Pages 1 - 35

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Edward M. Chen, Judge

IN RE CHRYSLER-DODGE-JEEP ECODIESEL MARKETING, SALES) Case No. 17-MD-02777-EMC PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION,

San Francisco, California Wednesday, May 24, 2017

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For the Jose Chavez, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

> HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP 1918 Eighth Avenue - Suite 3300 Seattle, WA 98101

BY: STEVE W. BERMAN, ESQUIRE

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.

5 Becker Farm Road Roseland, NJ 07068

BY: JAMES E. CECCHI, ESQUIRE

(Appearances continued on the following pages)

Reported By: Pamela A. Batalo, CSR No. 3593, RMR, FCRR

Official Reporter

For the Jose Chavez, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

COHEN, MILSTEIN, SELLERS & TOLL 2925 PGA Boulevard - Suite 200 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

BY: THEODORE J. LEOPOLD, ESQUIRE

MILLER LAW
950 West University Drive - Suite 300
Rochester, MI 48307

BY: SHARON S. ALMONRODE, ESQUIRE

SEEGER WEISS LLP 77 Water Street New York, NY 10005

BY: JENNIFER R. SCULLION, ESQUIRE

MASTANDO & ARTRIP, LLC 301 Washington Street - Suite 302 Huntsville, AL 35801

BY: D. ANTHONY MASTANDO, ESQUIRE ERIC J. ARTRIP, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Environmental Protection Agency:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Environment & Natural Resources Division P.O. Box 7611 Washington, DC 20044

BY: JOSEPH WARREN, ESQUIRE LEIGH RENDE, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs Kayla Kelley and John Milligan:

AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC 1016 Palm Avenue

West Hollywood, CA 90069

BY: TINA WOLFSON, ESQUIRE

For Mathue Fasching, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN 275 Battery Street - 29th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111

BY: ELIZABETH J. CABRASER, ESQUIRE

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN 250 Hudson Street - 8th Floor New York, NY 10013

BY: DAVID S. STELLINGS, ESQUIRE

BRANSTETTER, STRANCH & JENNINGS, PLLC 223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue - Suite 200 Nashville, TN 37203

BY: J. GERARD STRANCH, IV, ESQUIRE

BAILEY GLASSER LLP 209 Capitol Street Charleston, WV 25301

BY: BENJAMIN L. BAILEY, ESQUIRE

BLEICHMAR, FONTI & AULD LLP 1999 Harrison Street - Suite 670 Oakland, CA 94612

BY: LESLEY WEAVER, ESQUIRE

KELLER ROHRBACK LLP 1201 Third Avenue - Suite 3200 Seattle, WA 98101

BY: LYNN L. SARKO, ESQUIRE

MOTLEY RICE LLC 28 Bridgeside Boulevard Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464

BY: JOSEPH F. RICE, ESQUIRE

For Luke Kitchel, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

BARON & BUDD, P.C. 15910 Ventura Boulevard - Suite 1600 Encino, CA 91436

BY: ROLAND TELLIS, ESQUIRE

For Luke Kitchel, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated:

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP 655 West Broadway - Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

BY: RACHEL L. JENSEN, ESQUIRE

ROBERT C. GILBERT Miami, FL

For Plaintiffs Christopher Walker and Betty Lou Rugg:

LAW OFFICES OF FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA 456 Montgomery Street - 17th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104

BY: FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Jason Gaines:

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM 555 Montgomery Street - Suite 1210 San Francisco, CA 94111

BY: JOSEPH R. SAVERI, ESQUIRE NICOMEDES HERRERA, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs Charles Marlatt and Stanley Bruce:

GIRARD GIBBS LLP

601 California Street - 14th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94108

BY: ERIC H. GIBBS, ESQUIRE AMY M. ZEMAN, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Anthony Leocadio:

HEYGOOD, ORR & PEARSON 2331 W. Northwest Hwy - 2nd Floor Dallas, TX 75220

BY: MICHAEL HEYGOOD, ESQUIRE

HEYGOOD, ORR & PEARSON 6363 North State Hwy. 161 - Suite 450 Irving, TX 75038

BY: CHARLES MILLER, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Chatom Motor Company:

ROBINS KAPLAN LLP

601 Lexington Avenue - Suite 3400

New York, NY 10022

BY: STACEY P. SLAUGHTER, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Albert Sebastian:

CASEY GERRY SCHENK FRANCAVILLA BLATT &

PENFIELD LLP

110 Laurel Street San Diego, CA 92101

BY: DAVID S. CASEY, JR., ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Nathan Friedenfels:

