

IN RE: LEVAQUIN LITIGATION

**FILED**

NOV 15 2010

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
LAW DIVISION: ATLANTIC COUNTY

CASE NO. 286

CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER NO. 14

**Carol E. Higbee, P.J.Cv.**

**THIS MATTER**, having come before the Court for a Telephonic Conference in the presence of liaison counsel for the defendants (Susan Sharko, Drinker Biddle & Reath, LLP) and counsel for the plaintiffs (Richard Meadow, The Lanier Law Firm, Jonathan Orent, and Motley Rice), on October 25, 2010, to address the issue of a second video camera at depositions, and the Court having heard the argument of counsel, and for good cause shown:

IT IS on this 15 day of Nov, 2010, **ORDERED as follows:**

1. Defendants may, at their own expense, have a second video camera, at videotaped depositions, to videotape the questioning attorney.
2. Plaintiffs may, at their own expense, arrange for a third camera to videotape the lawyer defending the deposition.
3. Defendants shall bear the cost of synchronization of the videotapes from the second and third cameras for New Jersey depositions.
4. Any additional video cameras (as set forth in No. 1 and No. 2, above) shall focus on the face of the questioning and defending attorneys, and not the laptop computer or files of any attorney being videotaped.
5. The Court reserves decision on whether the videotapes from cameras focused on counsel may be used at trial.

6. A copy of this Order shall be served upon all counsel of record in these consolidated proceedings by defense counsel within 7 days from the date of entry.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. CAROL E. HIGBEE, P.J.Cv.