1		FATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	DIS.	INICI OF DELIAWANE
3	IN RE:	. Chapter 11 . Case No. 24-10164 (KBO)
4	CANO HEALTH, INC., et al	•, •
5		. (Jointly Administered) .
6		. Courtroom No. 3
7		824 North Market StreetWilmington, Delaware 19801
8	Debtors.	. Friday, September 13, 2024
9		9:30 a.m.
10	TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE KAREN B. OWENS UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
11		THE BINNEY TOT GODGE
12	APPEARANCES:	
13	For the Debtors:	Jared Friedman, Esquire WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP 767 Fifth Avenue
14		New York, New York 10153
15	For MedCloud Depot	
16	LLC:	Geoffrey Aaronson, Esquire AARONSON SCHANTZ BEILEY P.A.
17		2 South Biscayne Boulevard Suite 3450
18		Miami, Florida 33131
19		
20	Audio Operator:	Jermaine Cooper, ECRO
21	Transcription Company:	Reliable
22		The Nemours Building 1007 N. Orange Street, Suite 110 Wilmington, Delaware 19801
23		Telephone: (302)654-8080 Email: gmatthews@reliable-co.com
24	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording,	
25	transcript produced by transcription service.	



(Proceedings commenced at 9:32 a.m.)

THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. This is Judge Owens. We are gathered for a remote hearing in Cano Health regarding the MedCloud disputes.

Thank you for contacting Chambers. What can I do for you? What are the open issues.

MR. AARONSON: Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. AARONSON: Geoffrey Aaronson, Aaronson Schantz Beiley in Miami, for MedCloud Depot LLC.

I don't know if Your Honor wants to take
appearances or whether --

THE COURT: No, that's not necessary. Everyone can announce themselves when they decide to contribute.

MR. AARONSON: Thank you, Judge. So, I did not request this hearing. The debtor did. Apparently, they believe there are supplemental issues resulting from Your Honor's ruling from the bench last week. They didn't file a motion for protection, so I don't necessarily have a layout here for exactly what their issues are but we have had an opportunity to discuss it.

Their issues apparently appear to arise in the context of, at least as narrowed, as to whether or not I may conduct these depositions as subpoenaed, in person, or whether they can insist on Zoom depositions. Then there is a

supplemental, I guess, issue that I just can't get an answer on and that is with regards to I am trying to have them make a representation for these witnesses that they remain under subpoena. The subpoena's, Your Honor, I filed the proof of service. Its Docket Entry 1461 through 1465.

So, I am not going to steal Mr. Friedman's thunder here. I am happy to let him make his argument and I would like an opportunity to respond.

THE COURT: Thank you very much for setting the stage. I do think it makes sense that I hear from Mr. Friedman. I see that he's with us.

So, Mr. Friedman, nice to see you. Why don't you give me a summary of what the open issues are from your perspective, from the debtor's perspective, and the positions on them.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Are you able to hear me?

THE COURT: Yes, I can. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Wonderful. Good morning and thank you for making yourself available.

So, following the hearing we had earlier, this was last week, you gave the debtors two choices, one of which was just to make the five witnesses available for the hour and a half deposition each or we would have a broader discovery schedule. After speaking to our client, we decided to go

with option A and arrange the depositions.

Part of that, of course, involves starting to reach out to the witnesses and find out their availability for these 90-minute slots to be able to be examined by Mr. Aaronson. We reached out to Mr. Aaronson and proposed that we do these by Zoom given the fact that they are relatively short 90-minute depositions, given the fact that counsel from Delaware will be defending them.

So, it would avoid the time and cost of sending counsel down to Florida especially if it turns out that if we are not able to do them all on one day, we are going to try our best to do them all in one day, but that may or may not work out depending on people's schedules. There could be multiple days and we really would prefer not to be sending counsel down multiple times.

Look, the reality is that during the pandemic we learned a lot of things and even before the pandemic certainly we learned that we knew that video conference depositions, in many instances, are a fine substitute for doing things in person during the pandemic, you know, certainly lead by the bankruptcy court who showed us that, look, business can continue going on even if we are remote. We found effective ways to do all this stuff and most importantly, it was cost effective and efficient.