HELLMUTH & JOHNSON PLLC 8050 West 78th Street Edina, MN 55439

BY: RICHARD M. HAGSTROM, ESQUIRE

BERMAN DEVALERIO

One California Street - Suite 900

San Francisco, CA 94111

BY: TODD A. SEAVER, ESQUIRE

GUSTAFSON GLUEK PLLC

120 South Sixth Street - Suite 2600

Minneapolis, MN 55402

BY: CATHY K. SMITH, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs Bret Rivero and Jamie Varnado:

PATRICK MILLER LLC

400 Poydras Street

New Orleans, LA 70130

BY: MARC MICHAUD, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiff Maye Ramirez:

SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLP

35 East State Street

Media, PA 19063

BY: JAMES C. SHAH, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs John Stephens and Bill Turner:

DICELLO, LEVITT & CASEY LLC

Ten North Dearborn Street - 11th Floor

Chicago, IL 60602

BY: ADAM J. LEVITT, ESQUIRE

BEASLEY, ALLEN, CROW, METHVIN, PORTIS &

MILES, P.C.

272 Commerce Street

Montgomery, AL 36103

BY: W. DANIEL MILES, III, ESQUIRE

For Plaintiffs Victor Feldman and Dennis Overstreet:

QUINN, CONNOR, WEAVER, DAVIES & ROUCO

LLP

Two North 20th Street - Suite 930

Birmingham, AL 35203

BY: RICHARD P. ROUCO, ESQUIRE

For Defendants FCA U.S. and FCA N.V.:

SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP

125 Broad Street

New York, NW 10004

BY: ROBERT J. GIUFFRA, JR., ESQUIRE

DARRELL S. CAFASSO, ESQUIRE

For Defendant Robert Bosch LLC:

CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

BY: MATTHEW D. SLATER, ESQUIRE

Appearances According to the "Confirmed Telephonic Appearance Schedule":

Henry C. Barnett

Kathryn P. Caballero

Jodi W. Flowers

William B. Monahan

Sara Randazzo

Patti Waldmeir

Earnest Wotring

Ryan B. Beene

Katherine Charonko

Archie I. Grubb, II

Katy Pape

David Shepardson

Jon F. Worm

Wednesday - May 24, 2017

10:07 a.m.

2

1

PROCEEDINGS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

---000---

THE CLERK: Calling 17-MD-2777, In Re Chrysler-Dodge-Jeep EcoDiesel Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation and all the member cases.

Counsel, please come to the podium and say your name for the record and also please say your name before you speak.

MS. CABRASER: Good morning, Your Honor. Elizabeth Cabraser of Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein appearing this morning on behalf of the Fasching, Kitchel, and other plaintiffs. With me is my partner, David Stellings.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Cabraser.

MR. BERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Steve Berman on behalf of the Chavez plaintiffs.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Berman.

MR. SARKO: Good morning, Your Honor. Lynn Sarko from Keller Rohrback on behalf of the Fasching plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good to see you, Mr. Sarko.

MR. WARREN: Good morning. Joe Warren for the United States. We're here on behalf of the Environmental Protection Agency.

> THE COURT: Great. Thank you.

MS. RENDE: Good morning, Your Honor. Leigh Rende, R-E-N-D-E, for the United States as well. Mr. Warren will be

speaking for the United States today. 1 2 THE COURT: Thank you. MS. WOLFSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Tina Wolfson 3 of Ahdoot & Wolfson on behalf of Kayla Kelley and John 4 Milligan, plaintiffs. 5 THE COURT: Good morning. 6 MR. CECCHI: Good morning, Your Honor. James 7 Cecchi -- Carella, Bryne, Cecchi -- on behalf of the Chavez 8 plaintiffs. 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Cecchi. 10 MR. TELLIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Roland Tellis, 11 Baron & Budd, on behalf of the Kitchel, K-I-T-C-H-E-L, 12 13 plaintiffs. 14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 15 MR. LEOPOLD: Good morning, Your Honor. Ted Leopold 16 on behalf of the Chavez plaintiffs with the law firm of Cohen 17 Milstein, Sellers & Toll. 18 THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. MR. SCARPULLA: Good morning, Your Honor. Francis 19 20 Scarpulla on behalf of two of the plaintiffs, Walker and Rugg. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Scarpulla. 21 MR. HERRERA: Good morning, Your Honor. Nicomedes 22 23 Herrera with the Joseph Saveri Law Firm. We represent plaintiff Jason Gaines. 24

THE COURT: Thank you.

