

#0205
10/25/16

Eileen Oakes Muskett, Esquire
Attorney ID 020731994
Fox Rothschild LLP
Midtown Building, Suite 400
1301 Atlantic Avenue
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401
Phone: 609-348-4515
Attorney for Defendant Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.

Elizabeth Hebert

Plaintiff

vs.

Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.

Defendant.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

FOSAMAX LITIGATION

DOCKET NO. MID-I-9578-14

CIVIL ACTION CASE NO. 282

ORDER

WHEREAS, Defendant Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., by and through its attorneys Fox Rothschild LLP, upon notice to all interested parties, has moved before this Court for the dismissal of this matter against Defendant in this matter; and the Court having considered the papers submitted in support thereof; and for other good cause, **IT IS** on this 28th day of October, 2016, hereby **ORDERED** that the motion is granted, and all claims of Plaintiff in this case are hereby dismissed without prejudice.

Hon. Jessica R. Mayer, J.S.C.

OPPOSED - plaintiff's counsel
having complied with the requirements
A COPY OF THIS ORDER SHALL BE POSTED ONLINE BY THE COURT
at rule 4:23-5 by notifying plaintiff
of the pending motion and requesting
that plaintiff contact counsel

ORDERED that counsel for the non-moving party shall serve upon his or her client in accordance with R. 4:23-5(a)(1) a copy of this Order and the notice set forth in Appendix A of the Court's Rules.

#1037
opposite order
10/25/16

Josephine Reina, Esq.
WEITZ & LUXENBERG
A New York Professional Corporation
Attorney ID 079772015
200 Lake Drive East, Suite 205
Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002
Phone: (856) 755-1115

Attorneys for Plaintiff Elizabeth Hebert

) SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY) LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY)) DOCKET NO.: MID-L-9578-14)) CIVIL ACTION CASE NO. 282) ORDER))
ELIZABETH HEBERT	
Plaintiff,	
vs.	
MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.	
Defendant.	

This matter, having been opened to the Court on application by Weitz & Luxenberg, counsel for Plaintiff Elizabeth Hebert, an order in opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Provide Discovery, having considered the submissions of the parties and for good cause shown.

IT IS on this 26th Day of October 2016, that ~~the~~ ^{Defendant's} motion is ~~DENIED.~~ ^{GRANTED} for the reasons noted on the court's order dated 10/25/16.



HON. JESSICA R. MAYER, J.S.C.

OPPOSED