UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION This Document Relates to: All Cases	Case No. 25-md-3140 Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

JOINT RULE 26(f) REPORT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) and Case Management Order No. 1, the Parties respectfully submit this Rule 26(f) report and proposed discovery plan.

I. RULE 26 CONFERENCE

Pursuant to Case Management Order No. 1, the Parties held a Rule 26(f) meeting on March 3, 2025. The meeting took place at Dechert LLP, 1095 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY, and was attended by the following individuals[1]:

For Plaintiffs	For Defendants
Chris Seeger	*For Pfizer:*
Dave Buchanan	Joe Petrosinelli
Jennifer Hoekstra	Jess Rydstrom
Bryan Aylstock	Megan Bechtel

[1] Special Master David Herndon attended as well as Orran Brown and Jake Woody from BrownGreer PLC.

For Plaintiffs	For Defendants
Ellen Relkin Virginia Buchanan Tracy Finken Caleb Seeley Savannah Green Alana Bevan Elizabeth Koenig (ESI Vendor; ILS)	Loren Brown Ed Gramling (Director of Legal Operations, Pfizer) *For Viatris/Greenstone:* Clem Trischler Jason Reefer Frank Stoy Mark Cheffo Mara Cusker Gonzalez Brad Matta (Viatris/Greenstone Legal) Rob DeFerrari (Viatris/Greenstone Legal) Charles Beall *For Prasco:* PJ Cosgrove Kevin Bandy Georgia Hatzis Dan Neal (Chief Technology Officer; Prasco)

At the Rule 26(f) meeting as well as in subsequent meet and confers, the Parties discussed, among other things: (1) overall scheduling for the MDL, including the sequence of discovery; (2) BrownGreer's services as the MDL's Data Administrator and host of a centralized document repository; (3) Defendants' IT infrastructure,

computer systems, and hard-copy archives, including the location of potentially discoverable material; (4) custodians; (5) custodial and non-custodial sources of data; (6) an ESI protocol; (7) technology assisted review and Pfizer's search term process; (8) a centralized document repository; (9) a confidentiality and privilege order including phased privilege review; (10) a deposition protocol; (11) a direct filing order and a service order; (12) Defendants' corporate structure; (13) Rule 26 initial disclosures; (14) Science Day; (15) simplified service and master pleadings; (16) certain medical monitoring class issues; (17) a Plaintiff threshold proof of use and injury questionnaire with associated order; and (18) dismissal of the authorized generic distributor Defendants. Additionally, per Case Management Order No. 1, the Parties were accompanied by technical consultants and, in the case of Defendants, in-house counsel or IT personnel.

In advance of the Rule 26(f) meeting, the Parties exchanged several draft orders and preliminary information requests; Plaintiffs further provided Defendants with early Rule 34 Document Requests on March 2, 2025, to facilitate meaningful discussions on discovery from Defendants. These early exchanges, together with the comprehensive agenda guided by Case Management Order No. 1 and further developed by the Parties, facilitated a very productive Rule 26(f) meeting. As discussed in further detail below, the Parties made substantial progress on these issues, including with respect to the draft orders attached hereto as **Exhibits A-G**.

II. DIRECT FILING

The Parties discussed and agreed upon a Proposed Direct Filing order, which is attached hereto as **Exhibit A.**

III. SERVICE OF PROCESS

The Parties discussed an abbreviated service procedure using BrownGreer's MDL Centrality platform and emailed or electronic-only service. The Parties agreed upon a Proposed Order to that end, which is attached hereto as **Exhibit B.**

IV. PLEADINGS, PROPOSED DEADLINES, PROTECTIVE PROTOCOLS

A. Master and Short Form Pleadings

The Parties discussed the benefits of master and short form pleadings. The Parties agreed that, given the Pilot Case process and the anticipated deadlines involved with the common defenses, master and short form pleadings are not contemplated at this time. The Parties discussed that the motions regarding the common defenses or preemption and general causation would be filed and addressed on both the master docket for all cases and the individual Pilot Cases, and that the Court's rulings on these issues would apply to all claims in the MDL.

B. Scheduling Deadlines for the Pilot Cases

The Parties discussed scheduling deadlines for the Pilot Cases. The Parties worked collaboratively to set deadlines for amending pleadings, adding parties, and discovery for the early common defenses that aligned with the Court's preference for simultaneous discovery tracks of no more than 120 days for preemption and 180

days for general causation as expressed in CMO No. 1. All Defendants stated they would not file any Rule 12 motion and agreed to answer and provide Rule 26(a)(1) initial disclosures. Plaintiffs indicated that they anticipate expert testimony in support of their opposition to any dispositive motion regarding preemption; Defendants disagree that any expert testimony or evidence will be relevant to their preemption motions. The Parties discussed that the authorized generic DMPA distributor defendants (Greenstone and Prasco) do not own and never have owned the NDA for Depo-Provera, and, as such, the grounds upon which Prasco and Greenstone base their respective preemption motions will differ from Pfizer's. The Parties agreed upon a Proposed Scheduling Order for the Pilot Cases, attached hereto as **Exhibit C.**

Key deadlines from the Proposed Order include the following:

March 13, 2025	Deadline for Pilot Case Plaintiff(s) to file amended complaint(s)
March 27, 2025 (14 days after second CMC)	Discovery opens
March 27, 2025 (14 days after second CMC)	Defendants to Answer and serve 26(a)(1) disclosures in Pilot Cases
May 11, 2025 (45 days after start of discovery)	Defendants' certification of completion of document production on preemption and general causation
July 25, 2025 (75 days after Defendants' certification/120 days after start of discovery)	Close of preemption discovery

August 24, 2025 (30 days after close of preemption discovery)	Motions for summary judgment regarding preemption to be filed
September 23, 2025 (30 days after opening preemption motion briefs)	Opposition to preemption MSJs to be filed
September 30, 2025 (7 days after oppositions to preemption motions)	Replies in support of preemption MSJs to be filed, if requested by Defendants and permitted by Court
September 23, 2025 (135 days after Defendants' certification/180 days after start of discovery)	Close of general causation fact discovery
October 23, 2025 (30 days after close of general cause discovery)	Plaintiffs' general causation expert disclosures
November 22, 2025 (30 days after Plaintiffs' general cause expert disclosures)	Defendants' general causation expert disclosures
January 10, 2026 (50 days after Defendants' general cause expert disclosures)	Deadline for depositions of all general causation experts
February 10, 2026 (30 days after deadline for depositions of general cause experts)	Rule 702 motions regarding general causation experts to be filed
March 12, 2026 (30 days after opening Rule 702 motions filed)	Oppositions to Rule 702 motions to be filed
March 19, 2026 (7 days after oppositions to Rule 702 motions)	Replies in support of Rule 702 motions to be filed, if requested by movants and permitted by Court

C. Protective Protocols

The Parties also discussed protocols for protecting sensitive information. The Parties have agreed upon a Proposed Confidentiality Order, which is attached hereto

as **Exhibit D**.[2]

V. THRESHOLD PROOF OF USE AND INJURY

The Parties discussed a threshold proof of use and injury questionnaire at the Rule 26(f) meeting, including compatibility with BrownGreer's MDL Centrality platform. The Parties' agreed upon the proposed Threshold Proof of Use and Proof of Injury Order is attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

VI. COMPUTER SYSTEMS

Defendants shared preliminary information about their IT infrastructure and hard copy archives, including the locations of potentially discoverable material and how it would be collected and retrieved. Pfizer's in-house discovery counsel attended the meeting and responded to questions from Plaintiffs. IT personnel attended from Prasco.

A preliminary list of non-custodial sources of potentially discoverable information includes the following. Additional non-custodial sources continue to be identified:

Pfizer Sources:

Category	**Name and Description**
Collaborative Platforms	SharePoint
Email Systems and Custodial Files	Pfizer Microsoft Outlook (Email)
Hard Copy Archives	Pfizer Central Index of Company Records – CICR (Records Management) – linked to Pfizer's

[2] The Parties' Proposed Confidentiality Order includes the Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d) clawback provision referenced in CMO 1.

Category	Name and Description
	repository of hard copy documents located in Kalamazoo, MI
Labeling	Pfizer Global Document Management System – GDMS (Document Management)
Safety	Adverse Event Monitoring – AEM (Safety/AE)
Safety	Pfizer Argus (Safety/AE)
Safety	Pfizer Analytical and Statistical Tool – PfAST (Safety/AE)
Safety	Drop In Data Entry – DIDE (Safety/AE)
Regulatory	Document Management and Publishing System – DMPS (Document Management)
Regulatory	Pfizer Global Document Management System – GDMS (Document Management)
Regulatory	Pfizer Regulatory Affairs Document Archive & Retrieval System – RADARS (Document Management)
Clinical	Clinical Aggregation Layer (CAL)

As explained by Greenstone and Viatris during the Rule 26 conference, these parties are generally not in possession of any responsive or relevant information related to the products at issue.

By way of background, Viatris Inc. was formed in November 2020 as the result of the combination of Mylan N.V. and Upjohn Inc., a subsidiary of Pfizer Inc. (the "Combination"). As part of the Combination, Greenstone LLC transitioned from a subsidiary of Pfizer Inc. to a subsidiary of Viatris Inc.

Prior to the Combination, Greenstone distributed an authorized generic version of depot-medroxyprogesterone that was manufactured by Pfizer, the NDA holder. Before the Combination was finalized, the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") ordered Pfizer to grant Prasco LLC an exclusive license to distribute authorized generic depot-medroxyprogesterone acetate. The divestiture occurred in September 2020, and Prasco received the license to distribute the authorized generic product when the Combination became effective approximately two months later.

Following the Combination, neither Greenstone nor Viatris has ever marketed, distributed, or sold authorized generic depot-medroxyprogesterone acetate. Moreover, at no time—before or after the Combination—did Greenstone or Viatris ever manufacture or hold an NDA for Depo-Provera.

Importantly for purposes of discovery here, several legacy Pfizer/Greenstone employees transitioned with Greenstone following the Combination. Greenstone and Viatris, however, no longer have access to prior electronic data concerning the product. Likewise, there was no repository of information related to the at-issue product that came with Greenstone when it became a subsidiary of Viatris. Further, because Pfizer divested authorized generic depot-medroxyprogesterone prior to the Combination, there was no reason for Greenstone to attempt to gain access to any legacy data related to the sale of the product. As a result, neither Greenstone nor Viatris are in possession of any responsive or relevant data or information concerning branded Depot-Provera or authorized generic depot-medroxyprogesterone. Instead, all of the relevant

information is in the sole possession of Pfizer, which is not affiliated with Viatris or Greenstone.

This was explained in detail to Plaintiffs at the Rule 26 conference.

Similarly, as explained during the conference, Prasco is an authorized generic distributor. Prasco has never manufactured or held an application for branded Depo-Provera or DMPA. As discussed above, Prasco was granted an authorized generic product license by Pfizer to distribute authorized generic DMPA (and nine other authorized generic products) as a result of an FTC order. Prasco did not begin distributing authorized generic DMPA until November 2020. As an authorized generic distributor that does not manufacture DMPA and does not hold any application for Depo-Provera or DMPA, Prasco does not have a repository of relevant scientific or safety information (among other topics) regarding Depo-Provera or DMPA. Nonetheless, Prasco identifies the following non-custodial data sources generally discussed between Prasco's counsel and Plaintiffs' counsel at the Rule 26 conference:

PRASCO	
TOPIC AREA	NON-CUSTODIAL SOURCE
Hard Copy	SOPs are kept in hard copy binders on site at Prasco. A labeling folder is kept in hard copy on site at Prasco.
Email System	Microsoft Outlook
Product complaint/intake reports of potential adverse events	JD Edwards ERP enterprise solution
Labeling	Prasco shared drives Hard copy folder
SOPs	Prasco shared drives Hard copy binders Qualio
Agreements	Prasco shared drives

VII. CUSTODIANS

In response to Plaintiffs' inquiries, Pfizer disclosed the nature of anticipated custodians, and in subsequent meet and confers, Pfizer identified a preliminary list of eleven (11) custodians. In subsequent meet and confers, Prasco identified two custodians. Greenstone and Viatris have not yet identified any custodians.

VIII. ESI PROTOCOL

In advance of the Rule 26(f) meeting, Plaintiffs proposed an ESI protocol identifying the scope and form of production for each type of ESI, and a method for identifying discoverable ESI through the use of technology assisted review (TAR). Pfizer discussed Pfizer's retention, collection, and process for production using search terms and a validation methodology. The Parties worked hard to resolve certain disputes regarding both ESI format and search and validation protocols. The Parties'

agreed upon the proposed order Governing Production of Documents and Electronically Stored Information is attached hereto as **Exhibit F**. The parties have not yet reached agreement on the search methodology validation process. The parties believe that an agreement can be reached, or, alternatively, any remaining disputes crystallized for the Court's consideration, by March 10, 2025. [3]

IX. PHASED PRIVILEGE REVIEW

The Parties conferred and cooperated in formulating a phased privilege review schedule that begins early in the discovery process and prioritizes certain categories of documents. The privilege logging process is set forth in the agreed Proposed Confidentiality Order attached as **Exhibit D.**

X. DEPOSITION PROTOCOL

The Parties discussed a formal deposition protocol and Plaintiffs proposed a draft protocol during the Rule 26(f) meeting. While Plaintiffs anticipate proceeding with depositions on preliminary and other matters as soon as is reasonably feasible, the timing of Pfizer's document productions will necessitate significant deposition activity during the back end of the preemption discovery period. Accordingly, the Parties agree to dedicate the 30 days prior to the close of preemption discovery to depositions. Plaintiffs and Pfizer agreed to a Proposed Deposition Protocol attached

[3] The Parties acknowledge there may be different search and review methodologies and validation processes (i.e., use of TAR versus use of search terms and linear review) that are better suited for each Defendant, and they will continue working on these issues.

as **Exhibit G.** Plaintiffs, Prasco, Greenstone, and Viatris were unable to agree on the presumptive number of deposition days and submit competing proposals on page three of **Exhibit G.**

XI. SPECIAL MASTER

The Parties conferred and have no objection to the appointment of the Honorable David Herndon (Ret.) to aid the Court in its management of the MDL.