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ALMONRODE: Sharon Almonrode for the Chavez plaintiffs. I'm appearing in the stead of my partner, E. Powell Miller, who is having a motion today in Michigan on a case that is ready to go to trial. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MR. SAVERI: Good morning, Your Honor. Joseph Saveri on behalf of Plaintiff Gaines. THE COURT: Good morning. MR. GIBBS: Good morning, Your Honor. Eric Gibbs, Girard Gibbs, on behalf of Charles Marlatt and Stanley Bruce. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MS. ZEMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Amy Zeman, also with Gerard Gibbs, on behalf of the Marlatt plaintiffs. THE COURT: Thanks. MR. HEYGOOD: Good morning, Your Honor Michael Heygood -- Heygood, Orr & Pearson -- on behalf of the Leocadio plaintiff group. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Heygood. MS. SLAUGHTER: Good morning, Your Honor. Stacey Slaughter from Robins Kaplan on behalf of the plaintiff, Chatom Motor Company. THE COURT: Thank you. MR. MILLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Charles Miller -- Heygood, Orr & Pearson -- on behalf of the Leocadio plaintiffs.

THE COURT: All right. 1 MR. CASEY: Good morning, Your Honor. Dave Casey on 2 behalf of Casey Gerry on the Sebastian case. 3 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Casey. 4 MR. HAGSTROM: Good morning, Your Honor. Richard 5 Hagstrom, Hellmuth & Johnson, on behalf of Friedenfels. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr Hagstrom. 8 MR. MICHAUD: Good morning, Your Honor. Marc Michaud on behalf of plaintiffs Bret Rivero and Jamie Varnado. 9 10 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. 11 MS. JENSEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Rachel Jensen of Robbins, Geller, Rudman & Dowd on behalf of Kitchel and 12 13 Johnson plaintiffs. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 MR. GILBERT: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert 16 Gilbert from Miami on behalf of plaintiffs in the Kitchel case. 17 THE COURT: Great. Thank you. MR. SEAVER: Good morning. Todd Seaver of the law 18 19 firm of Berman DeValerio on behalf of plaintiff Nathan 20 Friedenfels. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. 22 MS. SMITH: Good morning, Your Honor. Catherine 23 Sung-Yun Smith on behalf of the plaintiff Friedenfels. 24 **THE COURT:** Thank you. 25 MR. STRANCH: Good morning, Your Honor. Gerard

Stranch -- Bransetter, Tranch & Jennings -- on behalf of the 1 Fasching, Miller, and other plaintiffs. 2 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Stranch. 3 MR. BAILEY: How do you do, Your Honor. I'm Ben 4 Bailey, Bailey Glasser, on behalf of the Fasching plaintiffs 5 and the Derek Johnson plaintiffs and others. 6 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning. MR. SHAH: Good morning, Your Honor. James Shah --8 Shepherd, Finkelman, Miller & Shah - on behalf of the Ramirez 9 10 plaintiffs. 11 THE COURT: Thanks. MS. SCULLION: Good morning, Your Honor. Jennifer 12 13 Scullion, Seeger Weiss, on behalf of the Chavez plaintiffs. 14 Your Honor, I'm here on behalf of my partner, Christopher 15 Seeger, who is preparing for trial and apologizes that he could 16 not be here today. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MR. MASTANDO: Good morning, Your Honor. D. Anthony 18 Mastando of Mastando & Artrip here on behalf of the Chavez 19 20 plaintiffs. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. MR. ARTRIP: Good morning, Judge. Eric Artrip from 22 23 Mastando & Artrip here on behalf of the Chavez plaintiffs. THE COURT: Good morning. 24 25 MR. LEVITT: Good morning, Your Honor. Adam Levitt

with DiCello, Levitt & Casey here on behalf of the Stephens and 1 Turner plaintiffs. 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 3 MS. WEAVER: Good morning, Your Honor. Leslie Weaver 4 on behalf of the Fasching and Johnson plaintiffs with the firm 5 Bleichmar, Fonti & Auld. 6 7 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. RICE: Good morning, Your Honor. Joe Rice with 8 Motley Rice from Charleston, South Carolina on behalf of the 9 Fasching plaintiffs and others. 10 11 THE COURT: Welcome. Thank you. MR. MILES: Good morning, Your Honor. D. Miles from 12 13 the Beasley Allen firm in Montgomery, Alabama on behalf of 14 plaintiffs Turner and Stephens. 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Miles. 16 MR. ROUCO: Good morning, you Your Honor. Richard 17 Rouco on behalf of the Feldman and Overstreet plaintiffs. THE COURT: Great. Thank you. 18 I think I should have had a Polaroid camera here and --19 20 ask me to remember everybody's names, but I will. MR. GIUFFRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert 21 Giuffra, that's G-I-U-F-F-R-A, from Sullivan & Cromwell for FCA 22 23 N.V., which is the holding company that owns FCA U.S., and FCA U.S. is basically the old Chrysler which was ultimately 24 25 purchased by Fiat at out of bankruptcy.

I'm here with my partner Darrell Cafasso. It's really 1 good to be here. 2 THE COURT: You are representing both FCA N.V. and FCA 3 U.S.? 4 5 MR. GIUFFRA: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Great. Thank you. 6 7 MR. SLATER: Your Honor, Matthew Slater, S-L-A-T-E-R, of Cleary Gottlieb on behalf of Robert Bosch LLC, one of the 8 defendants. 9 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, everyone. 11 What I wanted to do today -- this is really a very preliminary gathering. Of course you know that in two weeks, 12 13 we are going to be hearing the motion for appointment of lead 14 counsel and steering committee, and so I think the bulk of the work will proceed thereafter. But I did want to have this 15 16 preliminary meeting to find out some information and sort of 17 set the tone for various things. So first of all, I read or heard on the news yesterday and 18 now I've read the Complaint of the United States lawsuit filed 19 20 in the Eastern District, and so let me ask, since we have Department of Justice here, where you -- how you think that 21 impacts what we are doing here, and are you expecting 22 23 consolidation with this case? Come on up. Come up to the microphone. 24

MR. WARREN: Joe Warren for the United States.

25

Yes. That's correct. We filed our action yesterday in the Eastern District of Michigan and immediately filed a notice of potential tag-along with the MDL panel so we do expect to be consolidated here in the near future.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Appreciate that.

Before we go further, let me also acknowledge that there are a number of parties on the phone. I think I'm not going to read all their names, but a number of counsel representing some of the parties within the related actions here are listening in, as well as various interested parties. And we do have a list, and we'll keep that for the record. But I won't go through and name all those.

Let me ask then the FCA -- of FCA, Mr. Giuffra, you had in your preliminary statement indicated that there was a software, sort of, fix that had been submitted to the EPA and the CARB, and that you were awaiting response with the hopes that that might go some ways towards a resolution of this.

Do you have any further developments to report in that regard?

MR. GIUFFRA: Yes, I do, Your Honor.

On May 18th, FCA U.S. resubmitted applications for conditional approval with EPA and CARB for model year 2017 Jeep Grand Cherokee and Ram 1500s, including for modified emissions software calibrations.

Let me focus on what this case is about and why that's

important.

This case arises out of Notices of Violation that were filed until January by EPA and CARB asserting that Fiat -- that FCA U.S. had not disclosed eight auxiliary emissions control devices which effectively control the software on the emissions systems in the trucks. And the case concerns roughly 104,000 model year 2014 and 2016 Ram 1500s and Jeep Grand Cherokees, and they have three-liter V6 engines.

The key point here is notwithstanding the lawsuit that was filed yesterday by the Department of Justice, FCA is completely committed to working with EPA and CARB to get the calibrations approved for the 2017s.

Why does that matter?

Because essentially the engines are largely the same and both -- all the vehicles from the 2014s to the 2017s have what we believe to be state-of-the-art emissions control systems.

And so we believe that the new software calibrations that will be put in the 2017s, if that gets approved -- because those vehicles are not now currently being sold -- will address the regulators' concerns, and that the vehicles -- and this is very important -- will comply with the originally-certified emissions standards, and that's Tier 2 Bin 5, and that will not have an impact on either performance or fuel economy.

Now, if we get that approved -- and there has been/a lot of discussions back and forth in a cooperative basis between

FCA and CARB and EPA, and there has been testing, and I think we've made good progress based on what I've been told.

So before the very first hearing, we have put forward an emissions modification that we think will address the issue that's raised in all of these lawsuits.

THE COURT: What is the expected timeline, do you think?

MR. GIUFFRA: Well, we're hopeful that EPA and CARB will move very quickly, and it's our understanding that were they to approve this in a matter of weeks, we would be in a position to have this software calibration -- the technical term of art, it would be a reflash of the system.

I have learned from doing car cases that cars are very much full of a lot of computer systems in them now, and you essentially would take your truck back to the dealership, and it would be reflashed within probably, you know, less than 30 minutes, and the system, all the -- any of the issues with respect to the systems that have been raised by the regulators would be addressed.

Interestingly enough if you read the Complaint yesterday, the Government identifies a number of AECDs that it says were not disclosed, and there's arguments -- it's a very complicated -- the regulations are very complicated, and people in good faith can disagree about what something should be or should not be disclosed, and that's obviously something we have

to work out with the EPA and CARB.