That is really -- we are going to make the

witnesses available. We heard Your Honor loud and clear. We, obviously, had a different position but you ruled as you did and we are going to arrange for the depositions. We are just now trying to figure out how to do it in the most costeffective and efficient manner. Its not, frankly, just about the cost of counsel, but also, as you can imagine, for an individual to make themselves available from 9 to 10:30 for a deposition online they can do that from their office, they can do that from their home. Once they have got to start going to Mr. Aaronson's office, you know, no matter how far they be or close they may be to that office now you are talking about driving there early and getting there, they don't want to be late, so, you know, it turns into more like a three-hour event rather than a 90-minute event.

So, again, we are happy to work with Mr. Aaronson to find dates and times that are most effective, and efficient, and work for everybody, but we don't see any reason why this can't all be accomplished on Zoom. As I said, they are short depositions, the subject matter is fairly narrow. I have a feeling a lot of these depositions will end up being a lot less than 90 minutes because, you know, they are either going to learn that there is not a lot to what they think they might be finding out, but, again, they are right to talk to them and learn from them but, again, we would like to do that in an efficient manner and

that is really all that this is.

THE COURT: And I must admit, I am not clear on the second issue about the witnesses under subpoena. So, could you explain what that issue is.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I think the issue is Mr. Aaronson served subpoenas on the company, this is several months ago now when they first served their subpoenas. They weren't served on individuals; they were served on the company.

What we have told Mr. Aaronson is that he identified five individuals, we are going to coordinate so we can depose those five individuals. One of them is no longer at the company. We are going to reach out to them. We are going to do everything we can to have them be available. If it requires us compensating them for their time, because they don't work for us anymore, we are happy to do that. There is another individual who, I believe, actually today is their last day at Cano health. Again, we are going to coordinate and find a time that works for them to be able to sit for the deposition as well.

As far as we are aware right now, there shouldn't be any issues with having all five of them appear. If there are issues with any of them, we will speak to Mr. Aaronson, we will try to work it out with them. If for some reason we can't we will come back to the Court, but at this point I think its probably a non-issue because, as we told Mr.

Aaronson, we are coordinating with the witnesses and we anticipate being able to have all of them appear for depositions on dates and times that work for everybody.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

Why don't I kick the podium back to Mr. Aaronson and you can reply.

MR. AARONSON: Thank you, Judge. So, I would respectfully disagree with Mr. Friedman that proceeding with Zoom depositions is a fine substitute. I don't know who is going to -- these are IT people. These are people who are supervised by, as it turns out, DataRink (phonetic), the company that I believe, or at least our information leads us to believe, infringe on this software and reverse engineered the software. I have no idea who, in a Zoom deposition, will be in the room with these witnesses. I have no idea how many screens are in front of them. I have no idea whether their immediate supervisor is sitting next to me and, let's just say, assisting them in responding to a deposition.

Let me also address the subpoena issue because now for the first time I am hearing, oh, they weren't properly served, or at least that is the suggestion. If you look at the subpoenas each individual was properly served when the process server went to the premises. The person at the desk said they were completely authorized to accept service for the individuals. He waited there while the secretary or

whoever it was checked that out and in its affidavit of service he states that these individuals were served with subpoenas.

So, you know, maybe I am old school, but I would like to have the witness at my office. The Cano officers are way out northwest by the Everglades. In all probability my office is closer to where these people reside then the Cano officers. Let me also advise the Court that in accordance with the rules and the statute, we wrote a check to each witness for each witnesses travel fee to come to my office.

So, the fact that a low-level IT person may miss work for a couple of hours I think is irrelevant to the fact that they were properly served with subpoenas and I want to conduct a clean deposition without others in the room, without their supervisors in the room, without them being distracted by who knows what in the room. That is number one.

Number two, I find it honestly, Judge, a little rich when I hear that they want to save money on counsel having to travel down to Miami. This is a Miami business, it's a South Florida business. All of the employees are in South Florida within about a half an hour of my office. The debtor chose to hire a New York firm and to file in Delaware. I never objected to venue in this case, perfectly fine, that was their decision and they retained New York and Delaware

counsel. Now they are arguing that they could save some money by having their New York and Delaware counsel avoid coming down for the deposition. That argument is a bit rich for me.

