Because if he wished to do nothing, if he felt that this was a
24 process that could occur totally outside the oversight or
25 supervision or jurisdiction of this Court, he would have done

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 nothing. He did something.

2 THE COURT: Obviously, I'm open to some discovery or
3 we wouldn't be here. I would have just issued an order saying
4 you're entitled to no discovery on this.

5 MR. HAUSFELD: But the discovery issue goes to the
6 dilemma your Honor identified with respect to the policy behind
7 Judge Marrero's concerns, what type of notice is this.

8 Before notice would go out in a typical class action,
9 there would had to have been a motion for preliminary approval
10 and there would have had to have been a decision by the Court
11 that it made sense to do that and that the proposal was fair
12 and reasonable.

13 THE COURT: We would have a fairness hearing, in fact.

14 MR. HAUSFELD: No. The fairness hearing would occur
15 after notice.

16 THE COURT: Whatever.

17 MR. HAUSFELD: But that step has been bypassed through
18 this process. And the fairness hearing, as well, that would
19 have occurred subsequently is likewise bypassed. So there are
20 no indicia of a traditional review or oversight by a Court to
21 determine whether or not a settlement is fair or reasonable or
22 a claimant should accept or not accept participation in a
23 particular settlement.

24 THE COURT: We are a little bit spinning our wheels
25 here. This is the very policy issue that I said is going to

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 have to be brought up with Judge Marrero.

2 MR. HAUSFELD: All I wanted to do, your Honor, and I
3 appreciate your indulgence in allowing me to state that for the
4 record, we do believe that's a policy issue. We do believe
5 that issue needs to be decided, given the observations about
6 what is and is not being said in the notice.

7 One of the things that was somewhat disturbing in
8 terms of an acknowledgement this morning, in one of the letters
9 from the state AGs, there was a reference made to the fact that
10 by reason of this seeking of the discovery by the class
11 plaintiffs and the California plaintiffs, the ability of the
12 state AGs to send out this notice has been unduly delayed. But
13 given what the state AG said, they are not even ready yet to do
14 that themselves. So there are representations being made that
15 don't accurately characterize this process. And I think --

16 THE COURT: Duly noted. I am not sure it's relevant
17 to any of our issues today other than the fact that we are not
18 in perhaps the rush that we were told about earlier. But it
19 really doesn't affect what I was doing because I am prepared
20 for what I view as nonburdensome discovery to require it. And
21 if it takes a few weeks, that's not a problem for me. But we
22 have larger issues than that.

23 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes, your Honor. And as your Honor has
24 stated a number of times, to which we agree, those larger
25 issues need to be decided and addressed by the Court.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 THE COURT: Any other topic areas that have not
2 essentially been disposed of by what you said? Is there
3 something that you agree is not burdensome and is not subject
4 to an objection that I think is reasonable?

5 MR. HAUSFELD: I don't think anything --

6 THE COURT: The famous data from Mr -- begins with a
7 Z.

8 MR. HAUSFELD: Zwerner. It took us six weeks to seek
9 the information and two hours to learn that the Bank of America
10 had no information to give us because Mr. Zwerner is no longer
11 in their control, and they cannot state with any certainty
12 whether or not what he did had any impact on the financial
13 materials that were disclosed to us.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, may I correct the record
15 again. Mr. Hausfeld must have misspoke because we told class
16 plaintiffs, as soon as this order information was filed and we
17 had the first discussion about it, that the reason we could not
18 proffer any information to the class plaintiffs about this
19 order information before that time was because we didn't learn
20 of it ourselves. It only came to us from the Justice
21 Department. But they knew that we didn't have access to
22 Mr. Zwerner immediately. It didn't take six weeks to get --
23 for them to get that information.

24 We did go through with them and spent three hours with
25 them two days ago and went through the particular trades that

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 are in the so-called kitty and provided what information we
2 have been able to gather based upon our own investigation, even
3 though the results are limited.

4 But to get to the question of discovery versus notice,
5 which is, I think, what you were asking about, the class has a
6 proffer. They have the documents. The Oakland plaintiffs,
7 along with West Virginia, sent us a discovery request for this
8 information. To the extent they have requested information,
9 they will get it this Friday, the 13th of May. So I think,
10 unless there is disagreement from the plaintiffs here, I think
11 we can proceed on the basis that they will have that discovery
12 by no later than Friday, May the 13th.

13 MR. HAUSFELD: What we were seeking the discovery for
14 was what was just not addressed, which is whether or not that
15 what Mr. Zwerner did affected the financials. The answer to
16 that is the bank does not know. We are satisfied with that
17 answer as of now, and we are not seeking any further
18 information from the bank on that.

19 THE COURT: That's the end of it?

20 MR. HAUSFELD: Yes.

21 THE COURT: Anything else on your list of desired
22 discovery that we have not covered?

23 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, I think that in large part
24 our request with respect to Zwerner has been dealt with by the
25 previous discussion. Just for purposes of the record, we

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 requested -- among the material we requested was some
2 information about whether the plan of allocation or other
3 materials that would be used to determine shares to individual
4 class members or potential opt-ins to this settlement was
5 affected by any tainted data. I am not going to belabor that
6 because I think you have already heard argument about the
7 extent to which we are entitled to material regarding the plan
8 of allocation.

9 To my mind, it would be a subset of that and I don't
10 mean --

11 THE COURT: Just to be clear, I'm willing to order
12 discovery on what might even be potentially irrelevant matters
13 as long as I don't see a burden or a work product problem.
14 This might have been an area where I would like to have you get
15 this information and with that information you could make the
16 argument to Judge Marrero. The only reason you haven't gotten
17 the other information is I felt they were really burdensome as
18 to work product and confidentiality concerns. I am not sure I
19 feel this way about this data. Is there something you want
20 that you have not been getting?

21 MR. SAVERI: What we would want, and maybe this would
22 be subject to some kind of response from the AGs or the B of A,
23 we want to know whether the plan of allocation as it was
24 determined, or whatever the basis is of the plan of allocation,
25 whether it has been affected or tainted by the information

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 that, apparently, because of Mr. Zwerner's activity, was
2 fraudulent or might be otherwise unreliable. And I don't
3 know --

4 THE COURT: This could be a very narrow question that
5 perhaps they wouldn't mind answering, which is that for
6 purposes of doing any calculations they did, in line No. 208 or
7 whatever it is that has the data that shows the revenue, did
8 they rely on Bank of America's data, which you believe is
9 tainted and which they may have other explanations for.

10 MR. SAVERI: That's correct, your Honor. I didn't
11 want to prejudgement answer --

12 THE COURT: It's possible they won't object to answer
13 that. We will turn to them and find out.

14 MS. HOFFMANN: Your Honor, I can answer that question
15 right away. We have looked at this Zwerner data. We have gone
16 through it. We are taking it into account in allocating the
17 restitution part.

18 THE COURT: You are not taking Bank of America's data
19 at face value.

20 MS. HOFFMANN: That is correct.

21 THE COURT: Bank of America's input --

22 MS. HOFFMANN: With regard to the transaction, which
23 the Zwerner kitty, we are taking it into account in revising
24 the allocation so that --

25 THE COURT: How are you taking it into account?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 MS. HOFFMANN: I am not trying to be evasive here. I
2 understand my very basic understanding is that sometimes the
3 profits were overstated, sometimes they were understated. We
4 are figuring in those precise amounts to the extent we can to
5 determine --

6 THE COURT: Are you just willing to describe perhaps
7 in writing what you did to do that? In other words, how do you
8 know that something was over or understated?

9 MS. HOFFMANN: I will have to talk to my group. I
10 think in principle what we are willing to say today is we are
11 taking it into account on a transaction by transaction basis
12 for purposes of the allocation.

13 THE COURT: Would you want more than that?

14 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, with respect, I would like an
15 answer to the last question you asked, how was it taken into
16 account.

17 THE COURT: And you don't know whether you want to
18 answer that?

19 MS. HOFFMANN: I don't know whether we can describe it
20 to a greater extent than I have just described it.

21 THE COURT: Someone could answer it, presumably. And
22 someone must be able to say that there was some method by which
23 they decided something was over or under, based on some
24 principle.

25 MS. HOFFMANN: I think perhaps, your Honor, with all
SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 respect, perhaps this can be addressed best by looking at the
2 language in the notice regarding allocation and trying to
3 propose more detailed language that would take into account
4 this issue as well.