But the important point is that of those eight AECDs that were in the original calibration, none of them are being taken out. They are being recalibrated, readjusted.

So the important point here is that we believe we can, number one, address the regulators' concerns, recalibrate the software. We don't need to put in new hardware. We believe the cars can be recalibrated and, to use an expression, "fixed," at least to satisfy the regulators' concerns, in a manner that will fully have them be emissions compliant and will not have an impact on performance.

And, you know, again, we're fully committed as a company to working with the regulators to address this issue, and, you know, we believe that it will work.

THE COURT: Is there any dispute that, regardless of whether these are, quote, defeat devices or not and whether adequate disclosures have been made with respect to these control devices, that as we sit here now, there are about 100,000 cars or vehicles that are -- whose emissions exceed the current EPA and CARB standards?

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, we're not prepared to concede that point right now.

Our position is that one could say -- this whole question about what is a, quote/unquote, defeat device or not, it's permissible under the regulations in certain circumstances to

have the emissions software system operate in a different way, depending on, for example, if you're driving a truck up a road or if you're carrying a big load and it's -- there is a lot of complexity in it.

I'm not aware of the government asserting yet the extent that there are excess emissions or not. And more importantly --

THE COURT: That is alleged in their Complaint.

MR. GIUFFRA: Yes. But they haven't quantified the amount of the excess emissions. The plaintiffs do make some assertions in that regard, but even there, the testing that the plaintiffs have done is so-called on-road PEMS testing, and that is subject to -- for example, if you have a heavy load in the vehicle, if you drive it up a hill and if it's a hot day, you will have emissions higher than Tier 2 Bin 5, and that's expected under the regulations, depending on how you're driving the car.

The macropoint, Your Honor, that we would like to make is before the very first hearing in this case, we have proposed, we have submitted, there have been months of discussions with the regulators for a solution that will address the issues that are raised in the Department of Justice's Complaint and we believe in the civil Complaints to the point where the vehicles will be compliant.

You know, we can disagree about what should have been

disclosed or not disclosed, what is or is not a defeat device, but if we can get the certification for the 2017s, because essentially it can be applied to the earlier vehicles, there will be no issue here, in our view.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Let me ask, Mr. Warren, do you have any observations or comments or anything to enlighten us at this point about what we just talked about?

MR. WARREN: Sure, yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

The United States is obviously interested in getting the cars that are on the road, the model year vehicles for 2014 through 2016, repaired as quickly as possible.

And we are in agreement that if the application that's been submitted by FCA for 2017 is approved, that's a good first step toward getting the cars on the road fixed.

Where there is an area of disagreement is I can't endorse the view that we're a few weeks away from the regulators approving the FCA application that was just submitted with regard to these vehicles.

EPA, in conjunction with CARB, are working very closely in reviewing that application and doing testing to try to determine whether these vehicles can be certified as being in compliance with the Clean Air Act, but at this point, we can't say with certainty if they will be approved or when they will be approved.

THE COURT: Do you have any sense at all as to the progression, how quickly is this -- if not a few weeks, is it something that would -- might take months, or what's your best --

MR. WARREN: Obviously the preference would be that it happen quickly, but at the same time, you know, if past is prologue, as FCA counsel has pointed out, these -- we're not at the starting line in terms of reviewing the 2017 application.

There has been ongoing discussions between EPA, CARB, and FCA. It's already taken some time, so it's hard to predict what the future will hold.

Lastly, I should clarify that -- I am not sure FCA counsel raised this. It is our view that, again, if the 2017 vehicles should be certified as being in compliance, that that's really, for us, a first step toward repairing the vehicles on the road. In our view, there would be a number of steps, and those steps to make the -- you know, preferably for the fix to happen quickly, we think it would happen potentially through a settlement, and such a settlement we think would need to take -- be one that would be filed with this Court and a consent decree following public notice and comment.

THE COURT: Right.

All right. Well, I raise the question about the emissions issue because that underscores the urgency to move this along one way or the other. Whether we're going to do it on a

settlement track or litigation track, the public interest demands that we move forward quickly while this process is still in the works, I guess, before EPA and CARB.

I say that sort of in response to FCA's suggestion of a possible stay of proceedings. I think there was a hint in the papers that perhaps this Court should pause and see what happens, and I -- given this situation, I -- and the uncertainty as to how long this is going to take, I, frankly, don't see any basis to not move forward.

Certainly in the beginning stages of this case to get this case organized, we're going to move forward, and we will go forward with the hearing on, I think it's the 14th, on counsel selection, and then after that, I think I scheduled a date, if I'm not mistaken, with respect to possible appointment of a Settlement Master.

