Eileen Oakes Muskett, Esquire Attorney ID No. 020731994

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP

Midtown Building, Suite 400 1301 Atlantic Avenue Atlantic City, NJ 08401

Tel: (609) 348-4515 Fax: (609) 348-6834

emuskett@foxrothschild.com

Attorneys for Defendants Merck & Co., Inc. and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.

FILED

January 20, 2023

HON. BRUCE J. KAPLAN, J.S.C.

IN RE: FOSAMAX LITIGATION

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY

LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

MCL NO.: 282

Docket No. MID-L-7153-14

ORDER

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court upon motion by Fox Rothschild LLP, attorney for Defendants, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., for an Order, pursuant to the Court's October 3, 2022 Case Management Order, dismissing all cases listed on Exhibit A.1 with prejudice pursuant to R. 4:23-2(b), for failure to effectuate the probate process to appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate, as these cases were dismissed without prejudice on October 3, 2022, and the Court having read and considered the papers submitted in this matter, and for the reasons set forth in the attached Statement of Reasons, and for good cause having been shown;

IT IS on this 20th day of January, 2023;

ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss all cases listed on Exhibit A.1 with prejudice **is hereby GRANTED**; and it is further

1

ORDERED that service of this Order shall be deemed effectuated upon all parties upon its upload to eCourts. Pursuant to <u>Rule</u> 1:5-1(a), movant shall serve a copy of this Order on all parties not served electronically within seven (7) days of the date of this order.

ISI Bruce J. Kaplan HONORABLE BRUCE J. KAPLAN, J.S.C.

UNOPPOSED

Please see attached Statement of Reasons and Exhibit A1.

Statement of Reasons

This matter having been brought before the Court upon motion by Fox Rothschild LLP, attorney for Defendants, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., for an Order dismissing all cases listed on Exhibit A.1 with prejudice pursuant to <u>R.</u> 4:23-2(b), for failure to effectuate the probate process to appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate. The Court has read and reviewed the papers submitted and notes that Plaintiffs have not filed opposition.

By way of relevant procedural history, the claims of the Plaintiffs identified in Exhibit A.1 were previously identified as including a deceased Plaintiff for which there had been no substitution of an authorized Personal Representative. On October 3, 2022, this Court entered a Case Management Order ("CMO") dismissing all cases listed on Exhibit A.1 without prejudice. In addition to dismissing the cases on Exhibit A.1 without prejudice, the Court provided Plaintiffs with sixty (60) days to move pursuant to R. 4:34-1 to substitute an authorized Personal Representative for the Estate of a deceased Plaintiff identified on Exhibit A.1 and move to reinstate Plaintiffs' complaints. Sixty (60) days have passed and no motions for an extension of time or to substitute Plaintiff and amend the complaint have been filed. As a result, Defendants bring the instant motion to dismiss all cases listed on Exhibit A.1 with prejudice.

Under New Jersey law, a deceased person has no standing to pursue a claim pursuant to Repko v. Our Lady of Lourdes Med. Ctr., Inc., 464 N.J. Super. 570, 575-74 (App. Div. 2020). R. 4:34-1(b) provides that "If a party dies and the claim is not thereby extinguished, the court shall on motion order substitution of the proper parties. The motion for substitution may be made by the successors or representatives of the deceased party or by any party." Pursuant to Repko, the law requires substitution of a deceased Plaintiff's estate for a litigation to proceed. A deceased Plaintiff cannot proceed on the Court's docket without having an estate opened and a representative appointed.

In light of Plaintiffs' failure to comply with this Court's Orders and in light of the additional time provided previously, this Court will be entering an Order dismissing these cases with prejudice. The Court finds that despite notice and opportunity, Plaintiffs have not reinstated the complaint, have not substituted the estate, and have not filed opposition.

In so doing, the Court notes pursuant to \underline{R} . 4:23-5(a)(2), if "an order of dismissal ... without prejudice has been entered pursuant to paragraph (a)(1) of this rule and not thereafter vacated, the party entitled to the discovery may, after the expiration of 60 days from the date of the order, move on notice for an order of dismissal with prejudice." It is well-settled that "dismissal with prejudice is the ultimate sanction, [and that]

it will normally be ordered only when no lesser sanction will suffice to erase the prejudice suffered by the non-delinquent party," <u>Zaccardi v. Becker</u>, 88 N.J. 245, 253 (1982) (internal citations omitted), "or when the litigant rather than the attorney was at fault." <u>Ibid.</u> (citing <u>Schlosser v. Kragen</u>, 111 N.J. Super. 337, 341 (1970)).

