

By: Scott D. Levensten, Esquire
Attorney ID: 056322013
2200 Renaissance Blvd – Suite 320
King of Prussia, PA 19406
Phone: 215-545-5600
Fax: 215-545-5156
E: sdl@levenstenlawfirm.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED

December 2, 2022

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

ROBERTA KAY BRODIN and THOMAS T. BRODIN, her husband, Plaintiff, v. MERCK, SHARP & DOHME, CORP., Defendant.	SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY CIVIL ACTION NO.: MID-L-006792-14 ORDER
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

THIS MATTER having been opened to the Court upon the motion of The Levensten Law Firm, P.C., counsel for Plaintiffs, upon notice to all interested parties, has moved before this Court to substitute the Thomas and Roberta Brodin Living Trust, by Successor Trustee Thomas T. Brodin, and Thomas T. Brodin individually as plaintiffs v. MERCK, SHARP & DOHME, CORP., and the Court having read and considered the papers submitted in this matter, and for good cause shown;

IT IS on this 2nd day of December, 2022:

ORDERED that the Motion is **GRANTED**, and that the metadata and the caption in this matter shall reflect that Plaintiffs are The Thomas and Roberta Brodin Living Trust, by Successor Trustee Thomas T. Brodin, and Thomas T. Brodin individually v. MERCK, SHARP & DOHME, CORP.; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file and serve an Amended Complaint within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Order; it is further

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

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

UNOPPOSED

Having reviewed the within Motion, the Court finds it to be meritorious on its face, in compliance with R. 4:34-1, and unopposed. It therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers in accordance with R. 1:6-2.