Which leads me to my next question, Mr. Giuffra, and that is obviously there are some, quote, repeat players, close quote, here that have been through the VW process, and in some ways, it's been remarked how quickly that very complicated situation got resolved through the hard work of all the parties.

And I want to get your sense as to whether you see this -the VW case as providing some kind of a template for how this
case might proceed, or do you see this case being fundamentally
different in some ways?

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, I think there are similarities and there are differences. I think cases are like children. You know, my children are not all the same.

And, you know, in VW, there were some cars -- and this was the later, bigger SUV-type cars -- that the company thought it could fix, and there's a process now under way to try to fix those cars.

And with respect to those cars, you know, the issue of buy-back was -- at least the current Settlement Agreement provides those cars don't have to be bought back.

But I think the big difference between the cases, at least at this point, is that FCA has proposed -- and this is after months of discussion with EPA and CARB, including test results going back and forth -- last week a proposed fix, you know, before the very first court hearing, and that did not happen in the other case.

And it believes that fix is one that can address all of the concerns raised by the Department of Justice, EPA, and CARB, and it believes that it can do so in a way that will not impact fuel performance -- performance or fuel economy.

And the reason why that becomes important is because all the folks over there obviously are looking to see whether there has been any diminution in value of the vehicles. If there has been no diminution in value because the vehicles perform the same way because the fuel economy is the same, that obviously

goes to damages, and the claim that has been made -- and just to give an example, in the Chavez Complaint at 122, the theory is that FCA will not be able to make -- this is a quote.

"FCA will not be able to make the affected vehicles comply with emissions standards without substantially degrading their performance characteristics, including horsepower and efficiency."

Now, if our position is that we can address the emissions issues without substantially degrading performance characteristics, including horsepower and efficiency, the basis for the damages claim goes away.

Similarly, you know, they claim that -- in allegation to paragraph 64, that the vehicles will be worth less in the marketplace.

Well, if the vehicles can be fixed and they can be fixed through a software flash, there wouldn't be any diminution of value; therefore, no damages.

So I think in this particular case, our position respectfully is we want to get the vehicles fixed; we want to work with our regulators; we want to try to move the ball forward; and we think if the fix is approved with a new emissions calibration, that that will go a long way toward resolving the lawsuit.

Now, the plaintiffs obviously are not going to accept all of that. And I think the proper way to proceed would be, you

know, appoint a plaintiff Steering Committee. They will file a consolidated Complaint. We will respond to the consolidated Complaint.

I would hope -- what I meant maybe, Your Honor, is once we get the approval, I think we can get going in a couple of weeks to actually put it out into the field.

You know, this is a complicated process. It's already been going on for a number of months. When you have a new vehicle, it can sometimes take more than a year to have the back-and-forth between the regulators and the car company.

So we're hopeful it can be done -- you know, the Government says not two weeks. Maybe it's several months. But we would really like to get it done. And then once it's done, you know, the plaintiffs can evaluate whether the emissions calibration does address the issues that are raised in the Complaint, and we can go forward.

THE COURT: What if the fix is not approved? What is your Plan B at that point?

MR. GIUFFRA: You know, I think if the new calibration is not approved, then we're probably in a litigation situation for some period of time, unfortunately, which we would like to avoid because obviously we want to make sure that our customers are satisfied and we want to do right by our regulators.

But we strongly believe that we have proposed a -- an emissions calibration that will work.

And the big difference between this case and the other case is that for some of the vehicles in the other case, it was not possible to fix the cars to the certified standard.

In this particular case, the company's position is that it can address the regulators' concerns fully, as well as not impact performance.

And I think that's in part because these are -- these are big trucks with state-of-the-art emissions systems. And it appears, when you think about this as a logical matter, if all really that you're talking about is putting in a new software calibration, you know, we believe that part of the issue here was that the people at the company, you know, didn't do -- maybe didn't do the right job or there were disagreements or good-faith disagreements about what to be disclosed and when to disclose it, and we're trying to address it now.

Obviously we have a Complaint against us from the

Department of Justice which we'll have to deal with, and

Your Honor will be there. So a settlement process certainly

would make sense with the Government. We would like to resolve

our Complaint with the Government, and there may be a need for

one with the plaintiffs. I don't know.

But speed is obviously extremely important to the company.

THE COURT: Well, I think it's important for the reasons I stated in the public interest that we move this along. And so I do intend to move forward, knowing that there

is a process in the works that may or may not yield something.

But what I wanted to get a sense from you is if your recalibration or your software fix is not acceptable to the regulators, are we going to be in a similar mode in terms of trying to negotiate a larger resolution as happened in the VW case, or is this going to be sort of battle-by-battle sort of litigation on every front?

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, I think it's probably too early to tell.

In VW, the one point that did come forward was even with respect to the vehicles that could not be fixed fully to the certified standard, the company still reached an agreement with the PSC. That process of getting approvals done that I mentioned before for the vehicles that have -- that were fixable through a software fix -- you know, software fix, hundred percent compliant, that process is still going on after the settlement. And it probably will be resolved later this year. So that's another template one could use for resolving this.

I think what FCA is hoping for here is a simpler process whereby it actually -- it's already made the proposed calibration. It's shared test results with the Government. It thinks it has a calibration that works.

Assuming the regulators approve it, then we would go and put it in the field and have all the customers address it.

Then to the extent there is any issues, they've been resolved.

Obviously, the plaintiffs may have a different view of that and they would have to be part of that process, and then we try to resolve both cases.

THE COURT: All right.

Let me ask you with respect to preservation, you have addressed that in your statement in terms of litigation holds. I want to make sure that the preservation and litigation holds that have gone out encompass all -- both FCA N.V. in Italy as well as FCA U.S., that this is a worldwide preservation directive.

MR. GIUFFRA: Yes, it is, Your Honor. And we obviously have taken it very seriously.

The first hold, which was an investigative hold based on the fact that we were hearing from the Government, was in January 15, 2016. It's been updated three times.

Then we did a civil litigation hold, and it's largely coterminous with the investigative hold. Just certain tweaks to address things that the plaintiffs were focused on. That was first issued on December 15, 2016. It's been updated again.

These holds cover roughly 190 employees from around the world. They cover employees in the engineering, emissions certification, manufacturing, quality assurance, sales, finance, and the company's senior executives.

The holds cover matters relating to the engine development, marketing the sale of the vehicles, notifications to the Government, compliance with environmental and securities laws, public statements the company has made. And they are very broad.

They also cover records of all types, including obviously electronic, and we've taken steps to, you know, deal with the risk, for example, that someone might delete something from their inbox. And the way the hold works is it's done electronically, and it prevents the permanent deletion of emails and preserves emails on the company's servers right now indefinitely.

So we're confident that our holds are sufficient and satisfactory, and they operate around the world, and it also includes VM Motori, which is an important company --

THE COURT: That is what I was going to ask. It does include VM?

MR. GIUFFRA: Yes.

Just to give some background on the entire situation, which I think is important, FCA did not buy 100 per of VM Motori until October 2013. It first bought, I believe, 50 percent in 2010. It was a joint venture with General Motors/Roger Penske.

The engines were developed by this joint venture company.

Much of the development work was done prior to when FCA bought

100 percent of VM Motori. VM Motori is a very important player 1 in the whole question of the calibration of the software for 2 3 purposes of these engines. THE COURT: All right. And so VM Motori, as well as 4 North America, is covered by the hold --5 MR. GIUFFRA: Yes. 6 THE COURT: And is the hold any different -- based on 7 the VW experience that you had, is this similar scope then in 8 terms of the hold that's been issued? 9 10 MR. GIUFFRA: Well, I wouldn't want to compare. were issues actually before I got involved in the case with the 11 VW document holds. 12 13 THE COURT: I didn't mean to imply they were the same. 14 MR. GIUFFRA: As far --15 THE COURT: Knowing what you know --16 MR. GIUFFRA: As far as I know, there have been no 17 issues with respect to the FCA document holds, and the only issues that come up in both -- whenever you deal with a 18 European company is that there are issues with respect to, you 19 20 know, data privacy rules in Europe, and we've addressed those, and we're confident that the documents that are needed for the 21 22 litigation -- and that's litigation by the United States as

THE COURT: Right.

well as the plaintiffs --

23

24

25

MR. GIUFFRA: -- will exist.

THE COURT: Right.

Finally, what -- are there -- are you expecting more tag-along cases and are there cases pending in state courts that I should be aware of?

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, right now, I'm not aware of any state court cases. I think to the extent there have been any, I think we've removed them.

THE COURT: Are you expecting -- do you know of any more tag-alongs that are likely to come?

MR. GIUFFRA: The only one I was aware of, actually, was the Government yesterday, and they filed in Detroit, and if they didn't tag it, we were going to tag it.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

At the risk of opening the floodgates here -- and I'm going to shut that floodgate very quickly if it turns into a flood -- but I just want to hear at this juncture whether there are any concerns on the plaintiffs' side about the scope of the litigation holds or the preservation order, if anybody has any comments on that?

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, my -- I want to correct one thing.

