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THE DEPUTY CLERK: Civil action 12-450 JPMorgan Chase Bank National Association versus FDIC, et al. For the plaintiffs, Brent McIntosh, Ian McDonald and Mia Spiker. For the defense, Scott Christensen, Kathleen Fones, and Wendy Kloner.

THE COURT: Hello everybody.

MR. MCINTOSH: Good morning, Your Honor.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: Good morning, Your Honor.
MR. KURTENBACH: Daniel Kurtenbach for FDIC in it's corporate capacity, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Forgive me for sort of looking around trying to identify who everybody is. Nice to see you all.

All right, the question of the day; are you ready for the next step; have you completed all of the discovery that you think you needed? Remember it was going to be really brief discovery and you were going to use some of the discovery from Deutsche Bank so we didn't have to repeat it so that then you'd be ready to file briefs or something or go to trial maybe. What do you think? Please.

MR. MCINTOSH: Your Honor, Brent McIntosh, Sullivan \& Cromwell on behalf of plaintiff JPMorgan Chase.

We are as Your Honor acknowledges in a bit of an odd posture here because we're dependent on another case. We have
largely finished document discovery as was suggested and the order Your Honor set forth earlier.

The document discovery there as Your Honor knows focuses on the question of as to specific states and municipalities what was reflected in Washington Mutual Bank's books and records as the parties respectively understand that term. THE COURT: Do you agree on that term? MR. MCINTOSH: No, I think the meaning of that term THE COURT: I didn't think you did, so it's okay. MR. MCINTOSH: Your Honor, that leads to a bit of a quirk I think in the scheduling proposal we have here, but we are largely complete with document discovery. There are of course as there always is some stragglers, but we are, I think there's nothing on that topic that we need to discuss today.

The question in Your Honor's order on scheduling for us was you asked that we meet and confer, come back and tell you do we need additional forms of discovery depositions or written discovery and we have, I think given snow days and illnesses has been a remarkable show of diligence have met twice and had another phone call.

THE COURT: Met?
MR. MCINTOSH: Met even.
THE COURT: Face to face?

MR. MCINTOSH: True, true meet and confers in the
literal sense, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well I congratulate you all.
MR. MCINTOSH: Although given illnesses we've made sure to sit on far, on the opposite sides of tables and things like that.

THE COURT: Well that's all right. Lawyers acting as lawyers instead of as clients is always -- excuse me, I hope there isn't a client here I'm insulting. Lawyers acting as lawyers instead of clients is always very nice. Clients are in dispute. Go ahead, sir.

MR. MCINTOSH: Exactly, Your Honor.
The answer to the question $I$ think is that the parties agree that some small amount of additional, non document discovery would be useful perhaps a few litigations on each side.

THE COURT: You mean a few depositions?
MR. MCINTOSH: I'm sorry, did I -- a few depositions on each side from the FDIC's perspective to I think to understand Washington Mutual Bank's books and records and what was shown there. From our perspective to understand the FDIC's interactions with some of the states and municipalities at issue. I don't think it's a lot of depositions and I think some of it will be susceptible to being done as 30(B)(6) depositions.

So We have put together a proposed schedule for Your Honor
that the parties agree on that would have fact discovery completed by the end of May and then should there be a need for expert discovery we have dates for and if it would help I believe Mr. Christensen has clean copies of the proposed order that we would suggest to Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MCINTOSH: Expert reports, if any, due near the end of June and rebuttal is due near the end of July and expert depositions, if any, by the end of August. And then we would meet and confer about next steps once again because as Your Honor recognizes this is, there is a dependency here between this case and the Deutsche Bank case where we are litigating the meaning of the section, the relevant section of the Purchase \& Assumption Agreement Section 2.1.

THE COURT: Some day we will be. Right now you're doing things that you must, you must explain to me at another time and place.

MR. MCINTOSH: We are in the midst of expert discovery on that and have expert rebuttal reports due this Friday, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And experts are interpreting the agreement?

MR. MCINTOSH: We have experts; for example, the parties have experts on the accounting understanding of the term books and records; the parties have experts on what the
actual books and records as the parties respectively understand it showed for the repurchase obligations that are at issue in that litigation, but because of the dependency of this case on that case --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. MCINTOSH: -- we haven't proposed at this time a schedule for dispositive motions or for trial in this case. Summary judgment in the Deutsche Bank action is due to be, briefing is due to be completed in midsummer and the result of that, those motions $I$ think we all believe will have some effect on how this case proceeds.

THE COURT: Okay, and that was one of my questions whether -- you're exactly the people to ask. Whether Deutsche Bank would reach the point of summary judgment first or whether this case would reach the point of summary judgment first.

MR. MCINTOSH: I think it appears that Deutsche Bank would reach the point of summary judgment. In part because we have been, we're ahead in Deutsche Bank.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. MCINTOSH: And so in our expert discovery
already.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. MCINTOSH: I think that at some point because the Deutsche Bank action, the ruling in the Deutsche Bank action on the ultimate meaning of the provision at issue will effect this
case. There will be some interplay between the cases and this case is moving somewhat more rapidly than Deutsche Bank, so there may be some amount of convergence. I think it's probably too early to predict how that works out today.

THE COURT: I was under the impression that this case was moving more quickly than Deutsche Bank which is why I wasn't sure which would come first and which presented the most clear question of interpretation. I mean as you know better than I, this is a complicated set of facts and expectations and negotiations and statements and all of that.

MR. MCINTOSH: I would say that I don't think either necessarily presents the clearest, an obviously clearer way of interpreting the $P \& A$ then the other, but they do present different issues.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. MCINTOSH: It is conceivable that the Deutsche Bank ruling could go in one party's favor and the ruling here could go in the other party's favor or vice versa.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. MCINTOSH: It's kind of a four box option there.
And frankly, this case has the possibility for lots of different outcomes given that we have different states and municipalities and they have different postures vis-a-vis Washington Mutual Bank.

I would note last, Your Honor, that we have been, the FDIC
in particular has been attempting to narrow the dispute by writing to states and municipalities and saying have you given up yet, which we greatly appreciate. And just yesterday the City of New York at least some set of the taxes due appears to have decided it's no longer interested in pursuing this fight. So we are attempting to narrow the dispute for Your Honor. States and municipalities are not always cooperative in that we do occasionally get new tax assessments which expand the set of states and municipalities at issue. But we are attempting to work cooperatively to present only those states that are actually at issue.

THE COURT: Good, thank you.
MR. MCINTOSH: Thank you.

THE COURT: Did you want to add anything
Mr. Christensen?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Simply wanted to pick up where Mr. McIntosh left off and underscore I think most everything that he said about the benefit of the party's cooperation on trying to eliminate or at least narrow the actual liabilities that are in dispute.

As you recall, the underlying liabilities here are those asserted by third parties.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: Against that neither of us control against one or the other or both of us.

THE COURT: One or the other or both. And then there's the -- yes.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. If we can, to the extent we can make the underlying liability go away there's much less of -_

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: And I know there will at least be one such case remaining, but in the -- based on the discovery we received in December, the FDIC did send letters to every jurisdiction that the FDIC and to Chase both believe have a liability that is barred as a matter of law for failure to exhaust the FDIC's claims process. We sent ten letters at the beginning of this month. Just yesterday we received confirmation from the City of New York, as Mr. McIntosh mentioned, that it will, it has abandoned its proposed liability which takes 8.2 million dollars off the liability at issue in this case.

THE COURT: Oh well now we ought to be able to just settle this in a heart beat then.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: In the past couple of months, Your Honor, through discovery and through other processes we have been able to eliminate the liability asserted by the state of Washington which was at least 10.5 million dollars.

We've removed as a dispute between the parties the
liability asserted by the State of Oregon which was 29.8
million dollars.

We've been able to clarify that the only dispute remaining between the two parties here with respect to California amounts to about 1.89 million dollars rather than the 267 million dollars that was previously at stake. So just within the last couple of months we've been able to clarify and confirm that almost a third of a billion dollars are now off the table.

THE COURT: That makes substantial progress.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: So we expect that we will continue and we hope certainly we will continue to receive confirmation from the many jurisdictions we are trying to confirm.

THE COURT: And if they all one way or the other drop out, what are we down to, what gargantuan sum?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: We'll always have Connecticut which I think which is 2. was settlement JPMorgan Chase reached with a state for 2.65 million dollars. The state had asserted a 26 million dollar liability and Chase was able to settle that for a tenth of the alleged liability. So since that has been settled that remains on the, the only dispute between the parties.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: But there is at least no longer a third party chasing us, no pun intended for that liability.

THE COURT: Okay, if you get down to there given the
number of suits in the room, it may be useful to consider settlement.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Understood, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Right, yes. Okay, well I have no reason not to adopt your proposed scheduling order and the other aspects of the scheduling orders that I've issued that are pertinent would remain outstanding. The ones that say you should conduct yourselves in a civil and professional manner and call me on the telephone before you file any angry motions against each other and that sort of thing. All of which is going along between such professionals as you very well.

So, and when do we have anything happening in Deutsche
Bank next? Is it just waiting for you to finish and file papers; is that where I am? I don't see you again for that case?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yes, not for awhile.
THE COURT: Not for awhile.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: On the and forgive me if $I$ can't quote it verbatim, as Mr. McIntosh mentioned we're completing the expert reports this Friday.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: We are scheduled to complete for the moment expert depositions by the middle of March. I have motions for summary judgments submitted April 4th and with a schedule that proceeds with summary judgment briefing into

June.

THE COURT: Well, you should expect oral argument on
that case, all right?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I understand.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else we need to address?

MR. MCINTOSH: Not from us, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. May I just say again how much
I appreciate having good lawyers on a case of this magnitude.

Thank you.

MR. MCINTOSH: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Proceedings concluded @ 10:45 a.m.)
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| rather [1] 11/4 | smal 1 [1] 5/13 | this [20] [3/ |
| reach [3] 7/14 7/15 7/17 | snow [1] 4/19 | those [3] 7/10 9/10 9/21 |
| reached [1] 11/16 | so [11] $3 / 19$ 3/19 4/10 | through [2] 10/21 10/21 |
| ready [2] 3/15 3/20 | 5/25 7/20 8/2 9/6 11/5 | time [3] 6/17 7/6 14/5 |
| leason [1] 12/4 |  | today [2] 4/15 8/4 |
| rebuttal [2] 6/8 6/19 | 5/21 $5 / 23$ 6/15 $7 / 10$ 7/23 | toge [1] 8/4 |
| call [1] 9/21 | 8/1 8/3 9/4 | topic [1] 4/15 |
| receive [1] 11/11 | something[1] 3/20 | transcript [3] 1/11 2/9 |
| received [2] 10/9 10/13 | somewhat [1] 8/2 | 14/3 |
| recognizes [1] 6/11 | sorry [1] 5/17 | transcription [1] 2/9 |
| recorded [1] 2/9 | sort [2] 3/12 12/10 | trial [2] 3/20 7/7 |
| records [4] 4/6 5/19 6/25 | specific [1] 4/4 | true [3] 4/25 4/25 14/2 |
| 7/1 | SPIKER [2] 1/15 3/4 | trying [3] 3/13 9/19 |
| Reed [1] 1/21 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { stake } & {[1]} & 11 / 5 & \\ \text { ll }\end{array}$ | 11/12 |
| reflected [1] 4/5 | state [4] 10/22 10/25 | Tuesday [1] 1/5 |
| related [1] 14/7 | 11/17 11/17 | twice [1] 4/20 |
| relevant [1] 6/13 | stated [1] 14/6 | two [1] 11/3 |
| remain [1] 12/7 | statements [1] 8/10 | U |
| remains [1] 11/20 |  | ultimate [1] |
| remarkable [1] 4/20 | 9/10 14/4 | under [1] 8/5 |
| Remember [1] 3/17 | STATUS [1] 1/11 | underlying [2] 9/21 10/4 |
| removed [1] 10/24 | stenographic [1] 14/4 | underscore [1] 9/17 |
| repeat [1] 3/19 | step [1] 3/16 | understand [5] 4/6 5/19 |
| Reporter [2] 2/5 2/6 | steps [1] 6/10 | 5/20 7/1 13/4 |
| reports [3] 6/7 6/19 | stragglers [1] 4/14 | understanding [1] 6/24 |
| 12/20 | Street [2] 1/19 1/22 | Understood [1] 12/3 |
| repurchase [1] 7/2 | submitted [1] 12/24 | UNITED [4] 1/1 1/12 $2 / 6$ |
| respect [1] 11/3 | substantial [1] 11/9 | 14/4 |
| respectively [2] 4/6 7/1 | such [2] 10/8 12/11 | up [2] 9/3 9/16 |
| result [1] 7/9 | suggest [1] 6/5 | us [5] 4/16 9/24 9/25 |
| right [12] 3/15 5/6 6/15 | suggested [1] 4/1 | 11/24 13/8 |
| 7/5 7/19 7/22 9/23 11/22 | suits [1] 12/1 | use [1] 3/18 |
| 12/4 12/21 $13 / 313 / 9$ | Sullivan [3] 1/16 1/18 | usefu7 [2] 5/14 12/1 |
| room [1] 12/1 | 3/22 | V |
| ROSEMARY    <br> RPR $[2]$ $2 / 5$ $14 / 11$ |  | V VA [1] 2/4 |
| Ruling [3] $7 / 24$ $8 / 17$ $8 / 17$ | summary    <br> $7 / 17$ $12 / 24$ $12 / 25$ $7 / 14$ | verbatim [1] 12/19 |
| S | sure [2] 5/4 8/7 | versa [1] 8/18 |
|  | susceptible [1] 5/23 | versus [1] 3/3 |
| said [1] 9/18 | T | very [2] 5/9 12/11 |
| say |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {saying }}$ schedule [3] ${ }^{\text {9/2 }}$ 5/25 | table [1] 11/8 | vis [2] 8/23 8/23 |
| Schedu5 [3] 5/25 7/7 | les [1] 5/4 | Vis-a-vis |
| scheduled [1] 12/22 |  | W |
| scheduling [4] 4/12 4/16 | tax [1] 9/8 | waiting [1] 12/13 |
| 12/5 12/6 | taxes [1] 9/4 | want [1] 9/14 |
| SCOTT [2] 1/20 3/5 | telephone [1] 12/9 | wanted [1] 9/1 |
| section [3] 6/13 6/13 | tell [1] 4/17 | was [14] 3/17 4/1 4/5 |
| 6/14 | ten [1] 10/12 | 4/17 5/20 7/12 8/5 8/6 |
| see [2] 3/14 12/14 | tenth [1] 11/19 | 10/23 10/25 11/5 11/16 |
| send [1] 10/9 | term [4] $4 / 6$ 4/7 $4 / 8$ 6/25 | 11/18 14/9 |
| sense [1] 5/1 | than [4] $8 / 2$ 8/6 8/9 $11 / 4$ | Washington [8] $1 / 41 / 17$ |
| sent [1] 10/12 | thank [7] 3/12 9/12 9/13 | 1/22 $2 / 8$ 4/5 $5 / 19$ 8/24 |
|  | 13/5 13/6 13/11 13/12 | 10/23 |
| settle [2] 10/19 11/18 | that [59 | wasn't [1] 8/7 |
| settled [1] settlement [2] | that's [1] 5/6 | way  <br> we $[23]$$\quad 8 / 12 \quad 11 / 13$ |