Plaintiffs also submit a Proposed Order Appointing CPA Randy Sansom, attached hereto as **Exhibit H**.

XII. SCIENCE DAY

The Parties conferred at the Rule 26(f) meeting as to the benefit to holding a Science Day and agreed that, given the early general causation discovery track in the MDL, it would not be necessary or efficient to hold a Science Day.

XIII. MEDICAL MONITORING CLASS ACTIONS

The parties discussed the pending cases that assert putative medical monitoring classes.[4] Plaintiffs and Defendants agreed that there is no need for a separate class action track, and that the class certification motion deadline should remain stayed during the pendency of resolution of the potentially dispositive common defenses.

XIV. DISMISSAL OF AUTHORIZED GENERIC DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS

[4] *Makishia Greeno v. Pfizer Inc., et al.,* Case No. 3:25-cv-00148-MCR-HTC and *Christine Denelsbeck v. Pfizer, Inc.*, Case No. 2:25-cv-00230 (W.D. Pa.) (filed Feb. 18, 2025).

Plaintiffs and Defendants Greenstone and Prasco discussed potential dismissal of these Defendants, given their role as distributors of authorized generic DMPA that do not hold the Depo-Provera NDA, and that they do not manufacture or label the authorized generic DMPA they distribute. Plaintiffs and Defendants Greenstone and Prasco also discussed dismissal of these Defendants in cases in which the plaintiff's product use of authorized generic DMPA, if any, did not occur during the time period such Defendant distributed authorized generic DMPA.

DATED: March 7, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christopher A. Seeger
Christopher A. Seeger,
Interim Lead and Liaison Counsel
New Jersey State Bar No. 04231990
David R. Buchanan
New Jersey State Bar No. 303522019
Caleb Seeley
New Jersey State Bar No. 303522019
Seeger Weiss LLP
55 Challenger Boulevard
Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660
Tel.: (973) 639-9100
cseeger@seegerweiss.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs Blonski and Toney

/s/ Joseph G. Petrosinelli
Joseph G. Petrosinelli
Jessica Bodger Rydstrom
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
680 Maine Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: (202) 434-5547
jpetrosinelli@wc.com

Loren H. Brown
Matthew A. Holian
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020-1104
Telephone: (212) 335-4500
loren.brown@us.dlapiper.com

Counsel for Defendants Pfizer Inc., Pharmacia & Upjohn Co. LLC, and Pharmacia LLC

Bryan F. Aylstock
Jennifer M. Hoekstra
Savannah T. Green
Aylstock, Kreis & Overholtz, PLLC
17 East Main
Street Suite 200
Pensacola, FL 32502
Tel.: (850) 202-1010
baylstock@awkolaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff Toney

Clem C. Trischler
Jason M. Reefer
Alyssa M. Dedola
Frank H. Stoy
PIETRAGALLO GORDON
ALFANO
BOSICK & RASPANTI, LLP
One Oxford Centre, 38th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: (412) 263-1816
cct@pietragallo.com

Counsel for Defendants Greenstone LLC and Viatris Inc.

Ellen Relkin (*pro hac vice pending)*
WEITZ & LUXENBERG, P.C.
700 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
erelkin@weitzlux.com
Tel: 212-558-5500
Fax: 212-344-5461

Counsel for Plaintiff Schmidt

Tracy A. Finken
Anapol Weiss
tfinken@anapolweiss.com
One Logan Square 130 N. 18th Street
Suite 1600
Philadelphia, PA 19103 215-735-1130

Counsel for Plaintiff Valera-Arceo

Paul J. Cosgrove
Kevin M. Bandy
UB GREENSFELDER LLP
312 Walnut St., Suite 1400
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Telephone: (513) 698-5034
pcosgrove@ubglaw.com
Georgia Hatzis
UB GREENSFELDER LLP
1660 West 2nd Street, Suite 1100
Cleveland, OH 44113
Telephone: (216) 583-7474
ghatzis@ubglaw.com

Counsel for Defendant Prasco LLC d/b/a Prasco Laboratories

Virginia M. Buchanan
Christopher G. Paulos
Levin, Papantonio, Proctor, Buchanan,
O'Brien, Barr & Mougey, P.A.
vbuchanan@levinlaw.com
cpaulos@levinlaw.com
316 S Baylen St, Ste 600
Pensacola, FL 32502
(850) 435-7000

Counsel for Plaintiff Wilson

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	Case No. 25-md-3140
This Document Relates to: All Cases	Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

PRETRIAL ORDER NO. __
[Proposed] Stipulated Order on Procedures for Direct Filing

1. Direct Filing Permitted. To promote judicial efficiency and eliminate delays associated with the transfer to this Court of cases filed in or removed to other federal district courts, any Plaintiff whose case would be subject to transfer to MDL No. 3140 may file his or her case directly in the Northern District of Florida, Pensacola Division. The direct filing of actions in MDL No. 3140 is solely for the purposes of consolidated discovery and related pretrial proceedings as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 1407. Each case filed directly into MDL No. 3140 must identify a "Designated Forum," i.e., the federal district in which the Plaintiff would have filed his or her case in the absence of direct filing in the jurisdiction and venue section.[1]

[1] Suggested language for "Designated Forum" could include "*Plaintiff would show the Court that venue would be proper in the [Designated Forum] absent direct filing into this MDL.*

Counsel admitted *pro hac vice* in any other case before this MDL may initiate a separate action in this MDL without local counsel. An attorney who is not admitted *pro hac vice* in any case will be permitted to commence an action directly in this MDL pursuant to this order, provided that counsel must file his or her *pro hac vice* application within 30 days of the direct filing. Any case filed directly into MDL No. 3140 must comply with the prohibition on multi-plaintiff complaints set forth in Case Management Order No. 1, Dkt. 72.

2. No *Lexecon* Waiver. For cases filed directly into MDL No. 3140, the parties preserve and do not waive any and all rights under *Lexecon Inc. v. Milberg Weiss,* 523 U.S. 26 (1998), to have each case remanded to the Designated Forum for trial. Nothing in this order shall preclude the parties from agreeing to *Lexecon* waivers in the future.

3. No Determination Regarding Jurisdiction or Venue. The inclusion of any case in MDL No. 3140, whether such case was or will be filed originally or directly in the Northern District of Florida or transferred or removed to the Northern District of Florida, does not constitute a determination by this Court that jurisdiction or venue is proper in this District or any other Designated Forum. However, for purposes of cases filed pursuant to this Order, Defendants waive any argument that

---

Plaintiff reserves the right to amend this designation of proper venue and forum, once case specific fact and expert discovery is complete."

this Court lacks personal jurisdiction over the Defendants for purposes of coordinated pretrial proceedings but expressly preserve any personal jurisdiction defense that may be raised in an individual case.

4. Future Remands. Nothing herein shall preclude any party from moving for remand or a suggestion of remand, or otherwise seeking transfer under 28 USC § 1404, at any time as ordered by the Court or as otherwise permitted by law, nor from opposing any remand or suggestion of remand.

5. Direct Filing Shall Not Impact Choice of Law. The fact that a case was filed directly in MDL No. 3140 pursuant to this Order will have no impact on choice of law, including the statute of limitations and any statute of repose. Choice of law principles will be determined based on the choice-of-law rules that would have applied in the federal district court of the individual plaintiff's designated venue as specified in his or her complaint.

6. Form, Filing, Service, and Requirements for Direct Filed Complaints; Procedure for Improper for Incomplete Directly Filed Complaints.

A. Prior to directly filing a case pursuant to this Order, counsel for each Plaintiff is instructed to conduct a PACER and/or MDL-Centrality search to ensure that a previous complaint has not been filed for the same plaintiff. Prior to directly filing a case pursuant to this Order, counsel for each Plaintiff shall also make a reasonable effort to determine if that Plaintiff has filed a case in any state court. If

a prior complaint has been filed for the same Plaintiff and that case currently is pending (whether in state court, directly filed into MDL No. 3140, pending transfer from the federal district court where originally filed, or transferred to MDL No. 3140), no subsequent complaint may be filed by a different law firm on behalf of that same Plaintiff. If a subsequent complaint is filed on behalf of any plaintiff already in suit, the Court may pursuant to an Order to Show Cause, dismiss the second filed action. Absent a substitution or withdrawal of counsel, the attorney that filed the original complaint shall presumptively be case counsel for that plaintiff through all stages of the litigation, including trial and resolution, if applicable.

B. Service of a complaint filed pursuant to this Order shall be made in accordance with Pretrial Order No. 

C. Any directly filed complaint that does not comply with the foregoing provisions is subject to the presumptive transfer and/or Order to Show Cause Procedures set forth below.

D. Only a complaint in which a plaintiff alleges she developed intracranial meningioma(s) resulting from her alleged use of Depo-Provera (or depot medroxyprogesterone acetate) may be directly filed in this Court. If a plaintiff directly files into this MDL any complaint that does not allege she developed intracranial meningioma(s) resulting from her alleged use of Depo-Provera (or depot medroxyprogesterone acetate), Defendants may send to the Plaintiff's counsel a

presumptive transfer order, transferring the case to the District in which that Plaintiff resides, and Plaintiff's counsel shall have 14 days to challenge such transfer. If the Plaintiff's counsel and Defendants cannot agree after a meet and confer, the issue may be briefed to the Court. If Plaintiff's counsel fails to timely challenge Defendants' presumptive order, then, at expiration of the 14-day period, Defendants shall submit the presumptive transfer order to the Court for entry.

E. If a Plaintiff directly files a complaint that does not comply with the provisions of this Order, the complaint is presumptively deficient. Defendants shall list presumptively deficient complaints on a proposed "Order to Show Cause" as to why the complaint(s) should not be dismissed and shall provide that list to the individual plaintiffs' counsel for purposes of a meet and confer to occur within thirty (30) days of service. If no resolution can be reached, Defendants may file a request for an Order to Show Cause as to why the complaint(s) should not be dismissed for the Court's consideration within twenty-one (21) days following the meet and confer. The party in favor of consolidation in the MDL will then have seven (7) days to file a response to any response. Such objections and responses must be filed only in MDL No. 3140. No replies will be allowed without leave of Court. Failure to object as set forth herein shall constitute a waiver of any objection to inclusion of the case in the MDL. In the event the Court determines that a direct-filed case should not have been filed in this MDL, the plaintiff shall have 10 days from the date of that

determination to refile in another Court. If a complaint is refiled in another Court, such filing shall not revive any statute of limitations, statutes of repose, or any other time bars for any claims that expired prior to the original filing of the complaint in the MDL.

DONE and **ORDERED** on this ____ day of ____, 2025.

_____

M. CASEY RODGERS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	Case No. 25-md-3140
This Document Relates to: All Cases	Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

PRETRIAL ORDER NO. __
[Proposed] Stipulated Order Regarding Service through MDL Centrality

The parties have agreed to accept online submission and service of Complaints in actions direct filed in or transferred to MDL No. 3140, in the interest of efficiency and judicial economy.

1. ***Manner of Completion and Service.*** Plaintiffs and Defendants shall use the online MDL Centrality System designed and provided by BrownGreer PLC and accessible at www.mdlcentrality.com to complete and serve Complaints, as well as such other notices, discovery, and documents as the Parties may agree in the future, as follows:

A. Each Plaintiff shall, by counsel or as *pro se*, establish a secure online portal in the MDL Centrality online system and obtain authorized usernames and secure login passwords to permit use of MDL Centrality by such counsel or Plaintiff. Except as set forth herein, counsel for a Plaintiff, or each *pro se* Plaintiff, shall be

permitted to view, search, and download on MDL Centrality only those materials submitted by that Plaintiff, and by Defendants relating to that Plaintiff, and not materials submitted by or relating to other Plaintiffs.

B. Each Defendant shall by counsel establish a secure online portal with the MDL Centrality online system and obtain authorized usernames and secure login passwords to permit use of MDL Centrality by Defendant's counsel.

C. Plaintiffs' Co-Leads and Executive Committee shall have access to and be able to view, search and download all materials submitted by all Plaintiffs and all Defendants.

D. Each Plaintiff and Defendant shall use the MDL Centrality System to obtain, complete or upload data, and serve the appropriate documents online (including the upload of PDFs or other electronic records required by the Initial Plaintiff Disclosures).

E. Service of a completed Document shall be deemed to occur when the submitting party has performed each of the steps required by the MDL Centrality System to execute the online submission of the materials, and the submitting party has received confirmation on screen that the Document has been successfully submitted. The records maintained by MDL Centrality concerning service shall be presumed authoritative for purposes of establishing service. Service of a Complaint in this manner shall be deemed effective service under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4.

