



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

IN RE: HAIR RELAXER MARKETING SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL No. 3060 Case No. 23 C 818 Judge Mary M. Rowland Case Management Order No. 9A This Order relates to: All Cases
--	--

**CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER NO. 9A
(Annotation and Use of Records Authorizations by Third Party Vendor)**

The Court hereby issues this addendum to Case Management Order 9 (“CMO 9”) to govern the annotation and use of authorizations by Medical Research Consultants (“MRC”), the Third Party Vendor utilizing authorizations Plaintiffs provide with their Plaintiff Fact Sheets to Defendants for use in requesting the release of certain Plaintiff records.

- 1. Annotations of Authorizations Missing and/or Containing Incorrect Information by MRC.** If the authorizations provided by Plaintiffs with their Plaintiff Fact Sheets (“PFSs”) pursuant to CMO 9 contain information that Defendants or MRC determine is incomplete and/or incorrect information as to the following categories, MRC has the authority to fill in and/or correct the incomplete and/or incorrect information without the need to obtain permission from Plaintiffs’ counsel of record to do so:
 - a. Plaintiff’s Full Name and/or Missing Middle Initials (if indicated on PFS);
 - b. Plaintiff’s Social Security Number (if indicated on PFS);
 - c. Plaintiff’s Date of Birth (if indicated on PFS);
 - d. Plaintiff’s Current Home Address (if indicated on PFS);
 - e. Plaintiff’s ID Number(s) (if indicated on PFS and specifically for Insurance or Medicare/Medicaid records);

- f. Health Insurance Policy Number (if indicated on PFS);
 - g. The date range of records being requested as ten (10) years prior to the date of Plaintiff's alleged injury/injuries (if indicated on PFS) to present;
 - h. Listing MRC as the approved entity to which to release records;
 - i. Update Plaintiff's Personal Representative name and relationship (if indicated on PFS or supporting documentation uploaded with PFS); and
 - j. Plaintiff's signature dates (dated no later than the date MRC issues the records request).
2. However, MRC shall not make any additional edits or annotations to the authorizations signed by a Plaintiff without permission of Plaintiff's counsel of record beyond those enumerated above. This ability to annotate authorizations is applicable to all authorizations provided via the CMO 9 process but does not impact the process by which blank authorizations are to be utilized, noticed to Plaintiff's counsel, or objected thereto as applicable (which should not be unreasonable or delayed), as outlined below and in CMO 9.
3. **Electronic Duplication of Blank Authorizations.** In the event that all provided executed blank authorizations in a specific category (e.g., Healthcare) are used by MRC, MRC will electronically duplicate the blank authorizations such that Plaintiff's attorney of record does not need to replenish such authorizations as originally contemplated by Section I.8.c of CMO 9. For the avoidance of doubt, this section specifically amends and supersedes Section I.8.c of CMO 9 only. Consistent with the process outlined in Section I.8.b of CMO 9, MRC still must seek approval from Plaintiff's attorney of record to collect records from providers or employers not identified in the PFS using the executed

blank authorizations, which Plaintiff's attorney of record will not unreasonably withhold or delay.

ENTER:

Dated: October 9, 2024

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Mary M Rowland".

MARY M. ROWLAND
United States District Judge