I would also note that I offered to counsel, and I will offer again on the record, that counsel can appear by Zoom. I have done many depositions where counsel appears by Zoom. If they don't want to travel down, they don't have to travel down, but I would like my witness to appear as subpoenaed in my office clean with counsel either present physically or by Zoom without assistant or the possibility of assistance from the people who I believe are the people I am trying to prove reverse engineered this software.

With regard to the last issue, Judge, again, the individuals were subpoenaed. I still don't hear, even on the record, from Mr. Friedman, a representation from counsel that they will advise these people that they remain under subpoena. Yes, they were subpoenaed a few months ago, there was a motion to quash. The only reason why they didn't appear was because there was a motion to quash. We responded to that motion, the Court heard that motion. The Court ruled on that motion.

I have heard ad nauseum how they will use their best efforts. I appreciate that they are going to use their best efforts, but all I am looking for, and I believe there

is a difference between using your best efforts to control witnesses to appear and advising, specifically advising, these people who were previously advised that they don't have to appear at the deposition because of the motion to quash, advising them that they remain under subpoena. I cannot get that representation from debtors counsel. That is the fact and the law in this case. So, it's a secondary issue.

Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Is the concern that if they don't advise them that they remain under subpoena -- I guess I am not really understanding the effect of that. Sorry for my lack of understanding but walk me through the practical implication to this secondary issue.

MR. AARONSON: Well, I don't know whether it will happen or not, but I don't want to be told that a witness can't appear because its inconvenient, or they no longer are working for Cano and they can't get a hold of them, or the witness doesn't want to attend. I don't want to hear those kinds of things. These people were subpoenaed and if they don't intend to appear they need to do what is appropriate in response to a subpoena. The subpoena lays it out on the second page, as the Court is aware, is exactly what they might do if they are unable to appear, or refuse to appear, or don't want to appear.

You know, I appreciate Mr. Friedman's suggestion

that they will proceed in good faith. I have no problem with that. I do have a problem with them not advising them that they remain under subpoena. I want the witnesses. They have been subpoenaed. They have been paid and it doesn't hurt to tell them that the subpoena is still valid. I can't get that representation from debtors counsel.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, just to confirm a few things because this should be clear on the record. We will absolutely on any Zoom deposition instruct the witness and put on the record that they are in the room by themselves. If Mr. Aaronson would like to make sure they are working off of a single screen that is fine also; however, he would like the room to be set up we are happy to do that.

Again, you know, we have ethical obligations to this Court in instructing our witnesses about appropriate procedure during depositions and who can and cannot be in the room and what they can and cannot have in front of them. We take those ethical obligations quite seriously as do our colleagues at RLF who will be defending the depositions. So, I don't think that those are really concerns. Again, I am happy for Mr. Aaronson to confirm all those things with us if he was worried about them, but those are all non-issues.

The issue with the subpoenas also is a side show also. We don't agree that they are necessarily, you know,

under subpoena right now based on the way they were served or who was served, but we are also not all saying that we are not going to make these witnesses available. Your Honor gave us a choice, one of them was to make the five witnesses available based on Your Honor instructing us that that is what we had to do. We are making the five witnesses available for deposition as I represented already.

To the extent there are any issues that arise, I don't anticipate there being any, we will inform Mr. Aaronson immediately and if we can't work it out we will come back to the Court. It seems like we are creating a lot of issues where none really exist. We are just trying to take a pragmatic approach here to do what Your Honor ordered us to do which is to make these five witnesses available for 90-minute depositions each and we would like to do that as soon as possible so that we can have this done and move on.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. AARONSON: May I have one more reply, Judge?

THE COURT: I don't think its necessary. I appreciate everyone's time and effort to try to resolve this issue amicably and then present the issues promptly to me so that I can resolve them. I will start with the fact that I even permitted the depositions in the first place is an unusual circumstance given that we don't actually have a

contested matter at this point and I don't know what the scope of the issues are. So, I start with that proposition that I think that the fact that I granted them is highly unusual.

So, to balance that I think it is appropriate that the debtors are able to conduct these, I would call them initial depositions, by Zoom. I agree that, of course, there are concerns that -- you know, there's always concerns with respect to who is in the room and monitors and things of that nature. I acknowledge them and that is why my witnesses come in person to Court; however, for depositions Mr. Friedman is right that there are ways to set the room up to confirm that people are not coming into the room and influencing the witnesses. So, if that is truly your concern then you can address those issues with Mr. Friedman and he can make appropriate arrangements to set the room up in a manner that you can confirm that they are not being influenced.

My decision with respect to Zoom really does not relate to counsel admittedly. I agree with you that this is the nature of having counsel that are located outside of your territory and that that is just something that is necessary to the representation. But I am concerned about the time and attention taken away from the witnesses of their daily activities. I am cognizant that this is an unusual circumstance and so I do think that its appropriate to try to

streamline and decrease the effect on these witnesses at this point in time.

If this litigation advances where we are under a briefing schedule and you are conducting fulsome fact discovery then, you know, know I am not too inclined to agree to Zoom depositions absent agreement by all parties but at this initial stage I will allow it.

With respect to the secondary issue, I don't really think its an issue at this moment based on Mr.

Friedman's representations. If issues arise in the future, although I am not inviting piecemeal conferences with me with respect to this, but I generally don't have them because parties are able to resolve these things on their own and I am confident that you can. So, let's wait and see on that open issue. It sounds as if Mr. Friedman is making every effort to round these witnesses up and get their attendance locked in, in an appropriate time and convenient time. So, I will refrain from making any comments with respect to the second issue. I just don't think its necessary at this point.

So, I will leave the parties to meet and confer on the deposition schedule and how the Zoom depositions will take place, but hopefully given that they can be conducted by Zoom it will speed this process up and we can put this matter behind us and get them scheduled fairly prompt and

efficiently depending on what the witnesses schedules are.

MR. AARONSON: Your Honor, if I may just seek a clarification here. So, this discovery arises in the context of a motion for payment of administrative debt based upon the allegation that the debtors is violating a Court approved stipulation prohibiting the debtor from working with a company like DataRink, who they are now working with, in reverse engineering the software. Its teed up --

THE COURT: Its actually not teed up because they have not filed an objection yet and so I don't know what the scope of the disputed issues are which would factor into the relevancy of discovery. So, that is why it goes in a particular order as mandated by the code and the rules. So, based on that observation what is the point of clarification that you need right now.

MR. AARONSON: Well, I am trying to determine what I need to do to proceed the hearing. So, what I understand Your Honor is saying that once they file a response we then are going to have, if necessary, a separate discovery schedule and hearing schedule if we're still at issue, is that the correct approach?

THE COURT: Well, you have local counsel who can advise you on this and should be advising you on this, but, yes, you would agree on a briefing schedule, so an objection, then the reply deadline and you would need to proceed to

whatever the scope of discovery the parties believe they are entitled to and then you would ask for a trial date because this is -- you are, essentially, alleging infringement and as a result of infringement there is a remedy. So, I need to determine if there is infringement. So, to me that is highly complex and I don't do that on a summary schedule. So, you need to meet and confer with counsel.

Now, I was given the impression at the last hearing that you had said we are not sure if there actually is infringement, the purpose of these depositions is really to determine whether we need to go forward or not with our motion. So, I was persuaded and I am giving you this opportunity, but that is what these are in my opinion based on your representations at the last hearing.

So, the debtors have the right to conduct or I don't know what discovery the debtors would do, but you have to agree on whatever the appropriate scope of discovery would be following the objection.

MR. AARONSON: Thank you, Judge. I appreciate it.

THE COURT: No problem. So, thank you all very

much. I will let you get back to your days. I have another

haring in a few moments. So, we will consider this hearing

adjourned. If you need anything further from me, please let

me know.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

CERTIFICATION I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my knowledge and ability. /s/ Mary Zajaczkowski September 16, 2024 Mary Zajaczkowski, CET-531 Certified Court Transcriptionist For Reliable