F. On upload of any Complaint or other document to the MDL Centrality online system, each party being served must be automatically notified by the MDL Centrality system of service via email at the email address associated with such parties' username.

G. To expedite and streamline service of directly filed complaints, the Defendants (Pfizer Inc.; Pharmacia, LLC; Pharmacia & Upjohn Company, LLC; Greenstone LLC; Viatris, Inc.; and Prasco, LLC) have agreed to service via MDL-Centrality. For any other named Defendant(s), plaintiffs must effectuate service of process in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. However, for any newly named Defendant in this MDL, within thirty (30) days of being included and served via a direct-filed complaint, such new Defendants shall meet and confer with the Parties to utilize the MDL Centrality system for service and become compliant with the provisions herein.

H. The Court may establish a secure online portal with the MDL Centrality online system and obtain an authorized username and secure login password to permit use of MDL Centrality by the Court for access to reports and data regarding the Initial Plaintiff Disclosures served through MDL Centrality.

2. ***HIPAA Authorizations.*** By using MDL Centrality, each Plaintiff authorizes the disclosure of his or her medical records and other health information submitted to BrownGreer PLC as the administrator of the MDL Centrality System, the Court,

Plaintiffs' Leadership and Defendants, and to the authorized agents, representatives and experts of the foregoing, in accordance with and as permitted by the terms of the Protective Order herein. BrownGreer PLC shall be responsible for the maintenance and confidentiality of records contained on the MDL Centrality System.

3. ***No Impact on Privileges or Work Product Protection.*** The use of MDL Centrality by any party will not alter or otherwise waive or affect any attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine protection otherwise available that would otherwise apply to a document in the absence of the use of MDL Centrality. Any notations placed on materials, comments entered, or documents stored or uploaded to MDL Centrality by a user will be considered to be the work product of such user unless and until the material is served on or purposefully disclosed to the opposing party through the use of MDL Centrality or otherwise. Pursuant to Rule 502(d) of the Federal Rules of Evidence, this order with respect to privilege and work product doctrine protection applies to any other federal or state proceeding, and the use of MDL Centrality in this litigation therefore will not constitute a waiver in another federal or state proceeding as to any document.

4. ***No Impact on the Scope of Discovery***. Use or action in MDL Centrality will not be deemed to limit the scope of inquiry at depositions and/or admissibility of evidence at trial. The scope of inquiry at depositions will remain governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the admissibility of information will be

governed by the Federal Rules of Evidence and applicable law. No objections or rights are waived as a result of any response in the Initial Plaintiff Disclosures.

5. ***ECF Notifications.*** The Clerk of Court shall take all the steps necessary to include BrownGreer as the MDL Centrality Administrator as an interested party for purposes of receiving emailed ECF notifications related to this matter.

6. ***Decommissioning.*** The Parties shall negotiate the decommissioning of the MDL Centrality System at an appropriate future time, through an Order of the Court.

DONE and **ORDERED** on this ____ day of ____, 2025.

_____

M. CASEY RODGERS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

EXHIBIT C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION This Document Relates to: *Toney v. Pfizer*, No. 3:24-cv-624 *Wilson v. Pfizer*, No. 3:25-cv-100 *Schmidt v. Pfizer*, No. 3:25-cv-81 *Valera-Arcea v. Pfizer*, No. 3:25-98 *Blonski v. Pfizer*, No. 3:25-cv-167	Case No. 25-md-3140 Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

PRETRIAL ORDER NO. __
SCHEDULING ORDER FOR PILOT CASES

The Court adopts the following discovery and briefing schedule for the initial Pilot Cases, which was jointly proposed by the parties.

March 13, 2025	Deadline for Pilot Case Plaintiff(s) to file amended complaint(s)
March 27, 2025 (14 days after second CMC)	Discovery opens
March 27, 2025 (14 days after second CMC)	Defendants to Answer and serve 26(a)(1) disclosures in Pilot Cases
May 11, 2025 (45 days after start of discovery)	Defendants' certification of completion of document production on preemption and general causation
July 25, 2025 (75 days after Defendants' certification/120 days after start of discovery)	Close of preemption discovery

August 24, 2025 (30 days after close of preemption discovery)	Motions for summary judgment regarding preemption to be filed
September 23, 2025 (30 days after opening preemption motion briefs)	Opposition to preemption MSJs to be filed
September 30, 2025 (7 days after oppositions to preemption motions)	Replies in support of preemption MSJs to be filed, if requested by Defendants and permitted by Court
September 23, 2025 (135 days after Defendants' certification/180 days after start of discovery)	Close of general causation fact discovery
October 23, 2025 (30 days after close of general cause discovery)	Plaintiffs' general causation expert disclosures
November 22, 2025 (30 days after Plaintiffs' general cause expert disclosures)	Defendants' general causation expert disclosures
January 10, 2026 (50 days after Defendants' general cause expert disclosures)	Deadline for depositions of all general causation experts
February 10, 2026 (30 days after deadline for depositions of general cause experts)	Rule 702 motions regarding general causation experts to be filed
March 12, 2026 (30 days after opening Rule 702 motions filed)	Oppositions to Rule 702 motions to be filed
March 19, 2026 (7 days after oppositions to Rule 702 motions)	Replies in support of Rule 702 motions to be filed, if requested by movants and permitted by Court

SO ORDERED on this ____ day of ____, 2025.

_____
M. CASEY RODGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

EXHIBIT D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	Case No. 25-md-3140
This Document Relates to: All Cases	Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

PRETRIAL ORDER NO. __
[Proposed] Stipulated Order Governing Confidentiality

Plaintiffs and Defendants Pfizer, Inc., Pharmacia & Upjohn Co. LLC, Pharmacia LLC, Greenstone LLC, Viatris, Inc., and Prasco LLC (collectively "Defendants") anticipate that documents, testimony, or information that are protected by the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine or that contain or reflect confidential, proprietary, trade secret and/or commercially sensitive information could be requested, disclosed or produced during the course of discovery, initial disclosures, and/or supplemental disclosures in this litigation and therefore request that the Court enter this Order setting forth the conditions for treating, obtaining, and using such information.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and its inherent authority, the Court hereby orders the entry of the following Order Governing Confidentiality and Privilege ("Order" or "Protective Order") in this matter:

I. PURPOSES AND LIMITATIONS

A. Disclosure and discovery activity in this action could involve requests for and production of certain privileged, confidential, proprietary, or private information, provided from this or related litigation(s), for which special protection from public disclosure and from use for any purpose other than prosecuting this litigation may be warranted. Accordingly, the Parties hereby stipulate to and petition the Court to enter this Order. The Parties acknowledge that this Order governs discovery in *In re: Depo-Provera (Depo) Medroxyprogesterone Acetate)* Products Liability Litigation, Case No. 3:25-md-3140. This Order shall apply to all cases currently pending in MDL No. 3140 and to all related actions that have been or will be originally filed in, transferred to, or removed to this Court and assigned hereto.

B. This Order is binding on all Parties and their counsel in all cases currently pending or subsequently made part of these MDL proceedings and shall govern each case in the proceedings. The purpose of this Order is to expedite the flow of discovery material, facilitate the prompt resolution of disputes over confidentiality and privilege, and protect material to be kept confidential or privileged, pursuant to the Court's inherent authority, its authority under Federal

Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d), and the judicial opinions interpreting such Rules.

C. The Parties also acknowledge that this Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery and that the protection it affords from public disclosure and use extends only to the information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles. The Parties further acknowledge that this Order creates no entitlement to file Confidential Information under seal.

D. This Order shall not abrogate or diminish any contractual, statutory, or other legal obligation or right of any party or person with respect to any Confidential Information.

E. The recipient of any Confidential Information hereby agrees to subject himself/herself to the jurisdiction of this Court for the purpose of any proceedings related to the performance under, compliance with, or violations of this Order.

II. PROCEEDINGS AND FORM OF INFORMATION GOVERNED

A. This Order shall govern any document, information, or other thing which is designated as containing "Confidential Information" and "Highly Confidential Information – Outside Counsel's Eyes Only," (collectively referred to as "Confidential Information" unless specifically states otherwise) as defined herein, and is furnished by any party in this MDL in which various plaintiffs allege that

depot medroxyprogesterone acetate ("DMPA") contributed to their development of meningioma and/or allege that they are at an increased risk of the development of meningioma.

B. The form of information protected includes, but is not limited to, documents and things, responses to requests to produce documents or other things, interrogatories, responses to interrogatories, requests for admissions, responses to requests for admissions, and responses to subpoenas, deposition testimony, and exhibits, and all copies, extracts, summaries, compilations, designations, and portions of the foregoing.

C. For purposes of this Order, "document" shall be accorded its broadest possible meaning, and shall include, without limitation, the whole page or file or any portion thereof of any written, printed or graphic matter, and any computer file, record or tape produced by or obtained from any party or non-party, any electronically stored information, or any copy, extract, or complete or partial summary prepared therefrom, and any document or thing covered by Fed. R. Civ. P. 34.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Action: *In re: Depo-Provera (Depo) Medroxyprogesterone Acetate)* Products Liability Litigation, Case No. 3:25-md-3140, presently pending in the Northern District of Florida.

B. Party: Any party to this Action, including Plaintiffs, Pfizer, Inc., Greenstone LLC, Viatris, Inc. Prasco LLC, Pharmacia & Upjohn Co. LLC and Pharmacia LLC including all of their members, officers, directors, employees, and Counsel (and their support staff).

C. Discovery Material: All items or information, regardless of the medium or the manner in which it is generated, stored or maintained, that is produced or generated in disclosures or responses to discovery in this matter.

D. Confidential Information or Items: Any disclosure or Discovery Material that the Producing Party designates as "CONFIDENTIAL." The Producing Party may designate as "CONFIDENTIAL" Discovery Material that the Producing Party reasonably believes constitutes, reflects, discloses, or contains (i) trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information subject to protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c); (ii) material protected by federal, state, or foreign data protection laws or other privacy obligations subject to protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c); or (iii) other information subject to protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).

E. Outside Counsel of Record: Attorneys who are not employees of a Party but retained to represent or advise a party to the Action and have appeared on the pleading as counsel for a Party in this Action or who are affiliated with or

contracted by law firms who have appeared on the pleading as counsel for a Party in this Action.

F. In-House Counsel: Attorneys who are employees of a Party.

G. Counsel (without qualifier): Outside Counsel of Record and In-House Counsel (as well as their support staff).

H. Designating Party: A Party that designates information or items that it produces in disclosures or in responses to discovery as "CONFIDENTIAL."

I. Expert: A person with specialized knowledge or experience in a matter pertinent to the litigation who has been retained by a Party or its Counsel to serve as an expert witness or consultant in this MDL.

J. Non-Party: Any natural person, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity not named as a Party to this MDL.

K. Professional Vendors: Persons or entities that provide litigation support services (e.g., document and ESI processing, hosting, review, and production, photocopying, videotaping, translating, preparing exhibits or demonstrations, and organizing, storing, or retrieving data in any form or medium) and their employees and subcontractors.

L. Receiving Party: A Party that receives Disclosure or Discovery Material from a Producing Party.

M. Producing Party: A Party or non-Party that provides, produces, or makes available for inspection Disclosure or Discovery Material in the course of this Action.

N. "Highly Confidential Information," including "Highly Confidential Information – Outside Counsel's Eyes Only," (collectively referred to as "Highly Confidential Information" unless specifically states otherwise) as used herein, means Confidential Information that the Producing Party believes in good faith relates to mergers and/or acquisitions, contains Protected Health Information ("PHI"), the disclosure of which may be prohibited under federal or state regulation, including HIPAA, or would, if disclosed, cause a substantial risk of a significant competitive or commercial disadvantage to the Producing Party, including but not limited to information that reflects: the Producing Party's competitiveness in the market; sales or marketing strategies; or research and development materials.

IV. TYPES OF MATERIALS THAT MAY BE DESIGNATED "CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER"

A. A Party may designate any portion of Discovery Material (as defined in Section III.C above) as "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" as permitted herein (see Section III.D).

B. Confidential Information shall include any Discovery Material that the designating party reasonably and in good faith believes not to be in the public domain and to contain materials defined as Confidential (see Section III.D above).

C. Medical records of the Plaintiffs are presumptively Confidential and it is not necessary that they be designated as "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order."

V. ACCESS TO AND USE OF INFORMATION DESIGNATED AS "CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER" AND "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION – OUTSIDE COUNSEL'S EYES ONLY"

A. If a Party reasonably and in good faith believes that information produced in these actions contains Confidential Information, that Party may designate the information as "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" or "Highly Confidential Information – Outside Counsel's Eyes Only," as appropriate.

B. Access to information marked "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" shall be limited to, and only to, the following "qualified persons":

a. The Parties listed in Paragraph III.B, including the employees and staff of such Parties;

b. The Receiving Party's Outside Counsel of Record in this MDL and, if the attorney of record is a member of a law firm, the employees and staff of the law firm (collectively "Outside Counsel");

c. Special Masters, professional jury or trial consultants, mock jurors, and Professional Vendors to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary for purposes of the Action;

d. Experts and consultants (including both testifying and non-testifying experts), who shall be informed of the existence and contents of this Protective Order;

e. The Court, its personnel, and any court reporters, stenographers, and videographers involved in taking or transcribing testimony in these actions;

f. Mediators and their staff enlisted by the parties to assist in the resolution of this matter;

g. A person identified in the document marked "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" as an author, source, addressee, or recipient of the communication or document, or who already has a copy of the document marked "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order";

h. A deponent or witness at a deposition or pre-trial hearing; and

i. Such other persons as hereafter may be designated by written agreement in these actions or by order of the Court.

C. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a Party from introducing into evidence at an evidentiary hearing, motion hearing, or trial any Confidential Material that is admissible under applicable law, subject to the provisions of this Order.

D. Information specifically designated as "Highly Confidential Information – Outside Counsel's Eyes Only" may be shared only with (i) Plaintiffs' attorneys of record in the Litigation, including clerical, secretarial, and other staff employed or retained by Plaintiffs' counsel, (ii) outside counsel for a party, including counsel's clerical, secretarial, and other staff employed or retained by such counsel and (iii) the persons listed in paragraphs (c)-(i) above.

The designation of information as "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" and "Highly Confidential Information – Outside Counsel's Eyes Only – Subject to Protective Order" shall be made at the following times:

a. For documents and things, at the time of the production of the documents or things.

b. For written responses to interrogatories or requests for admissions, at the time of the written response;

c. For deposition testimony and exhibits, at the time of the testimony or within 30 days after receipt by the Designating Party of the final transcript of the deposition.

E. The designation of Confidential Information shall be made as follows:

a. For documents, by placing a conspicuous legend on each page or portion of such document entitled to such protection, reading "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" or "Highly Confidential Information – Outside Counsel's Eyes Only," as appropriate;

b. For tangible objects, by placing a label or tag on the object or the container therefore, or if not practicable, as otherwise agreed;

c. For written responses to any individual interrogatory or individual request for admission, in writing in the text of the individual response thereto;

d. Deposition testimony and the transcripts and video recordings thereof obtained during pretrial discovery shall be treated as "Confidential Subject to Protective Order" for a period of 30 days, or as many days as the parties shall agree, after receipt of the final deposition transcript to allow time for the deponent or counsel for the deponent, or any party or counsel to any party, to notify all Parties of any Confidential Information contained therein. Such Confidential Information contained in deposition testimony may be designated by any party, within 30 days of receipt of the final deposition transcript, by page and line number, and video cassettes, DVDs, or other storage media shall be labeled in accordance with the provisions of this Order. The court reporter shall include on the cover page of each deposition a clear indication that the deposition contains Confidential Information. Any document designated as "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" or "Highly Confidential Information – Outside Counsel's Eyes Only" that is marked as an exhibit in any deposition shall be treated according to the designation of that document prior to the deposition.

F. Protected Health Information. In addition to the provisions herein applicable to Highly Confidential documents, the use or disclosure of Protected Heath Information shall not be permitted. If the Receiving Party has any question about whether a document contains PHI, in addition to the provisions applicable to Highly Confidential, it will treat that information in a HIPAA compliant manner.

VI. FILING CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION OR ITEMS /FILING UNDER SEAL

A. Without written permission from the Designating Party or a court order, a Party may not file any Confidential Information into the public record as part of these Actions. All Parties shall make reasonable efforts to avoid requesting the filing of Confidential Information under seal by, for example, redacting or otherwise excluding from a submission to the Court any such Information not directly pertinent to the submission. Where not reasonably possible, any Party wishing to file a document or paper containing Confidential may provisionally file such Information under seal, provided that the Designating Party then moves to seal within seven (7) days of the filing, explaining the bases for sealing the Information in question. Failure to file a motion to seal will result in the Information being filed publicly. While any motion to seal is pending, the document or paper containing Confidential Information shall remain under seal provisionally.

B. The provisions of this Protective Order do not apply to any hearings or trial proceedings in this Action. The Parties will separately request the Court to enter an Order governing the handling of such materials at hearing or at trial.

VII. INADVERTENT PRODUCTION OF SUBSEQUENTLY CLAIMED PRIVILEGED INFORMATION

A. The production of privileged or work-product protected Discovery Material ("Disclosed Protected Information") in this MDL, whether inadvertent or otherwise, is not a waiver of the privilege or protection from discovery in this case or in any other federal or state proceeding. This Protective Order shall be interpreted to provide the maximum protection allowed by Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d). Nothing contained herein is intended to, or shall serve to limit a Party's right to conduct a review of any Discovery Material for relevance, responsiveness, and/or segregation of privileged and/or protected information before production. Additionally, the inadvertent production of Discovery Material without an appropriate designation of confidentiality shall not be deemed a waiver or acknowledgment as to the confidentiality of any inadvertently produced document and any related material.

B. Upon discovery that a document has been produced, which it believes to contain privileged and/or work product material, the Producing Party must notify the Receiving Party within 30 days, in writing, asserting either the attorney-client

privilege or work product protection with respect to Disclosed Protected Information. The written notice of the recall of privileged material shall be accompanied by a log articulating the privilege basis for each privileged document.

C. The Receiving Party must—unless it contests the claim of attorney-client privilege or work product protection in accordance with paragraph VII.D—within five business days of receipt of that writing and, to the extent applicable, any replacement media containing a reproduction of the documents that formerly included (and now omits) the purportedly privileged or protected document: (i) return or destroy all copies of the Disclosed Protected Information and (ii) provide a certification of counsel that all of the Disclosed Protected Information has been returned or destroyed. Within five business days of receipt of the notification that the Disclosed Protected Information has been returned or destroyed, the Producing Party must produce a privilege log with respect to the Disclosed Protected Information, articulating the privilege basis for each privileged document.

D. If the Receiving Party of inadvertently produced records contests the claim of attorney-client privilege or work product protection, the Receiving Party must—within ten business days of receipt of the claim of privilege or protection—move the Court for an Order compelling disclosure of the Disclosed Protected Information (a "Disclosure Motion"). The Receiving Party must seek to file the Disclosure Motion under seal and must not assert as a ground for compelling

disclosure the fact or circumstances of the disclosure, and may not disclose, rely on, or refer to any of the Disclosed Protected Information. Pending resolution of the Disclosure Motion, the Receiving Party must sequester the Disclosed Protected Information and not use the Disclosed Protected Information or disclose it to any person other than as required by law.

E. Disclosed Protected Information that is sought to be reclaimed by the Parties to this case pursuant to this Order shall not be used as grounds by any third party to argue that any waiver of privilege or protection has occurred by virtue of any production in this case.

F. Should any motion compelling production of the Disclosed Protected Information be filed, the Producing Party shall retain the burden of establishing its privilege or work product claims. Nothing in this paragraph shall limit the right of any Party to petition the Court for an *in camera* review of the Disclosed Protected Information. Nothing in this Order shall relieve counsel for any Receiving Party of any existing duty or obligation, whether established by case law, rule of court, regulation or other source, to return, and not to review, any privileged or work product materials without being requested by the Producing Party to do so.

VIII. RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES REGARDING DESIGNATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

A. If any Party disagrees with the designation of any Discovery Material as "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" "Highly Confidential Information –

Outside Counsel's Eyes Only," that Party will provide written notice to all other Parties to these actions, and the Parties will attempt first to resolve the dispute on an informal basis before presenting the dispute to the Court. All items objected to shall continue to be treated as initially designated by the Designating Party pending resolution of the parties' dispute. If the dispute can be resolved, all Parties shall promptly be informed of the resolution.

B. If the dispute cannot be resolved informally, the Designating Party shall file a motion with the Court seeking an order that the Confidential Information subject to the dispute remain confidential. The designating Party bears the burden of persuading the Court that the information is in fact "Confidential – Subject to Protective Order" or "Highly Confidential Information – Outside Counsel's Eyes Only," within the definition of that term set forth above. Failure of the designating Party to file such a motion within 30 days from receipt of the written notice waives the designating Party's designation on the subject Discovery Material.

C. Entering into, agreeing, and/or complying with the terms of this Order shall not: (a) operate as an admission by any Party that any particular documents, material, or information contain(s) or reflect(s) currently valuable trade secrets or proprietary or commercial information; or (b) prejudice in any way the right of a Party at any time: (i) to seek a determination by the Court of whether any particular document, item of material or piece of information should be subject to the terms of

this Order; (ii) to seek relief on appropriate notice from any provision(s) of this Order, either generally or as to any particular document, item or piece of information; (iii) to object to any discovery request, including the right to assert that no discovery should be had of certain documents or information; or (iv) to seek documents or other information from any source.

IX. REDACTIONS

A. Pursuant to 21 C.F.R. §§ 314.430(e) & (f) and 20.63(f), the names of any person or persons reporting adverse experiences of patients and the names of any patients that are not redacted shall be treated as Confidential, regardless of whether the document containing such names is designated as Confidential Information.

B. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions, nothing contained herein shall be construed as a waiver of a Party's ability to challenge such redactions. The burden as to the propriety of any redaction remains on the Producing Party at all times.

X. PRIVILEGE LOG PRODUCTION

A. Unless otherwise provided in this Protective Order or as otherwise agreed by the parties, any document falling within the scope of any request for production or subpoena that is responsive to the search criteria required by the Order for Production of Documents and Electronically Stored Information (including

custodians, search terms, and date ranges) and that is withheld on the basis of a claim of attorney-client privilege, work product, or any other claim of privilege or immunity from discovery is to be identified by the Producing Party on a cumulative privilege log,[1] which the Producing Party shall produce in an Excel format with separate categories of information sufficient to describe the nature of the documents, communications or tangible things withheld as to enable the receiving party to access the claims of privilege, including Custodial Source, To, From, Carbon Copy, Date, reason for privilege or immunity and a description sufficient to meet the requirement of Rule 26. The privilege log shall also identify the production date of the document, or the production wave associated with the document. Individuals who are In-House Counsel or Outside Counsel of Record shall be noted, and the name of the law firm or entity employing such Counsel shall be identified. Privilege log production shall be phased such that substantially all documents withheld from a production pursuant to an attorney-client, work product, or other applicable privilege or immunity, shall be identified on a privilege log, which shall be provided by the Producing Party no

[1] The most current privilege log tendered by a party shall include the information noted in this subsection regarding documents withheld from that party's most recent production together with such information regarding documents withheld from all prior productions.

later than thirty (30) days after the date of service of a custodial production from which the document was withheld.[2]

B. Privilege log identification is not required for post-December 1, 2024 communications specific to the proceedings herein exchanged between the Producing Party and their outside Counsel or among outside counsel for the Producing Party, except that the parties will produce a privilege log for communications between and among outside counsel and non-attorney Pfizer employees involved in discussions regarding Depo-Provera, DMPA, MPA, or meningioma.. In addition, neither communications between or among Counsel for Plaintiffs or between Counsel for Plaintiffs and their clients are required to be identified on the Producing Party's privilege log.

XI. REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS OR INFORMATION SUBJECT TO THIS ORDER IN ACTIONS OTHER THAN THIS MDL

A. If any Party has obtained Confidential Information under the terms of this Protective Order and receives a subpoena or other compulsory process commanding the production of such Confidential Information, such party shall promptly notify the designating Party, including in such notice the date set for the production of such subpoenaed information along with copies of the requests,

[2] For documents that are created after January 1, 2023, the privilege log will be provided no later than fourteen (14) days after the date of service of a custodial production.

subpoena, or order. The subpoenaed party shall not produce any Confidential Information so received in response to the subpoena prior to the date specified for production in the subpoena unless in response to an order of a court of competent jurisdiction (other than the subpoena or other compulsory process) compelling the subpoenaed party to produce the Confidential Information. The party subject to subpoena or compulsory process, however, shall have no duty to appear or resist any application or motion seeking to compel production of such Confidential Information.

XII. PARTY'S OWN INFORMATION

A. The restrictions on the use of Confidential Information established by this Protective Order are applicable only to the use of Confidential Information received by a Party from another Party or from a non-party. A Party is free to do whatever it desires with its own Confidential Information, provided that any dissemination of Confidential Information by the Party that owns the Confidential Information may lead to the loss of that information's confidential status.

B. Nothing herein shall impose any restrictions on the use or disclosure by a Party or witness of documents, material or information obtained by such Party or witness independently of the discovery proceedings in these actions, whether or not such documents, material or information are also obtained through discovery proceedings in these actions.

XIII. APPLICABILITY OF ORDER TO THIRD PARTIES

A. In the course of these actions, the Parties may attempt to discover documents and information from Third Parties. Any Third Party from whom discovery is sought by the Parties may avail itself upon the protections and limitations of disclosure provided for in this Order by signing this order prior to production. The Third Party shall identify any Confidential Information produced in accordance with this Order. By so availing itself of the protections and limitations provided for in this Order, any such Third Party shall submit to the jurisdiction of the Court for all matters relating to or arising out of this Order.

B. The Parties hereby agree to treat any material properly designated Confidential produced by a Third Party in accordance with the terms of this Order. The Parties shall reference this Order in any subpoena or discovery request they serve or otherwise provide to any Third Party.

XIV. VIOLATIONS

A. In the event that any person or party violates the terms of this Protective Order, the aggrieved Producing Party should apply to the Court to obtain relief against any such person or party violating or threatening to violate any of the terms of this Protective Order. In the event that the aggrieved Producing Party seeks injunctive relief, it must direct the petition for such relief to this Court. To the extent the same document or categories of documents are at issue in both the above-

captioned MDL 3140 and in any Related Litigation, the Parties will attempt first to resolve the issue in the MDL and before this Court. The Parties and any other person subject to the terms of this Protective Order agree that this Court shall retain jurisdiction over it and them for the purpose of enforcing this Protective Order.

XV. MODIFICATION OF THIS PROTECTIVE ORDER

A. This Protective Order shall remain in force and effect until modified, superseded, or terminated by order of the Court made upon reasonable written notice. Unless otherwise ordered, or agreed upon by the Parties, this Protective Order shall survive the termination of this action. The Court retains jurisdiction even after termination of this action to enforce this Protective Order and to make such amendments, modifications, deletions, and additions to this Protective Order as the Court may from time to time deem appropriate.

Dated: _____, 2025

SO ORDERED:

_____

M. CASEY RODGERS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPO MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION This Document Relates to: All Cases	Case No. 25-md-3140 Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

I, _____, declare that:

1. My address is _____, and the name and address of my present employer is _____.

2. My title is _____.

3. I have received a copy of the Stipulated Protective Order (the "Protective Order") in these actions.

4. I have carefully read and understand the provisions of the Protective Order, agree to be bound by them, and specifically agree I will not use or disclose to anyone any of the contents of any Confidential Information received under the protection of the Protective Order in violation thereof.

5. I understand that I am to retain all copies of any of the materials that I receive which have been so designated as Confidential Information in a container, cabinet, drawer, room, or other safe place in a manner consistent with the Protective

Order and that all copies are to remain in my custody until I have completed my assigned or legal duties. I will return all Confidential Information which comes into my possession or which I have prepared relating thereto to counsel for the party by whom I am retained. I acknowledge that such return or the subsequent destruction of such materials shall not relieve me from any of the continuing obligations imposed upon me by the Protective Order.

6. I consent to the exercise of personal jurisdiction by this Court in connection with this Declaration and my obligations under the Protective Order.

7. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this day of 20___ at _____ in the State of _____.

By: _____ (SIGNATURE)

EXHIBIT E

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	Case No. 25-md-3140
This Document Relates to: All Cases	Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

[PROPOSED] PTO ___
THRESHOLD PROOF OF USE AND INJURY REQUIREMENTS

Plaintiffs and Defendants (collectively "Parties") agree that all Plaintiffs with filed cases must provide (a) initial documentary proof of use of each named Defendant's product, and (b) initial documentary proof of their alleged meningioma injury. The parties have therefore asked the Court to enter this Order governing the process for obtaining and producing such information. The parties have agreed to use the online MDL Centrality System, as designed and provided by BrownGreer PLC, to complete and serve the materials subject to this Order. Accordingly, the Court hereby orders as follows.

This Order shall govern all actions that are properly filed in, removed to, or transferred to this MDL. Other than as set forth in this Order, there shall be no discovery of any Plaintiff until further order of the Court. All Plaintiffs, however,

have an obligation to preserve all relevant evidence in their possession, custody, or control, as required by law.

I. Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire

The term "Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire" refers to the questions and document production requirements attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

For all cases filed in or transferred into MDL 3140 on or before the date of this Order, the Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire is due 120 days from the entry of this Order, by _____, 2025.

For all cases filed in or transferred into MDL 3140 after the date of this Order, the Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire deadline is 120 days from the date the case was filed in or transferred into MDL 3140.

Each Plaintiff must complete and serve on Defendants through MDL Centrality answers and document(s) responsive to the Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire by the above deadlines. For cases currently pending in this MDL where Plaintiffs have requested prescription, medical insurance, and pharmacy records but lack definitive product identification, each Plaintiff, after first consulting with Plaintiffs' leadership, may serve targeted subpoenas on medical providers, health insurance carriers, hospital formularies and/or wholesale drug distributors, seeking identification of the DMPA product administered to them or sold to their medical provider at the applicable time period. The purpose of the consultation is to

ensure that subpoenas have not already been served on such third-party entities in a more global fashion. Any documents received pursuant to such subpoenas will be served on Defendants through the MDL Centrality platform.

Any Plaintiff's answers to the Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire will be made under penalty of perjury, will be treated as interrogatory responses pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33, and will be subject to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 37.

The Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire deadlines may only be extended by: (i) the Court on a showing of good cause; or (ii) agreement of the parties with leave of Court.

II. Deficiencies

A Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire is complete where accurate and responsive answers are provided to every question on the form.

Defendants must notify each Plaintiff of any allegedly deficient answers to the Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire via MDL Centrality within 45 days of being served with the answers through MDL Centrality. Defendants' notification must specify which answers are allegedly deficient, along with the basis for their

position. The deficiency process is not an opportunity to test the veracity of a Plaintiff's answers; it is intended to address omissions and incomplete answers.

Within 21 days of receiving Defendants' deficiency notification, a Plaintiff must respond to the notification by either serving a revised Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire with non-deficient answers and/or otherwise explaining in writing why he or she disagrees with the deficiencies identified by Defendants.

The parties will have 14 days from the date that a Plaintiff's response to Defendants' notification is served to meet and confer regarding any allegedly uncured deficiencies.

Thereafter, Defendants may request the Court to resolve the outstanding dispute(s) via motion practice. To the extent the Court finds a Plaintiff's answers deficient, that Plaintiff will be granted a 10-day time period within which to cure the deficiency.

If a Plaintiff fails to provide nondeficient answers to the Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire within the applicable deadlines specified above, such failure will be grounds for the Court to dismiss that Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice, though Plaintiff retains the right to argue that good cause exists for a dismissal without prejudice.

DONE and **ORDERED** on this ____ day of ____, 2025.

_____

M. CASEY RODGERS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

EXHIBIT A

Plaintiff Proof of Use/Injury Questionnaire

1. Case Information

A. Plaintiff Full Name (if acting in representative capacity, full name of product user):

First: _____

Middle: _____

Last: _____

B. Date of Birth (if acting in representative capacity, Date of Birth of product user):

_____

C. Address:

Street: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

D. Attorney(s) of record (if applicable):

Counsel Name:

_____

Firm Name:

_____

E. N.D. Fla. Civil Action Number: _____-cv-_____

F. MDL-Centrality Plaintiff ID: _____

2. Product Use

A. Provide beginning month/year and end month/year for each depot medroxyprogesterone ("DMPA") product used by the product user. If use was not continuous, provide beginning and end date for each period of use.

Start Date	End Date	Medroxyprogesterone product

B. Does Plaintiff/Injured Party currently have records (*i.e.*, prescription, medical, insurance, or pharmacy records) that demonstrate he or she was administered medroxyprogesterone acetate?

◯ Yes ◯ No

C. If no, have the following been requested?

Prescription records ◯ Yes ◯ No Date of request: _____

Medical records ◯ Yes ◯ No Date of request: _____

Insurance records ◯ Yes ◯ No Date of request: _____

Pharmacy records ◯ Yes ◯ No Date of request: _____

3. Injury

A. Has Plaintiff/Injured Party been diagnosed with meningioma?

◯ Yes ◯ No

B. Date of meningioma diagnosis (if diagnosed more than once, indicate each date):

Diagnosis 1: _____

Diagnosis 2: _____

Diagnosis 3: _____

Diagnosis 4: _____

Diagnosis 5: _____

4. Document Production Requirement

Upload and produce via MDL-Centrality the following:

A. Documents sufficient to show Plaintiff was administered DMPA.

B. Documents sufficient to show Plaintiff has been diagnosed with meningioma consistent with your response to question 3.B.

EXHIBIT F

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	Case No. 25-md-3140
This Document Relates to: All Cases	Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

PRETRIAL ORDER NO. __
ORDER GOVERNING PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION

The following Order governs the production of documents and electronically stored information ("ESI") and shall apply to all discovery of ESI and hard copy documents in this case, unless the Parties agree in advance and in writing or if this Order is modified by the Court.

Except as specifically set forth herein, this Order does not: (a) alter or affect the applicability of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("Federal Rules") or any Local Rules of the U.S. District Courts ("Local Rules"), as applicable; (b) address, limit, determine, or affect the relevance, discoverability, or admissibility as evidence of any document or ESI, regardless of whether the document or ESI is to be preserved, is preserved, or is produced; or (c) alter or affect the objections to discovery available under the Federal Rules. The purpose of this Order is to facilitate the exchange of ESI and hard

copy documents in an efficient manner and in accordance with the Federal Rules. By stipulating to this Order and agreeing to produce documents, generally, in a particular form or forms, no Party waives any objections to producing any particular document or category of documents on any grounds whatsoever.

I. Format for Defendants' Productions

The following section governs the production of documents and electronically stored information ("ESI") by Defendants Pfizer, Inc., Pharmacia & Upjohn Co. LLC, Pharmacia LLC , Greenstone LLC, Viatris, Inc., and Prasco LLC (collectively "Defendants") and shall apply to all discovery of ESI and hard copy documents by Defendants in this case, unless the Parties agree in advance and in writing or if this Order is modified by the Court.

1. File Types and Formats. All spreadsheet files (*e.g.*, Microsoft Excel, Corel Quattro, etc.) shall be produced as native files with TIFF placeholder images. All presentation files (*e.g.*, Microsoft PowerPoint), image files (*e.g.,* .jpg, .gif), and PDF files shall be produced as native files with TIFF placeholder images, unless redactions are required, in which case such files shall be produced as TIFFs. All word processing files (e.g., Microsoft Word) created or modified after January 1, 2023 shall be produced as native files with TIFF placeholder images; word processing files last modified prior to January 1, 2023, and word processing files created or modified after that date for which redactions are required, shall be produced as TIFFs. All media files, such as audio and video files, shall be produced as native files with TIFF placeholder images. Emails shall

be produced as TIFFs. The Parties will meet and confer on the production of other file types. With respect to any ESI produced in TIFF format, the Producing Party shall honor reasonable requests from the Receiving Party for production of the associated native file. Files containing privileged information will be produced as redacted TIFF images.

2. Native Files. Any document produced in native file format shall be given a file name consisting of a unique Bates number and, as applicable, a confidentiality designation; for example, "ABC00000002_Confidential." For each native file produced, the production will include a *.tiff image slipsheet indicating the production number of the native file and the confidentiality designation, and stating "File Provided Natively." To the extent that it is available, the original document text shall be provided in a document-level multi-page UTF-8 with BOM text file with a text path provided in the *.dat file; otherwise the text contained on the slipsheet language shall be provided in the *.txt file with the text path provided in the *.dat file. Where redaction makes production of native-format files infeasible, the Parties will confer to determine a reasonably usable form for the production.

3. TIFF Images. Any document produced as TIFF images shall be named according to the Bates number of the corresponding TIFF image. Each *.tiff file should be assigned a unique name matching the Bates number of the corresponding image. All TIFF images should be provided in single-page, Group IV TIFF with a resolution of 300 DPI. Bates numbers and confidentiality designations should be electronically branded on

each produced *.tiff image. These *.tiff images should be provided in a separate folder and the number of TIFF files per folder should be limited to 1,000 files.

4. Digital Photos. Where reasonably possible, all digital photographs will be produced as full color image files in their native file format at their original resolution.

5. Databases, Structured, Aggregated or Application Data. The Parties will meet and confer to address the production and production format of any responsive data contained in a database or other structured or aggregated data source or otherwise maintained by an application. The Parties will reasonably cooperate in the exchange of information concerning such databases to facilitate discussions on productions and production format. If the Parties cannot reach agreement, the matter will be decided by the Court or its designee.

6. Hard Copy Documents. Documents that exist in hardcopy will be scanned to *.tiff image format as set forth in Subsection I(3) above. Defendants' hard copy documents that are not text-searchable shall be made searchable by OCR prior to production where possible. In scanning paper documents, distinct documents should not be merged into a single record, and single documents should not be split into multiple records (i.e., paper documents should be logically unitized[1]). In the case of an organized compilation of separate documents (for example, a binder containing several separate

[1] Logical Unitization is the process of human review of each individual page in an image collection using logical cues to determine pages that belong together as documents. Such cues can be consecutive page numbering, report titles, similar headers and footers, and other logical indicators.

documents behind numbered tabs), the document behind each tab should be scanned separately, but the relationship among the documents in the compilation should be reflected in the proper coding of the beginning and ending document and attachment fields. Defendants will make their best efforts to unitize the documents correctly.

7. Short Message Communications. Short message communications (*e.g.,* text messages, WhatsApp, Slack, iMessage, Teams, G-Chat, Bloomberg, etc.) will be produced in TIFF format. The TIFF image(s) shall reflect the short message communication thread for the full twenty-four day containing the short message communication, as well as the day(s) in the short message communication thread prior to or subsequent to such day that contain related or contextual content, or as may be necessary to demonstrate the inception or conclusion of the responsive conversation (the "complete communication thread"). The TIFF image of the complete communication thread shall reveal and reflect the associated date, time, sender, recipient, and other persons included in the message/chat, and in-line representations of emojis plus inline references to any attachment, linked file, or embedded file revealed in the TIFF image of the communication/thread. Attachments, resolved linked files, and embedded files associated with any short message communication shall be produced in accordance with subsections I(10) and I(12) hereof. Except for messages that contain privileged content, which may be redacted on the TIFF image in accordance with this Order, the complete communication thread will be produced. The Producing Party shall honor reasonable

requests from the Receiving Party for production of native short message communication files. x

8. De-NISTing. Electronic files will be De-NISTed, removing commercially available operating system and application file information contained on the current NIST file list.

