

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

IN RE SUBOXONE)	Case No. 1:24-md-3092
(BUPRENORPHINE/NALOXONE))	
FILM PRODUCTS LIABILITY)	MDL No. 3092
LITIGATION)	
)	Judge J. Philip Calabrese
This Document Applies to All Cases)	
)	

MINUTES AND ORDER

On December 2, 2025, the Court held a hearing in person and on the record pursuant to its discussion with counsel at the November 20, 2025 status conference regarding the parties' dispute about non-responsive child attachments. (ECF No. 566, PageID #9317.)

The following attended on behalf of Plaintiffs: Ashlie Case Sletvold, Tim Becker, Trent Miracle, and Alyson Beridon.

The following attended on behalf of Defendants Indivior, Inc., Indivior Solutions, Inc., and Aquestive Therapeutics, Inc.: Mary Pawelek, Randall Christian, Patrick DeLaune, Jason Lundry, Denise Dickerson, and Jodie Munn Schebel.

On the record, the Court and counsel addressed the following issues.

1. Production of Non-Responsive Child Attachments

Counsel outlined their respective arguments on the issues regarding the production of non-responsive child attachments and explained why the tentative deal that they reached to resolve the dispute at the November 20, 2025 status conference did not work out. (*Id.*, PageID #9315.) Based on counsels' respective arguments, the

Court outlined the general contours of resolution to this issue. Then, the Court afforded counsel time to negotiate the details among themselves.

After discussion, counsel reached agreement as to how to proceed and placed that agreement on the record. Generally, that agreement is as follows:

1.a. Wave Production

Defendants agreed to run the search terms without the root product modifier against the roughly 661,000 non-produced attachments. Defendants will provide the results to the PLC on a wave basis for the first three waves of production that have been provided to date. The first wave will take approximately 45 days, the second wave 60, and the third 75.

1.b. Deposition Two-Day Turnaround Requests

For specific requests made within two weeks of a deposition, the PLC can request production of up to 150 non-hit-attachments and Defendants will provide them within two days. More than two weeks before a deposition, the PLC will request documents, and Defendants may provide them or explain why they are not responsive.

1.c. Other Requests

The Court clarified that neither of the foregoing parts of the agreement should rule out additional requests for documents and meet-and-confer discussions regarding the same. This agreement is designed to minimize the burden for all involved while dealing with the problem of the non-child attachments.

1.d. Consilio Confirmation

Defendants indicated that they would follow up with their eDiscovery provider, Consilio, to confirm that it ran the search terms correctly and that the number of non-child attachments in issue is not the result of a technical issue.

2. Next Status Conference

Following resolution of the parties' dispute regarding non-responsive child attachments, counsel discussed whether the next status conference set for December 17, 2025 should be in person or virtually. For the reasons stated on the record, the Court will hold the next status conference in person. This is subject to change if counsel requests based on the report of counsel when they submit the agenda for the next status conference.

3. Motion to Show Cause for Providers

Finally, the Court directed defense counsel to file an additional submission for a motion to show cause for noncompliant providers of records for Plaintiffs by the end of the next week. The Court requested that defense counsel provide the complete updated list of providers. The next show cause hearing remains set for January 21, 2026.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 2, 2025



J. Philip Calabrese
United States District Judge
Northern District of Ohio