Our Supreme Court has also held that, "[t]he dismissal of a party's cause of action, with prejudice, is drastic and is generally not to be invoked except in those cases where the order for discovery goes to the very foundation of the cause of action ... or where refusal to comply is deliberate and contumacious." <u>Schlosser</u>, 111 N.J. Super. at 341 (citing <u>Tsibikas v. Morrof</u>, 5 N.J. Super. 306 (App. Div. 1949)).

The unfortunate reality is given the length of time of non-compliance, and the lack of any opposition, the Court finds there is no "lesser sanction" that can suffice to remedy the violations of this Court's Order.

More than 60 days has passed since Plaintiffs' Complaints were dismissed without prejudice and Plaintiffs have failed to substitute the estate, have failed to file a Motion to Reinstate the case, and Plaintiffs have failed to object to the requested relief. As a result, Defendants' motion to dismiss with prejudice is granted.

EXHIBIT A.1

Plaintiff Name	Plaintiff Counsel	Case No.	Status
Guse, Jane	Aylstock Witkin	L-8334-14	
Mathews, Anna	Aylstock Witkin	L-8544-14	
Naghousi, Ehteram	Aylstock Witkin	L-9299-14	
Pennell, Thomas	Aylstock Witkin	L-8384-14	
Plesko, Kathleen	Aylstock Witkin	L-6893-14	
Pressman, Judith	Aylstock Witkin	L-8862-14	
Spear, Alta L.	Aylstock Witkin	L-9327-14	Stipulation of Dismissal Pending
Stritikus, Priscena	Aylstock Witkin	L-6951-14	
Blakely, Lyle	Bern Ripka Napoli Shkolnik	L-9228-14	
Beaudoin, Phyllis M.	D'Arcy Johnson Day, P.C.	L-11346-14	
Benson, Theodora	Douglas & London	L-9099-14	
Gaastra, Ronald	Douglas & London	L-7721-14	
Hardin, Mervin	Douglas & London	L-8725-14	
Moore, Leola	Douglas & London	L-8705-14	
Ellis, Eleanor Imogene	Jan Meyer & Associates	L-7197-14	
Mazurik, Delores	Jan Meyer & Associates	L-7596-14	
Noble, Lorraine Lynn	Jan Meyer & Associates	L-7249-14	
Avers, Lyla	Levensten Law Firm	L-7948-14	
Barbee, Margaret	Levensten Law Firm	L-8318-14	
Baron, Charlotte	Levensten Law Firm	L-7276-14	
Bishop, Merlin	Levensten Law Firm	L-7625-14	Dismissed 8/8/2022 as to Merck Active as to Teva, Mylan, UDL Laboratories only
Bollino, Mary Alice	Levensten Law Firm	L-8480-14	Dismissed 9/2/2022 as to Merck Active as to Watson and Northstar only
Brown, Barbara D.	Levensten Law Firm	L-8721-14	
Cochran, Vanila A.	Levensten Law Firm	L-7519-14	
Duffy, Lucille	Levensten Law Firm	L-8461-14	
Fisher, Doris	Levensten Law Firm	L-6744-14	
Furr, Betty	Levensten Law Firm	L-7000-14	
Gretencort, Gail	Levensten Law Firm	L-9265-14	
King, Charles	Levensten Law Firm	L-6753-14	
Kinison, Meriam	Levensten Law Firm	L-8983-14	
Kinsey, Dora	Levensten Law Firm	L-7769-14	
Lee, Young Hwi	Levensten Law Firm	L-8216-14	Dismissed 8/8/2022 as to Merck Active as to Mylan, UDL Laboratories only
Lobsiger, Genice	Levensten Law Firm	L-8684-14	
Payne, Juanita	Levensten Law Firm	L-7618-14	
Quick, Diane	Levensten Law Firm	L-7896-14	
Rogers, Everlener C.	Levensten Law Firm	L-7641-14	Dismissed 9/2/2022 as to Merck Active as to Watson only

Plaintiff Name	Plaintiff Counsel	Case No.	Status
Rummer, Karen Lane	Levensten Law Firm	L-6967-14	
Siedman, Ruth	Levensten Law Firm	L-8565-14	
Stiffey, Shirley	Levensten Law firm	L-9349-14	
Taylor, Carol	Levensten Law Firm	L-7378-14	
Wasserman, Arlene	Levensten Law Firm	L-7664-14	
Dix, Julius Alfred	Locks Law Firm LLC	L-7942-14	
Harrington, Joanie	Locks Law Firm LLC	L-7786-14	
Skapura, Jeanne	Locks Law Firm LLC	L-7604-14	
Walters, Judith Ann	Locks Law Firm LLC	L-8922-14	
Ahmadi, Akila	Lynch Daskal Emery	L-9193-14	8/1/2022 - Motion for Extension of Time to Move for Substitution of Party; requested extension to 9/21/2022 8/5/2022 – Motion for Extension WITHDRAWN
Collier, Knelda	Lynch Daskal Emery	L-8415-14	
Gaitan, Alice	Lynch Daskal Emery	L-9139-14	
Petkovsek, Marian	Lynch Daskal Emery	L-9121-14	
Smith, Dorothy	Lynch Daskal Emery	L-9165-14	
Stephenson, Mildred Nadine	Lynch Daskal Emery	L-9117-14	8/1/2022 - Motion for Extension of Time to Move for Substitution of Party; requested extension to 9/21/2022 8/5/2022 – Motion for Extension WITHDRAWN
Gromfine, Mildred	Miller Firm, LLC	L-7697-14	
Born, Rosalyn	Oshman & Mirisola	L-8187-14	
Crain, Memory	Oshman & Mirisola	L-8168-14	
Gossett, Judith	Oshman & Mirisola	L-8195-14	
Johnson, Yvonne	Oshman & Mirisola	L-8819-14	
Mooney, Carole Ann	Oshman & Mirisola	L-7192-14	
Overton, Dolores	Oshman & Mirisola	L-8118-14	
Stracke, Doris	Oshman & Mirisola	L-7055-14	
Su, Christina	Oshman & Mirisola	L-7824-14	
Whited, Mary Ann	Oshman & Mirisola	L-8185-14	
Woods, Charlotte A.	Oshman & Mirisola	L-7867-14	
Boyce, Emma	Parker Waichman	L-9080-14	
Christy, Maysel	Parker Waichman	L-8001-14	
Dunaway, Joyce C.	Parker Waichman	L-8624-14	
Galleshaw, Dianne	Parker Waichman	L-8623-14	
Kotkins, Adaline	Parker Waichman	L-7621-14	
Liggon, Carolyn	Parker Waichman	L 7035·14	
Pugliese, Amelia	Parker Waichman	L-7492-14	
Tarasar, Mary	Parker Waichman	L-6787-14	

Plaintiff Name	Plaintiff Counsel	Case No.	Status
Young, Evonne	Pinilis Halpern	L-7001-14	
Phelps, Clara	Sanders Grossman Phillips	L-7101-14	
Baker, Billie Sue	Seeger Weiss	L-6895-14	
Campbell, Elizabeth	Seeger Weiss	L-2363-15	
Colangelo, Vera	Seeger Weiss	L-6795-14	
Corkum, Joan	Seeger Weiss	L-6894-14	
Creeley, Shirley	Seeger Weiss	L-7049-14	8/8/2022 - Motion for Extension of Time to Move for Substitution of Party; requested extension of 30 days, or 9/7/2022 8/18/2022 - Opposition to Motion to Extend Time 8/22/2022 - Letter withdrawing motion to extend time
Cyr, Susan	Seeger Weiss	L-9128-14	
Fowler, Barbara	Seeger Weiss	L-8741-14	
Frame, Nancy J.	Seeger Weiss	L-9039-14	
Fullmer, Patricia	Seeger Weiss	L-8744-14	
Gossett, Julia	Seeger Weiss	L-9154-14	
Harrell, Doris	Seeger Weiss	L-7746-14	
Henderson, Bettye J.	Seeger Weiss	L-6832-14	
Luckeroth, Ruth	Seeger Weiss	L-8453-14	
Mason, Mennie	Seeger Weiss	L-8297-14	
Moragne, Earline	Seeger Weiss	L-6827-14	
Olbrich, Diane J,	Seeger Weiss	L-6831-14	
Oravets, Arlene	Seeger Weiss	L-9284-14	
Peigh, Valentina	Seeger Weiss	L-7881-14	
Strayer, Sally	Seeger Weiss	L-8630-14	
Timko, Betty	Seeger Weiss	L-9169-14	
Carlisle, Delores	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-6832-16	
Feeheley, Joan	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-9469-14	
Gaby, Julia	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-9579-14	
Janda, Maureen	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-8024-14	
Lake, Judith	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-9640-14	
Morales, Raul	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-9645-14	
Penoyer, Laverne	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-3612-15	
Seagraves, Katie	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-7329-14	
Viljevac, Janice	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-9484-14	
Webb, Gladys	Weitz & Luxenberg	L-7465-14	