5 THE COURT: Let me change the topic area.

6 On the question of answering this question, I guess we
7 could put off to see if they are willing to answer it. And if
8 they don't, that would be another complaint to Judge Marrero.

9 My suggestion is, you write a letter either saying we
10 are not going to give you further information or providing the
11 methodology or whatever else. If you can do that --

12 MR. SAVERI: That seems perfectly fair, your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Do that in the next few days. If you
14 don't give it, explain why you are not giving it, burden, work
15 product, whatever it is. Please explain in detail.

16 MR. SAVERI: That works for us, your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Anything else on your list?

18 MR. HAUSFELD: Nothing, your Honor.

19 THE COURT: I guess we need a plan of action.

20 I suppose what you could do is consider this in an
21 aisle of discovery in any areas where I didn't give you the
22 discovery, and then you should somehow make a presentation to
23 Judge Marrero.

24 I guess there is two ways you can do this. One is,
25 you could object to the failure to get the discovery. The

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 other way, which might be better, would be to do it all in one
2 package, which is to say, here is our comments to the class
3 notice with the information we have now. Here is why it's
4 totally inadequate, because we didn't get discovery on this,
5 that, and the other thing, and here is why we need that
6 discovery. Because we want to be able to beef up this notice
7 to have the following kinds of things, and discovery would
8 allow us to do that. I think that's the better way to do it.

9 When do you think you can put that together?

10 MR. HAUSFELD: That would depend in large part on the
11 production that your Honor did grant discovery on, and that's
12 the list, and I would say within two weeks of getting that
13 list.

14 THE COURT: That's fair. And then you would
15 presumably respond to that letter to Judge Marrero?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, we would, your Honor. We could
17 respond to that within a week. I would like to at least
18 explore this so we can move this along. I know the state has
19 an interest in moving this along. We would like to get this
20 issue resolved and potentially move us forward in other aspects
21 of this case.

22 Knowing precisely who is on the list is not going to
23 be necessary for the plaintiffs to make their arguments to
24 Judge Marrero about the content of the notice because the
25 content of the notice is going to go to those parties. They

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 will get those parties.

2 THE COURT: Why do you need the actual list in order
3 to make these arguments?

4 MR. HAUSFELD: So that we can determine an argument
5 that we would make as to the adequacy of the -- to whom the
6 notice is being sent. And then we can check the names of the
7 entities will be accompanied by the transactions, so we will be
8 able to know why they are getting this and who is getting it.
9 And, in our opinion, we want to object to that aspect of the
10 notice as well.

11 THE COURT: There is your answer. What do you want to
12 say about it? Are we going over a week here? I thought this
13 list was coming pretty soon.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: I think the AG suggested it would be
15 within about a week.

16 THE COURT: We are arguing over one week. This is not
17 worth it.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: Why don't we schedule it for say two
19 weeks.

20 THE COURT: Two weeks from when they get the list.
21 The Attorney General has every incentive to speed this along.
22 They are the ones that have the greatest interest. I am going
23 to rely on them to act expeditiously. Maybe the two-week
24 period is too long. It seems to me you can pretty much prepare
25 this starting now. Can you do it one week from when you get

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

15BMMUNC

1 the list. This is all on the table right now. You've written
2 the letters anyway.

3 MR. HAUSFELD: Again, your Honor, being of utmost
4 candor, we are coming into graduation season. A lot of
5 people --

6 THE COURT: That's why I don't want to put it any
7 later.

8 MR. HAUSFELD: That's why I said give me two weeks so
9 we can work our personnel in a way that we can get it done
10 within two weeks of when we get it.

11 THE COURT: Here is what I am going to do. Let's say
12 one week. If you need more time, talk to the other side. If
13 there is a dispute, write me a letter. I'll be very reasonable
14 about extensions. Let's shoot for one week. Let's start
15 preparing it now. If you need more time, just come back to me.

16 MR. HAUSFELD: Thank you.

17 THE COURT: One week for the response.
18 Anything else from plaintiffs?

19 MR. HAUSFELD: No, your Honor.

20 THE COURT: From your side?

21 MR. SULLIVAN: No, your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 o0o

24

25

