

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

Glenn S. Kerner, Esq. (043431987)

One Vanderbilt Avenue

New York, NY 10017

Tel.: (212) 801-9200

Fax: (212) 801-6400

Glenn.Kerner@gtlaw.com

Carla R. Karp, Esq. (035482009)

Angelica Halat, Esq. (204462017)

500 Campus Drive, Suite 400

Florham Park, NJ 07932-0677

Tel.: (973) 360-7900

Fax: (973) 301-8410

Carla.Karp@gtlaw.com

halata@gtlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Teva

Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.

MERLIN BISHOP,

Plaintiff,

v.

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP., et al.,

Defendants.

FILED

January 6, 2023

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY
DOCKET NO. MID-L-7625-14
MCL CASE NO. 282

CIVIL ACTION

ORDER

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court upon motion by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, attorneys for Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., for an Order to Dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice pursuant to R. 4:23-5(a)(2), for failure to effectuate the probate process to appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate as this case was 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 6th day of January, 2023;

ORDERED that Defendant's Motion to Dismiss with prejudice is **hereby GRANTED**;
and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's complaint is hereby dismissed with prejudice; and it is further

ORDERED that service of this Order shall be deemed effectuated upon all parties upon its upload to eCourts. Pursuant to Rule 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.

/s/ Bruce J. Kaplan
HONORABLE BRUCE J. KAPLAN, J.S.C.

UNOPPOSED

See Statement of Reasons attached

Statement of Reasons

This matter having been brought before the Court upon by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, attorneys for Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., for an Order to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice pursuant to R. 4:23-5(a)(2), 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 Plaintiff has not filed an opposition.

By way of relevant procedural history, on September 22, 2022, during a Case Management Conference, Defense Counsel identified a group of plaintiffs who were deceased, and no substitution of an authorized personal representative had occurred. These plaintiffs were later identified in Exhibit A.1. This Court entered a Case Management Order on October 3, 2022, which dismissed the cases identified in Exhibit A.1 without prejudice for failing to effectuate the probate process and appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate as the plaintiff. The Court notes that Plaintiff was included in Exhibit A.1. In addition to dismissing Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice, the Court's October 3, 2022 Order provided Plaintiff with 60 days to come into compliance and appoint a formal estate representative or Defendant may move to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice. Defendant brings the instant motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice because more than 60 days has passed since this case was dismissed without prejudice and plaintiff's next of kin has failed to appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate as the plaintiff in this matter.

In light of Plaintiff's 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 this case with prejudice. The Court finds that despite notice and opportunity, Plaintiff has not provided the outstanding discovery, has not reinstated the complaint, or filed opposition.

In so doing, the Court notes pursuant to 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,” Zaccardi v. Becker, 88 N.J. 245, 253 (1982) (internal citations omitted), “or when the litigant rather than the attorney was at fault.” Ibid. (citing Schlosser v. Kragen, 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.” Schlosser, 111 N.J. Super. at 341 (citing Tsibikas v. Morrof, 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 Plaintiff’s Complaint was dismissed without prejudice and Plaintiff has failed to substitute the estate, has failed to file a Motion to Reinstate the case, and Plaintiff has failed to object to the requested relief. As a result, Defendant’s motion to dismiss with prejudice is granted.