9. Deduplication. Defendants shall make reasonable efforts to de-duplicate ESI. ESI produced by Defendants shall be globally de-duplicated across all collected custodial and non-custodial sources. Documents are considered exact duplicates if a document family or stand-alone file has a matching MD5 or SHA-1 hash value as compared against the same document type (i.e., family or stand-alone file). Hash values of emails will be calculated on the concatenated values of at least the following fields: From, To, CC, BCC, Subject, Date Sent, Time Sent, Attachment Names, Body, and the hash values of all attachments. The names of all custodians and non-custodial sources who were in possession of a document prior to de-duplication will be populated in the ALL CUSTODIANS metadata field. The original file paths of a document prior to deduplication will be populated in the ALL FILE PATHS[2] metadata field. To account for

[2] ALL FILE PATHS metadata field shall include the original file/folder paths, including file name for non-emails, where reasonably available, of all the locations where copies of the item were located at the time of collection, separated by semi-colons, in the order corresponding to the order of names in ALL CUSTODIANS. For emails collected from container files (e.g., .pst's), these include the original file paths of the container files and the location of the emails within the folder structure of the mail container/.pst from which it was collected, where reasonably available.

and properly reflect the de-duplication (and thus removal) of duplicate documents in the possession of custodians and non-custodial sources for production waves/volumes following the initial production of a particular document, a meta-data overlay file shall be periodically provided (no less than every two weeks, triggered by known changes to already produced documents) updating the ALL CUSTODIANS and ALL FILE PATHS meta-data fields for the initially produced version of the duplicate document with any additional de-deduplicated CUSTODIANS and ALL FILE PATHS.

10. Embedded Files. Embedded files, except for images embedded in emails, are to be produced as family groups. Embedded files should be assigned Bates numbers that directly follow the Bates numbers on the documents within which they are embedded.

11. Dynamic Fields. Documents with dynamic fields for file names, dates, and times will be processed to show the field code (e.g., "[FILENAME]"), rather than the values for such fields existing at the time the file is processed.

12. Parent-Child Relationships. For document families, the parent-child relationships—the association between the parent document and the attached document and/or linked file—should be preserved. Attachments/linked files should be consecutively produced with the parent document that attached/referenced them.

13. Time Zone. All provided metadata pertaining to dates and times will be standardized to UTC.

14. Bates Numbering. Bates numbering should be consistent across the production, contain no special characters, and be numerically sequential within a given document. If a Bates number or set of Bates numbers is skipped, the skipped number or set of numbers should be noted with a placeholder. Attachments to documents will be assigned Bates numbers that directly follow the Bates numbers on the documents to which they were attached. In addition, wherever possible, each *.tiff image will have its assigned Bates number electronically "burned" onto the image. The Bates number shall:

a. be consistent across the production;

b. contain no special characters; and

c. be numerically sequential within a given document.

15. Excluded File Types. Absent a particularized need and good cause showing, the Parties agree that there is no need to collect ESI from the following sources:

a. Deleted, slack, fragmented, or other data only accessible by forensics;

b. Random access memory (RAM), temporary files, or other data difficult to preserve without disabling the operating system;

c. On-line access data such as temporary internet files, history, cache, cookies, and the like;

d. Back-up data that is duplicative of data that can be collected elsewhere; and

e. Server, system, or network logs.

16. Redactions. No redactions for relevance may be made within a produced document or ESI item. Any redactions shall be clearly indicated on the face of the

document, with each redacted portion of the document stating that it has been redacted and the basis for the redaction, and a metadata field shall indicate that the document contains redactions and the basis for the redaction (e.g., "A/C Privilege"). Where a responsive document contains both redacted and non-redacted content, Defendants shall produce the remainder of the non-redacted portions of the document and the text/OCR corresponding to the non-redacted portions.

a. Spreadsheets. Spreadsheet files requiring redaction for information other than privilege, including Microsoft Excel files, will be redacted within the native file, and the redacted native file will be produced as provide herein.

b. Other Documents. All native files that require redaction shall first be processed to show and reveal all color, comments, revision marks, speaker notes, or other user-entered data which are visible in any view of the document in its native application, all of which shall be evident in the generated TIFF image(s). Where reasonably possible, any occurrences of date/time auto-field items, including in headers and footers, will be removed and replaced with the term AUTODATE to prevent the current date from being printed. Email header information (e.g. date, subject line, etc.) should not be redacted unless it is independently privileged. The production of a document in a redacted form does not affect Defendants' obligation to timely assert and substantiate the assertion of privilege over the content in a privilege log. Defendants shall honor reasonable requests for the

production of particular redacted documents in other formats where the TIFF image is not reasonably usable. Redacted versions of documents that contained color in their un-redacted form shall be produced in color in TIFF format.

17. Load File Formats. ESI will be produced with a standard Concordance (*.dat) load file format and an image load file that is in .OPT format. The Concordance (*.dat) load file shall be provided with UTF-8 encoding.

18. Metadata to Be Produced. The metadata fields detailed in Exhibit A should be produced for each document to the extent that such information is available or, in the case of metadata created during processing such as Bates numbers, created, at the time of collection and processing, except that if a field contains privileged information, that privileged information may be redacted and noted in a corresponding privilege log.

19. Extracted Text and OCR. Each document, whether produced in Native or in TIFF format, and whether originally existing in electronic or in hard copy, shall be produced with extracted text or OCR, as described herein.

a. Extracted Text (Emails, Short Message Communications, Unredacted Native ESI, and Redacted Spreadsheets). All email, short message communications, un-redacted native ESI, and redacted spreadsheets produced as native files, should be provided with complete document-level extracted text files. Extracted text shall include all comments, revisions, tracked changes, speaker's notes, embedded URLs, and text from

documents with comments or tracked changes, and hidden and very hidden worksheets, slides, columns and rows. Text extracted from emails shall include all header information that would be visible if the email was viewed in Outlook including: (1) the individuals to whom the communication was directed ("To"), (2) the author of the email communication ("From"), (3) who was copied and blind copied on such email ("CC" and "BCC"), (4) the subject line of the email ("RE" or "Subject"), (5) the date and time of the email, (6) the text of any embedded URLs, and (7) the names of any attachments.

b. OCR (Redacted Native ESI, Hard Copy Documents). In the event a document other than spreadsheets, *e.g.*, Excel files, contains text that is to be redacted, Optical Character Recognition ("OCR") text files should be provided for any un-redacted portions of the documents. Document-level OCR text files shall also be provided for all hard copy scanned documents. OCR software must be set to the highest quality setting for any previously unscanned paper documents, and reasonable quality control measures shall be used to ensure that the integrity of scanned copies of previously unscanned paper documents are preserved for OCR (e.g., pages are not angled or skewed, text is not blurred or obscured, etc.). Documents containing foreign language text must be OCR'd using the appropriate settings for that language, (e.g., OCR of German documents must use

settings that properly capture umlauts and OCR of Asian language documents must properly capture the relevant Asian characters). Settings such as "auto-deskewing" and "auto-rotation" must be turned on during the OCR process to maximize text recognition on any given page.

c. Format of Extracted Text and OCR. The extracted full text and/or OCR text for all deliverables should be in separate document-level, UTF-8 with BOM encoded TXT files provided in a separate folder. The number of TXT files per folder should be limited to 1,000 files.

20. Encryption. To maximize the security of information in transit, any media or file sharing electronic document repository on which documents are produced must be encrypted by Defendants. Production deliverables provided via File Transfer Protocol ("FTP") shall be made available on a secured FTP connection with AES 256-bit encryption. All production volumes uploaded by Defendants via this file sharing document repository shall remain available for download for no less than thirty (30) calendar days. In such cases, the Defendants shall transmit the encryption key or password to a requesting Party, under separate cover, contemporaneously with sending the encrypted media, or correspondence indicating the availability of the encrypted FTP deliverables.

II. Protocol for Search/Identification of Responsive Documents

21. The Parties have been meeting-and-conferring, and agree to continue to meet and confer, concerning the potential use of TAR, other enhanced search techniques

and protocols, and validation processes and protocols to facilitate Defendants' identification of responsive documents for production. The Parties shall submit their joint proposed search and validation protocol, or points of dispute for resolution by the Court, by March 13, 2025.

III. Production Format for Plaintiffs' Productions

22. The Parties anticipate that the production and production format of Plaintiffs' case-specific materials will be the subject of a future Court order. Absent further agreement or order of the Court, Plaintiffs' counsel shall produce case-specific materials in native file format, PDF, or such other reasonably useable format that retains the relevant characteristics of the original document. Any document that requires redaction shall be produced in image format, e.g., TIFF or PDF. All of Plaintiffs' production documents shall be uniquely named.

23. For document families, the parent-child relationships—the association between the parent document and the attached document and/or linked file—should be preserved. Attachments/linked files should be consecutively produced with the parent document that attached/referenced them.

24. To the extent Plaintiffs produce a document other than in native format, and Defendants request metadata or other information, the Parties shall reasonably confer about an alternative production format for such document, including the necessity for such alternative production format. Any such request by a Defendant shall be specific and targeted.

IV. Provisions Applicable to Both Plaintiffs' and Defendants' Productions.

25. Known Responsive Material Must Be Produced. ESI and hardcopy documents that are known to Plaintiffs' Counsel or Defendants' Counsel to be non-privileged and responsive to a discovery request shall be produced without regard to whether it was responsive to a search term, of high "relevance" by a TAR text classification algorithm, or otherwise flagged as potentially responsive by another search technique, unless Counsel specifically identifies the documents as being withheld pursuant to a specific objection.

26. Discrete Document Collections. Those portions of a Plaintiff's or Defendant's documents that represent discrete document collections, such as substantially relevant folders of ESI specifically segregated by Defendants, Defendants' employees, or Plaintiffs, before or after the commencement of this litigation, that are substantially relevant to the claims and defenses in this proceeding, shall be reviewed for responsiveness (subject to appropriate claims of privilege) without regard to whether a given document in the collection is responsive to a search term, of high "relevance" by a TAR text classification algorithm, or otherwise flagged as potentially responsive by another search technique.

27. Unsearchable Documents. Documents that are reasonably believed to be responsive and for which text-based search technologies are fundamentally ineffective, such as images, spreadsheets, etc. must be reviewed without culling by search terms, predictive coding, or other technologies that rely primarily on text.

28. Use of Other Technology or Methodology. Prior to use or further use by any Party other than as specified within this protocol or the upcoming supplement regarding a protocol for the identification of and search for responsive documents, the Parties must meet and confer to disclose and discuss any proposed use of software or other technologies used to identify or eliminate sources of potentially responsive documents, including keyword or Boolean searching, file type culling, de-duplication, filtering, near de-duplication, e-mail thread suppression, clustering or concept searching. Use of such technologies to reduce the volume of materials to be collected or reviewed, other than as described within this document, requires the opposing party's consent and will be subject to a separate mutually agreed-upon stipulation or Order of the Court setting forth the protocol for the use of such technologies as negotiated by the Parties.

29. Additional or Alternate Methodologies for Documents from Certain Custodians and Non-Custodial Data Sources. The Parties will meet and confer to address the need for and implementation of additional or alternate methodologies for identifying possibly responsive documents from custodians and non-custodial data sources that may warrant such treatment.

30. Mobile and Handheld Device Documents and Data. If responsive data that can reasonably be extracted and produced in the formats described herein is identified on a mobile or handheld device, that data shall be produced in accordance with the generic provisions of this protocol. To the extent that responsive data identified on a mobile or handheld device is not susceptible to normal production protocols, the Parties will meet

and confer to address the identification, production, and production format of any responsive documents and data contained on any mobile or handheld device.

31. ESI Liaisons. To promote transparency, communications, and cooperation among the Parties, the Parties shall designate e-discovery liaisons for purposes of meeting and conferring on ESI topics. As proposed by the Parties, the ESI liaison for Plaintiffs shall be David Buchanan, or his designee, and the ESI liaison for Defendants shall be Jessica Rydstrom or their designees. All productions of ESI by any Party or non-party shall be sent to the Parties' respective ESI liaison and lead counsel, and any identified designees.

32. Impact of Order on Other Obligations. Nothing in this agreement shall affect the preservation requirements set forth in previous orders, subsequent orders, or any other preservation obligations of the Parties for these proceedings or for other purposes, such as pursuant to court order, administrative order, statute, or in response to other anticipated litigation. By preserving documents or ESI for the purpose of this litigation, the Parties are not conceding that such material is discoverable, nor are they waiving any claim of privilege.

33. Continuing Obligations. The Parties will continue to meet and confer regarding any issues as necessary and appropriate, including agreeing to modify any of the dates and periods set forth in this Order. This Protocol does not address or resolve any objections to the scope of the Parties' respective discovery requests.

34. Reservation of Rights. The Parties retain the right, upon reviewing any productions made by another Party in this Action or conducting other investigation and discovery, to request that Documents from additional non-custodial data sources and custodians be produced. The Parties shall meet and confer regarding such request(s) prior to any search or production related thereto.

35. Document Storage. During the pendency of this litigation, the Parties shall make reasonable efforts to preserve the originals of all hard copy and ESI documents produced to the opposing Parties and to preserve the original native format version of any ESI produced in non-native format.

36. Good Faith Compliance and Conferral Obligation. The Parties shall make good faith efforts to comply with and resolve any differences concerning compliance with this Order. No Party may seek relief from the Court concerning compliance with this Order unless it has first conferred with the other Parties. The Parties shall reasonably cooperate in the exchange of information concerning data systems and ESI as may be necessary to facilitate the discovery and exchange of ESI in these proceedings and to further the exchange of information commenced at the Parties' Rule 26(f) Conference.

37. Non-English Documents. To the extent that Documents are produced that contain languages other than English, in whole or in part, the Producing Party shall produce each such Document in the original language or languages in which it was written when collected. The Producing Party has no obligation to create a translation of the Documents or any portion thereof, but shall provide any translation of the Document

or any portion thereof that exists or is created through machine translation prior to production of the Document.

38. Alternate Formats. Notwithstanding the Parties' stipulations herein, upon reasonable request made by the Receiving Party, the Parties shall confer regarding the production in an alternate format of a document previously produced in accordance with this order.

39. Effect of Order. The Parties' agreement to this Order is without prejudice to the right of any Party to seek an order from the Court to rescind or amend this Order for good cause shown. Nothing in this Order shall abridge the rights of any person to seek judicial review or to pursue other appropriate judicial action with respect to any discovery ruling made by the Court in this matter.

SO ORDERED this __ day of ___ 2025

_____
M. CASEY RODGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ATTACHMENT A[3]

Field	Definitio n
CUSTODIAN	Name of person or other data source (non-human) from where documents/files are produced. *Where redundant names occur, individuals should be distinguished by an initial which is kept constant throughout productions (e.g., Smith, John A. and Smith, John B.)*
ALLCUSTODIANS	Identification of any additional custodians for duplicate files or email messages
BEGBATES	Beginning Bates Number (production number)
ENDBATES	Ending Bates Number (production number)
PGCOUNT	Number of pages in the document
FILESIZE	File Size
APPLICATION	Commonly associated application for the specified file type.
FILEPATH	Original file/path of the location where the item was located at the time of collection. This should include location, and, for e-documents and e-attachments, file name, and file extension. Folder names and path should be included, and, for emails and attachments collected from a container such as a .pst, the full folder path within the container. Any container names should be included in the path.

[3] The fields listed in this Attachment A should be included for documents produced where the metadata is available and reasonably collectable or where it can be reasonably added. The parties recognize that not every document produced will be produced with all available data – e.g., one off collections from targeted sources may not be reasonable to collect forensically in order to preserve all available metadata. To the extent a document is produced missing certain metadata, and the metadata is necessary to understand the context of the document, a Receiving Party may request a Producing Party conduct a reasonable investigation as to why the metadata is missing. No reasonable request for such investigation shall be denied.

ALLFILEPATHS	Original file/path of the location where duplicate items were located at the times of collection. This should include location, and, for e-documents and e-attachments, file name, and file extension. Folder names and path should be included, and, for emails and attachments collected from a container such as a .pst, the full folder path within the container. Any container names should be included in the path.
FILENAME	Original file name at the point of collection
NATIVEFILELINK	For documents provided in native format only
TEXTPATH	File path for OCR or Extracted Text files
MSGID	Email system identifier assigned by the host email system. This value is extracted from parent message during processing
FROM	Sender
TO	Recipient
CC	Additional Recipients
BCC	Blind Additional Recipients
SUBJECT	Subject line of e-mail
PARENTMSGID	Where the item is an email which is a REPLY or FORWARD, the MSGID of the original email which was REPLIED to or FORWARDED
CONVERSATIONID	Email thread identifier
ATTACHBATES	Bates number from the first page of each attachment
BEGATTACH	First Bates number of family range (i.e., Bates number of the first page of the parent e-mail or document)
ENDATTACH	Last Bates number of family range (i.e., Bates number of the last page of the last attachment or, if no attachments, the document itself)
ATTACHCOUNT	Number of attachments to an e-mail

ATTACHNAMES	Names of each individual Attachment, separated by semi-colons delimited by unique character
PRODVOL	Name of media that data was produced on.
DATESENT (mm/dd/yyyy hh:mm:ss AM)	Date Sent
DATERCVD (mm/dd/yyyy hh:mm:ss AM)	Date Received
E-MAILDATSORT (mm/dd/yyyy)	Sent Date of the parent e-mail (most recent e-mail in a chain)
E-MAILOUTLOOKTYPE	Type of Outlook item, e.g., e-mail, calendar item, contact, note, task (Outlook or similar system data)
HASHVALUE	MD5 hash value
TITLE	Internal document property
AUTHOR	Internal document property
DATECRTD (mm/dd/yyyy hh:mm:ss AM)	Creation Date
LAST MODIFIED BY	Last person who modified (saved) a document
LASTMODD (mm/dd/yyyy hh:mm:ss AM)	Last Modified Date
REDACTED	"Redacted" shall be indicated with a Y/N.
REDACTIONREASON	Basis of redaction. If more than one, separate reasons by semi-colons
HASREVISIONS[4]	Y if a Word document with revisions, otherwise N or empty
HASCOMMENTS	Y if a Word or Excel document with comments, otherwise N or empty
HASHIDDENTEXT	Y if a Word document with hidden text, otherwise N or empty
HASHIDDENSLIDES	Y if a PowerPoint document with hidden slides, otherwise N or empty

[4] Defendants advise that their ESI processing platform does not provide the requested meta-data for certain requested fields (noted in bold and italic in this attachment): *i.e.,* HASREVISIONS, HASCOMMENTS, HASHIDDENTEXT, HASVERYHIDDENWORKSHEETS. The Parties shall confer, and in the event Defendants' processing platform cannot generate such information, those fields may be excluded from the meta-data deliverable.

HASSPEAKERNOTES	Y if a PowerPoint document with speaker's notes, otherwise N or empty
HASHIDDENROWS	Y if an Excel document with hidden rows, otherwise N or empty
HASHIDDENCOLUMNS	Y if an Excel document with hidden columns, otherwise N or empty
HASHIDDENWORKSHEETS	Y if an Excel document with hidden worksheets, otherwise N or empty
HASVERYHIDDENWORKSHEETS	Y if an Excel document with very hidden worksheets, otherwise N or empty
DOCUMENTTYPE	Descriptor for the type of document: **"E-document"** for electronic documents not attached to e-mails; **"E-mail"** for all e-mails; **"E-attachment"** for files that were attachments to e-mails; and **"Physical"** for hard copy physical documents that have been scanned and converted toan electronic image.
IMPORTANCE	High Importance – indicates Priority E-mail message.
CONFIDENTIALITY TREATMENT	Confidentiality treatment level
TRANSLATION	Translation of any foreign language text (Y/N)

EXHIBIT G

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION This Document Relates to: All Cases	Case No. 25-md-3140 Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

PRETRIAL ORDER NO. __
[PROPOSED] DEPOSITON PROTOCOL

1. Order Applicable to All Cases in MDL Proceedings. This Order applies to all cases currently pending in MDL No. 3140 and to all related actions that have been or will be originally filed in, transferred to, or removed to this Court and assigned hereto (collectively, "the MDL Proceedings"). This Order is binding on all Parties and their counsel in all cases currently pending or subsequently made part of these Proceedings and will govern each case in these MDL Proceedings.

2. Scope. This Order applies to: (i) all fact depositions of witnesses who are currently or were formerly employees of MDL Defendants relating to Defendants' preemption and general causation defenses ("Phase One Discovery"); and (ii) all third-party witnesses relating to Phase One Discovery. For the avoidance of doubt, this Order does not apply to: (i) fact depositions of any MDL Plaintiff, his

or her representatives, family members, personal acquaintances, healthcare providers, and all other case-specific fact witnesses; (ii) general corporate (or case-specific) discovery of Defendants on topics outside of Phase One Discovery and (iii) expert depositions.

3. Terms. For the purpose of this Order, the terms "MDL Plaintiffs" and "MDL Defendants" refer, respectively, to all Plaintiffs and all Defendants in these MDL Proceedings (each a "Party" and collectively, the "Parties"). The terms "Plaintiffs" or "Plaintiffs' Counsel" refers to Plaintiffs' Leadership appointed by the Court, or the designees of the foregoing. The term "Involved Counsel" refers to those attorneys participating in a particular deposition, which may include Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel or their designees or Defendants' Counsel or their designees.

4. Cooperation. The Parties and their counsel acknowledge their duty to work together cooperatively in both scheduling and conducting depositions and agree to meet and confer and to strive to reach agreement between and among all involved Parties where possible.

5. Number of Depositions; Deposition Days for Depositions of Current and Former MDL Defendant Employees. Given the nature of the product at issue in the litigation, including its multiple-decade development history, more than thirty years on the market, and the complex history of corporate acquisitions and divestitures, the Parties agree that Plaintiffs may presumptively take 35 deposition

days of (i) fact witnesses currently or formerly employed by Pfizer, and (ii) witnesses designated by Pfizer pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6). Any request by the Plaintiffs for additional depositions days beyond the presumptive 35 days will be granted so long as the request is reasonable and appropriate in light of the discovery taken to that point. **[*Plaintiffs' proposal:*** Plaintiffs may presumptively take twenty (20) deposition days for the same category of witnesses for each of Prasco, Greenstone and Viatris. ***Greenstone, Viatris, and Prasco's proposal:*** Plaintiffs may presumptively take ten (10) deposition days for the same category of witnesses for Viatris, Greenstone, and Prasco combined—the ten total days may be allocated in whatever manner Plaintiffs choose.**]** The Parties agree to meet and confer regarding deposition limits for general corporate discovery after the resolution of the preemption and general causation defenses.

6. With respect to depositions of Defendants' current or former employees, MDL Plaintiffs will be permitted 7 hours of examination time per deposition day. Following re-direct of the witness, any re-cross by MDL Plaintiffs may not exceed the amount of time taken for re-direct. Each deposition will count as at least one full deposition day, even if the time on the record during a particular deposition is less than 7 hours. For the avoidance of doubt, additional examination conducted subsequent to, and within the scope of, any examinations conducted by

counsel for the witness or counsel for other parties, shall not be counted as an additional day under the limits set forth in this Order

7. Nonparty or third-party witnesses. The duration of a deposition of a nonparty or third-party witness shall be seven (7) hours of examination on the record, unless otherwise agreed or ordered by the Court. If there are multiple noticing parties, the Parties agree to confer regarding the duration and sequence of examination as set forth elsewhere in this Order.

8. Notice of Anticipated Multiple-Day Examinations. The deposition of a witness will be presumed to be one day. Should Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel anticipate the deposition of a witness will require more than a single day, Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel must provide notice to Defendants at least 14 days prior to a deposition. The parties will then meet and confer, and, in the event they are unable to reach agreement, promptly raise the issue with the Court. Absent such notice, Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel or their designees will have no more than one (1) day deposition examination time. Absent agreement of the Parties or order of this Court on a showing of good cause: (i) no deposition may occur over more than two deposition days; and (ii) any deposition scheduled for more than one day must occur on consecutive calendar days.

9. Fact Witnesses Defendants Designated as Corporate Representatives. The Parties may agree to consecutive depositions of an individual who is both a fact

witness and a 30(b)(6) corporate representative witness (as properly noticed by Defendants pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6)). One deposition will be taken in his or her individual capacity (as a fact witness) and a separate deposition will be taken in his or her capacity as a corporate representative, with each deposition counting as one day.

10. Time Limit. The time limits for a deposition set forth above will be based on the actual time spent examining the witness. Time spent on attorney colloquy and breaks (including for lunch) will not be counted toward the time limit.

11. Cross-Noticing of Common Witnesses. Any Party can cross-notice a deposition in any related state-court litigation. The Parties must use their best efforts to coordinate, to the extent practicable, the scheduling and taking of depositions with state-court plaintiffs, including working on agreements for the cross-noticing of depositions, in order to minimize the number of times that a common witness must appear for a deposition, eliminate duplicative discovery, conserve judicial resources, and promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation. In a coordinated deposition, the Court expects MDL counsel and state-court counsel to cooperate in selecting a primary examiner. When the primary examiner has concluded his or her examination, other appropriate counsel may ask non-duplicative additional questions prior to the completion of the deposition. To the extent there is a need for Court input on the allocation of time between MDL counsel and state-court counsel

during a particular deposition, Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel must notify the Court in advance. The time that state-court counsel spends examining a common witness will not be counted against the examination time allotted to MDL counsel. With that said, the Court will not permit redundant or excessive questioning of a witness.

12. Parties to Meet and Confer on Scheduling. Plaintiffs' Counsel and Defendants' Counsel must work cooperatively to ensure a fair and orderly process for the scheduling of depositions. Absent extraordinary circumstances, Involved Counsel must consult in advance with proposed deponents or their counsel in an effort to schedule depositions at mutually convenient times, and counsel for the deponent must provide Involved Counsel multiple available deposition dates to aid the Parties' efforts at cooperative scheduling. Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel, Defendants' Counsel, and counsel for the deponent, if applicable, must cooperate on selecting a mutually convenient date for each deposition.

