

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois – CM/ECF NextGen 1.9 (rev. 1.9)
Eastern Division**

In RE: Hair Relaxer Marketing, Sales Practices, And
Products Liability Litigation, et al.

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.:
1:23-cv-00818
Honorable Mary M.
Rowland

L'Oreal USA, Inc., et al.

Defendant.

NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on Thursday, July 2, 2026:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable Beth W. Jantz: Plaintiffs and Defendant RNA Corporation called in for a status hearing on July 2, 2026, to discuss the issues noted in the Court's order of June 21, 2026 (Dkt. 1943). First, the parties discussed Plaintiffs' request for certain expedited discovery from RNA regarding certain bellwether Defendants' responses that RNA is a necessary party (or that there are unnamed necessary party(s)). Plaintiffs informed the Court that several Defendants identified RNA as necessary party in their June 30, 2026 discovery responses but did not, in Plaintiffs' view, identify the facts that purportedly render it a necessary party. The remaining Defendants maintained a necessary-party defense but did not identify any party(s) by name. In light of that, Plaintiffs requested from RNA, on an expedited timeline, its correspondence to and from all of the bellwether Defendants, any attachments thereto, and any contracts with the bellwether Defendants, all as it relates only to chemical hair relaxers. The parties represent that Plaintiffs requested certain discovery from RNA years ago via subpoena(s), before RNA was named as a second-wave Defendant, but they dispute why these subpoenas were pulled down. As ordered at the hearing, by any time on July 7, 2026, the parties shall submit brief statements that include: (1) the timeline and facts surrounding the pulling down of Plaintiffs' earlier subpoena(s) to RNA; and (2) legal support or authorities for or against the proposition that it is not RNA's burden to produce expedited discovery that goes to the affirmative defenses of the bellwether Defendants (both those who have named RNA, and those who have not identified specific necessary party(s)). In that same submission, RNA should identify a short timeframe in which it can produce to Plaintiffs affidavit(s) documenting that it did not produce or manufacture any hair relaxer products for certain bellwether Defendants. The Court will review the parties' submissions and decide whether to order this expedited discovery. If so, it will direct the parties to meet and confer on a more granular basis about the discovery that RNA and bellwether Defendants have already produced to Plaintiffs, the discovery that Plaintiffs believe they still need, and how quickly RNA can accomplish further expedited discovery productions. If the parties cannot agree, the Court is referring the dispute to Special Master Grossman. Second, the parties confirmed their jointly held position that third-party discovery as to

RNA remains open (because the first-wave discovery deadlines do not apply to RNA as a second-wave Defendant). Mailed notice. (as,)

ATTENTION: This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at ***www.ilnd.uscourts.gov***.