My colleague indicated to me -- and I had forgotten this -- we do have some state court cases in Texas.

THE COURT: What is the status of --

MR. GIUFFRA: There is a state court MDL being formed

in Texas.

THE COURT: State court MDL. Okay.

MR. GIUFFRA: We would like it all to be before Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. All right.

And let me ask, Mr. Slater, in terms of litigation hold, do you something similar to report?

MR. SLATER: Yes, Your Honor.

We've -- we have litigation holds in place both with Robert Bosch LLC AND the United States. And we've been working with the parent company, Robert Bosch GmbH in Germany, to ensure that there are holds in place there as well. And we think that it's comprehensive of the issues that might arise in litigation. They have been in place for a long time. They have been updated over time as needed, and we have identified any potential new sources of information and think that we're in good shape.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And since Bosch is here, let me also -- I want to disclose, to complete the record here, that I am an unnamed member in the VW/Bosch case. I happen to have a vehicle that was covered by that. I don't see a conflict. But out of abundance of caution, I have renounced any entitlement or interest in the Bosch portion of the settlement that I guess is still pending. And since Bosch is a party here, I don't think

it's really related, but I'm renouncing -- I have already sent my letter in renouncing any part of that. But I did want to disclose that to all the parties here.

So let me go back to the plaintiffs' side, whether there are any comments or concerns about the litigation hold.

Pending appointment of lead counsel and everything else, do we -- do I need to address anything at this point?

MR. BERMAN: Very briefly, Steve Berman.

I raised this issue with Mr. Giuffra, and that is when I looked at the types of devices that were subject to the litigation hold, I had a concern that text messages on employees' phones were not being preserved, and that could be a very valuable source of evidence.

We just finished the deposition in the General Motors case where text messages are very important because these employees get excited. They text each other. "Hey, look what's happening."

Mr. Giuffra didn't respond. I'm sure he has an answer for the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Giuffra.

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, it's my understanding that the scope of the hold picks up text messages. The only issue, of course, is that unlike, say, with a computer server where the company can control the server, you know, with text messages, it may be a little more difficult to make sure that

someone isn't deleting a text message --

THE COURT: Has a directive gone out --

MR. GIUFFRA: Every single -- the notices all talk about preserving text messages, so that's been covered. The only issue -- the caveat I'm making is that unlike a computer server where the company can freeze the computer server, a text message is a little more complicated.

THE COURT: You have to rely on the directive to the custodian of that device?

MR. GIUFFRA: Yes.

I'll go back after we walk out of court today and I'll even speak to Mr. Berman, if he would like. If someone has a better idea to make sure we do that, I will do something different. But I know the actual scope of the hold picks up text messages.

THE COURT: All right.

Any other comments?

All right. A question has been raised in anticipation of the hearing on the 14th as to how we're going to conduct that.

And I intend to allow each person that wants a place, either in leadership or on the Steering Committee, to make a short presentation. I have the paperwork.

I think Judge Breyer limited it to -- was it two minutes?

I don't have 156 or whatever it was, so I can be slightly more expansive in that time, but, you know, three minutes or

something like that. But I will give an opportunity for everyone who wants to to make a short presentation.

And I will want the parties to also address, particularly those who have applied for the leadership positions -- and I may have -- take a little bit more time in that regard, sort of what you envision as the structure. That's been addressed to a certain extent, but maybe more specifics about the structure and the potential size of that -- of the Steering Committee and whether that needs to be much different.

Some have already commented on that, but I do want to hear more comments, especially as this case evolves, now that the United States has come into the case and we begin to see what this might look like.

So that's what we will do. We will convene on the 14th, and this will probably take the better part of the day or a good part of the day.

But I do intend to move this case forward because notwithstanding the submission of the potential software fix, I have no assurance -- we have no assurance at this point whether that's going to be accepted, how long it's going to take to work that out, what the impact will be.

In the meantime, at least as alleged, there are 100,000 vehicles on the road whose emissions of nitrogen oxide appears to, at least allegedly, exceed current EPA and CARB guidelines, and so that underscores the urgency to move expeditiously,

whether by way of a resolution or by way of litigation. And if we are going to go the litigation route, there are obviously going to be a number of issues that have to be addressed, and -- because of the complexity of this case, but I intend to move forward if that's the route we're going to take. So unless there is any other comments, which I'm not inviting necessarily, but if somebody feels the urge, we will reconvene on the 14th. MR. GIUFFRA: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you everyone for coming. (Proceedings adjourned at 10:46 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Thursday, May 25, 2017 DATE: Pamela A. Batalo Pamela A. Batalo, CSR No. 3593, RMR, FCRR U.S. Court Reporter