13. Ineligible Deposition Dates. Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties or ordered by the MDL Court, depositions may not be taken on Saturdays, Sundays, or federal court holidays.

14. Start Time. In the absence of agreement to the contrary, depositions will commence at 9:00 a.m. in the time zone in which the deposition is taking place.

15. Notice Form/Content/Timing. Each deposition notice in the MDL Proceeding must comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b). The deposition notice must

include the name, address, and telephone number of an attorney point of contact designated by the party noticing the deposition, as well as the date, time, and location of the deposition. The notice must clearly state whether the deposition will be videotaped in addition to being recorded by stenographic means. Any notice for the deposition of a corporate or organizational representative under Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) must describe with reasonable particularity the matters for examination, and the parties must confer in good faith about the matters for examination before or promptly after the notice or subpoena is served. The questioning during the representative deposition must be limited to the matters referenced in the notice. Absent agreement of the parties, good cause, or an order of the MDL Court, any deposition notice must be served at least fourteen (14) days before the date the noticed deposition is to occur.

16. Authority to Serve & Receive. Notices for depositions in the MDL Proceeding must be served by email, mail, courier service, or other electronic means on Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel and Defendants' Counsel.

17. This Order, in its entirety, must be attached to any subpoena or notice that relates to the deposition of a third-party witness.

18. Postponements. Once a deposition has been mutually scheduled by the Parties, it may not be taken off the calendar, rescheduled, or relocated fewer than one week in advance of the date it is scheduled to occur, other than to withdraw the

notice, except upon agreement in writing among the examiner designated by the noticing party and Lead Counsel for the opposing party, or by leave of Court for good cause shown.

19. Conduct of the Deposition

a. Who May Attend. Unless otherwise agreed to by the Parties, depositions may be attended only by the Parties, the Parties' counsel, the deponent, the deponent's attorney, in-house counsel for the Parties, court reporters, videographers, and lawyers, assistants invited by examining counsel to assist, and any person who is assisting in the litigation and whose presence is reasonably required by the aforementioned counsel of record. For the avoidance of doubt, retained experts may not attend unless agreed to by the Parties. Unnecessary attendance in person or by telephone by non-examining counsel is discouraged and may not be compensated in any common benefit fee application to the Court without good cause shown or if the attendance was approved by Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel.

b. Notice of Attendees at a Deposition. For there to be adequate deposition space and to notify building security, counsel intending to attend a deposition noticed in the MDL should advise all Parties, including counsel for the noticing party, of their intention to attend in person at least two (2) business days prior to the deposition.

c. Number of Examiners. Based on the number of Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' counsel involved in this litigation, Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel may designate up to two (2) attorneys to serve as the primary and secondary examiner of each deponent on behalf of the MDL Plaintiffs. Each MDL Defendant may designate one attorney for the MDL Defendants to conduct the examination of each deponent, but only in the event that there are issues unique to more than one Defendant. Notwithstanding the number of examiners, the time limits set forth above will still apply. Counsel should cooperate so examinations by multiple attorneys do not result in duplicative questioning or a deposition exceeding the allotted time.

d. Sequence of Examination for Depositions of Defendants' Representatives/Employees; Allocation of Time for Defendants. In the absence of an alternative agreement by Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel and Defendants' Counsel, questioning at the deposition of Defendants' representatives and/or current or former employees will be conducted in the following sequence: (i) Plaintiffs' Counsel, followed by examination by any non-MDL plaintiffs participating in the deposition; (ii) Defendants' Counsel, followed by counsel for the witness (if not also Defendants' Counsel); (iii) re-cross/re-direct by Plaintiffs' Counsel and any non-MDL plaintiffs participating in the deposition; (iv) re-direct by Defendants'

Counsel. Any re-cross/re-direct must be responsive to the examination conducted by Defendants' Counsel and counsel for the witness and may not exceed the time taken by the examination by Defendants' Counsel and counsel for the witness.

e. Cross-Notice Required. If Defendants intend to conduct a direct examination of a witness noticed by Plaintiffs, then that examination must be cross-noticed in advance of the deposition. Defendants' failure to properly cross-notice will constitute a waiver of their right to conduct a direct examination during the respective deposition. Any properly cross-noticed direct examination by Defendants must be limited to three (3) hours, with an additional 30 minutes for redirect/re-cross. If Defendants anticipate needing more than three (3) hours for the direct examination of a particular witness, they may request leave of Court for additional time, at or before the time they cross-notice the deposition. Before questioning the witness, Defendants' Counsel must state on the record that he or she is conducting a direct examination. If the properly cross-noticed direct examination extends into a second deposition day, for the sole purpose of Defendants' direct examination, that second day will not be counted against the deposition days allotted to Plaintiffs.

f. Sequence of Examination/Allocation of Exam Time for Third-Party Witnesses. If the Parties cannot reach agreement regarding the sequence of examination, they must submit their dispute to the Court, which will determine the sequence of examination without regard to which party issued the deposition or subpoena notice first. In conferring regarding the allocation of time between the Parties with regard to such witnesses, the parties must be reasonably guided by the principle that the examination time per deposition day must be allocated evenly. If the Parties cannot agree on the allocation of deposition time, they must submit the dispute to the Court, which will determine the allocation of deposition time without regard to the Parties' presumptive equal allocation of time. Nothing in this Order is intended to limit the ability of the Parties, for good cause shown, to seek more time for certain key witnesses.

g. The deposition will be conducted in a manner to replicate, to the extent feasible, the presentation of evidence at a trial. Unless physically unable, the deponent must be seated at a table or in a witness box except when reviewing or presenting demonstrative materials for which a change in position is required. To the extent practicable, the deposition will be conducted in a neutral setting, against a solid background, with only such lighting as is required for accurate video recording. Lighting, camera

angle, lens setting, and field of view will be changed only as might be necessary in order to record accurately the natural body movements of the deponent or to portray exhibits and materials used during the deposition. Sound levels will be altered only as necessary to record satisfactorily the voices of counsel and the deponent. The witness must appear in ordinary business attire. Eating and smoking by deponents during the deposition will not be permitted.

20. Recording of Depositions. A certified court reporter must stenographically record all deposition proceedings and testimony and provide a "real time" transcription feed to devices such as video monitors and computers. The court reporter must administer the oath or affirmation to the deponent. The written transcript prepared by the court reporter will constitute the official record of the deposition for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 30's requirements concerning filing, retention, certification, and the like.

21. Audioconferencing Capabilities. The certified court report must arrange for an audio conference line for counsel participating remotely. Any counsel or other authorized attendee who "attends" the deposition remotely must be identified on the record. During breaks and off the record discussions, the audio conference must be muted.

22. Right to Videotape Depositions. Any party has the right to request that the deposition of any party or witness be recorded on videotape and such written request must be provided with the deposition notice. Where the party wishing to videotape did not notice the deposition, a request for video tape recording must be submitted in writing to Lead Counsel for the Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel and Defendants' Counsel no later than ten (10) days before the date on which the deposition is scheduled to occur. The party wishing to videotape the deposition, if not originally noticed as such, is responsible for arranging and paying for the videotape. All videotaped depositions must be accompanied by a simultaneous audio tape and stenographic transcript. The stenographically prepared transcript will constitute the official record of the deposition.

23. Remote Depositions. Upon agreement of the Parties and counsel for the witness, a deposition may be held remotely using a secure Zoom connection or a similar audio/video conferencing technology platform. In the event that a deposition proceeds remotely ("Videoconference Deposition"), the following shall also apply:

a. If the witnesses' counsel or any Parties' counsel is physically located in the room or facility where the witness is located, then the noticing counsel has the right to be physically located in the room or facility where the witness is located.

b. Any Videoconference Deposition taken pursuant to this Court's Orders must comply with the requirements in Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(5). This includes the requirements that, (a) "[u]nless the parties stipulate otherwise, a deposition must be conducted before an officer appointed or designated under Rule 28," and (2) that officer must administer the oath or affirmation to the deponent. A Videoconference Deposition taken pursuant to this Order will be deemed to have been taken before an appropriate officer despite the court reporter not being in the same physical location as the witness—as long as the court reporter attends the deposition by the same remote means as the other participants and is able to hear and communicate with other attendees. To the extent permitted by the law of the state in which the witness is located, the witness may be sworn in remotely with the same effect as an oath administered in person.

c. The deposition notice for any Videoconference Deposition pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30 must list the location(s) (city and state) from where the witness will attend, information the witnesses' counsel must provide upon request of the noticing party.

d. All deposition notices must identify the company that will host and record the remote deposition (the "Remote Deposition Vendor") and contain a general description of how those attending may access the remote

connection being utilized (e.g., GoToMeeting, Zoom, WebEx). The party noticing the deposition must provide the witness and all other attendees with detailed instructions regarding how to participate in the Videoconference Deposition at least three business days before the deposition.

e. To host a remote deposition, a Remote Deposition Vendor must have implemented adequate security measures to ensure the confidentiality of the remote deposition (e.g., video and audio feeds, exhibits). These security measures include using tools such as a "virtual waiting room" that allows the court reporter to admit only individuals authorized to attend the deposition. At least 24 hours before the Videoconference Deposition is scheduled to start, counsel, the witness, and the Remote Deposition Vendor must conduct a test of the system, equipment, and internet connection that will be used to conduct the remote deposition (the "Remote Deposition Technology"). If a witness noticed for a Videoconference Deposition does not have a webcam equipped tablet, desktop or laptop computer that can be used during the deposition, counsel who noticed the deposition must provide the deponent with an agreed-upon tablet containing the audio, webcam, and Wi-Fi connectivity needed to participate in the deposition.

f. The party noticing the deposition shall arrange for technical support for the duration of the deposition to be available to any participant in the event of technological issues.

g. At the time of the deposition, the witness must advise the court reporter of his or her physical location. The witness should endeavor to participate in the deposition from a quiet, well-lit, indoor location, while seated in front of a neutral background, and facing the camera being used to record the witness. To avoid any potential disruptions of a Videoconference Deposition, those attending must enable "do not disturb" settings for applications not in use, including but not limited to, Skype, instant messaging, and/or e-mail notifications. The Court recognizes that the microphones for certain attendees (such as the witness, the court reporter, the attorney taking the deposition, and the attorney defending the deposition) must remain on when the deposition is on the record. Other attendees should mute microphones when not speaking. The Remote Deposition Technology must be able to show in real-time a list of all persons attending the Videoconference Deposition. The attorneys participating in the examination may be visible to all other participants during the deposition.

h. Counsel and/or the interpreter shall be on camera and ensure no audio disruption if there are multiple remote attendees in a single location.

i. During live testimony on the record, no one, including attorneys, shall communicate in any manner with the deponent in any way that cannot be heard or seen by all Participants to the deposition. This includes silent signals and private messages of any kind, including, but not limited to, instant messages or text messages conveyed through phones, smart watches, or similar devices. Such prohibition shall not affect the right of the deponent and her/his lawyer(s) to communicate in private off the record to the extent otherwise permitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(c)(1).

j. During the deposition, full and complete copies of deposition exhibits must be provided to the witness and counsel who are attending the deposition. Deposition exhibits must be made available via the Remote Deposition Technology, file sharing software, or other electronic means. A witness may be required to use a keyboard, mouse, or other similar means to open and/or advance the pages of an exhibit. Upon request, deposition exhibits must be made available in physical (hardcopy) form. The fact that a witness was provided with an electronic copy of an exhibit will be an insufficient basis, by itself, to object to the admissibility of that exhibit at

trial. During the deposition, the Remote Deposition Technology must allow: (1) the witness to privately access any part of the exhibit and to control his or her movement through the document; (2) counsel to display and annotate exhibits for the witness; (3) add and remove exhibits; and (4) change the order in which the exhibits are presented to the witness.

k. Any pauses, lags, and/or disruptions in technology, including but not limited to interruptions in Internet connection, will not result in waiver of objections by any party. If any pauses, lags, and/or disruptions are persistent or prolonged, the Parties should: (1) extend the remote deposition by an amount of time equal to the duration of the pause, lag, and/or disruption, provided that the additional time is less than an hour; or (2) consider rescheduling the remote deposition for a later date, if the additional time required is an hour or more.

DONE and **ORDERED** on this ____ day of ____, 2025.

_____

M. CASEY RODGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

EXHIBIT H

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION

IN RE: DEPO-PROVERA (DEPOT MEDROXYPROGESTERONE ACETATE) PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	Case No. 25-md-3140
This Document Relates to: All Cases	Judge M. Casey Rodgers Magistrate Judge Hope T. Cannon

[PROPOSED] ORDER OF APPOINTMENT

The Court has determined that the appointment of a CPA is necessary for the fair and efficient management of the Common Benefit Fund for this litigation. The Court has consulted with Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs support this appointment. Accordingly, the Court hereby appoints Randall Sansom as CPA. The Court is aware of Mr. Sansom's credentials and experience, and finds them well qualified to perform this work.

Mr. Sansom is directed to meet and confer with Lead Counsel and thereafter submit a proposed order regarding the guidelines and procedures for the creation of the Common Benefit Fund, including the submission of time worked and expenses incurred for the common benefit. Mr. Sansom may communicate *ex parte* with plaintiffs' counsel and/or with the Court. Mr. Sansom shall be compensated from the Common Benefit Fund, once it is established.

DONE and **ORDERED** on this ____ day of ____, 2025.

_____

M. CASEY RODGERS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE