

FILED

MARCH 19, 2021

**FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP**

Eileen Oakes Muskett, Esquire  
Attorney ID 020731994  
Midtown Building, 4<sup>th</sup> floor  
1301 Atlantic Avenue  
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401  
T: 609-348-4515 // F: 609-348-6834  
[emuskett@foxrothschild.com](mailto:emuskett@foxrothschild.com)

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

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

MARIE KECKEISEN

vs

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

FOSAMAX CASE CODE: 282  
Docket No. MID-L-7402-14

**ORDER WITHDRAWING  
THE PRO HAC VICE ADMISSION OF  
EMMA NEFF, ESQUIRE**

**WHEREAS**, Defendants, Merck & Co., Inc. and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. (“Merck”), by and through its attorneys Fox Rothschild LLP, upon notice to all interest parties, have moved before this Court for an Order withdrawing the *pro hac vice* admission of Emma Neff, Esquire and the Court having considered the papers submitted in support thereof, and for good cause shown:

**IT IS** on this 19th day of March 2021, hereby;

**ORDERED** that the motion is granted, and the *pro hac vice* admission of Emma Neff, Esquire, is hereby withdrawn for all purposes and in all proceedings in connection with the above-captioned matter, with an effective date of as of the date of this Order, and it is further

**ORDERED** that counsel for Merck shall forward a copy of this Order to the Treasurer of the New Jersey Fund for Client Protection within ten (10) days of the date of this Order, and it is further

**ORDERED** that the posting of this Order on eCourts shall constitute service upon all counsel of record. Pursuant to R. 1:5-1(a), the movant shall serve a copy of this Order upon all parties not served electronically within seven (7) days of receipt of this Order.

*/s/ Bruce J. Kaplan*

**Hon. Bruce J. Kaplan, J.S.C.**

**(X) Unopposed**

Having read and considered the above motion, the Court finds it to be unopposed, meritorious on its face, and in compliance with R. 1:21-2. Pursuant to R. 1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers.