

COUGHLIN DUFFY LLP

Lorna A. Dotro, Esq. – ID No. 031351997

350 Mount Kemble Avenue

P.O. Box 1917

Morristown, New Jersey 07962-2075

Telephone: (973) 267-0058

Facsimile: (973) 267-6442

Attorney for Defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc.

FILED
MAY 05 2014
BRIAN R. MARTINO
J.S.C.

MATHIA MARCELLA,

Plaintiff,

v.

BAYER HEALTHCARE
PHARMACEUTICALS INC., BAYER
PHARMA AG, BAYER OY, and JOHN DOES
1-10

Defendant.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION
BERGEN COUNTY

DOCKET NO.: BER-L-8702-13-MCL

Civil Action

In Re: Mirena Litigation
Case No. 297

**ORDER ON MOTION TO DISMISS FOR
FAILURE TO PROVIDE A PLAINTIFF
FACT SHEET**

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court by way of motion of Coughlin Duffy LLP, counsel for defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc. (“Defendant”), for an Order dismissing Plaintiff’s Complaint for failure to provide a Plaintiff Fact Sheet pursuant to Case Management Order No. 3; and the Court having considered the papers submitted; and the Court having heard the arguments of counsel, if any; and for good cause shown;

IT IS, on this 5 day of May, 2014;

ORDERED that the Complaint of Plaintiff Mathia Marcella is hereby dismissed without prejudice; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff Mathia Marcella shall have 90 days from the date of this Order to serve upon Defendant a Completed Plaintiff Fact Sheet, and move before this Court for reinstatement of the Complaint and payment of the appropriate fee; and it is further

ORDERED that if Plaintiff Mathia Marcella fails to provide a Completed Plaintiff Fact Sheet within 90 days from the date of this Order, Defendant may file a Motion to Dismiss this action with prejudice; and it is further

ORDERED that a signed copy of this Order be served upon all counsel within seven (7) days of the date hereof.

Opposed

Unopposed


_____, J.S.C.
HONORABLE BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI, J.S.C.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: BERGEN COUNTY**

CASE NO. 297

CIVIL ACTION

**IN RE MIRENA
LITIGATION**

MEMORANDUM DECISION

FILED

MAY 05 2014

**BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI
J.S.C.**

Before this Court are 9 motions¹ for summary judgment on Plaintiffs Kikelomo Oyinloa, Bonnie Msith, April Flores, Samantha Taylor, Mathia Marcella, Erica Loftis, Crystal Rivera, Taniea Roark, and Dana Allen

I. Procedural Background

On May 13, 2013, the Supreme Court designated litigation involving the Mirena contraceptive device be consolidated as a multicounty litigation in Bergen County, New Jersey before Superior Court Judge Brian R. Martinotti. Since then, 12 Case Management Orders, in addition to the initial Case Management Order, have been issued in the pending litigation. Case Management Order #3, dated August 23, 2013, regarded the Plaintiff Fact Sheet. Paragraph 3 explains that the Plaintiff Fact Sheet (hereinafter 'PFS') is a convenient form of interrogatories and requests for document production. It is governed by the standards applicable to written discovery under Rules Governing the Courts of the State of New Jersey. Paragraph 7 requires every Plaintiff to provide Defendant's Counsel with a PFS that is "substantially complete in all respects." This means all applicable questions must be answered, there must be a signed Declaration by the Plaintiff included, duly executed releases Authorizations must be provided, and responsive documents requested in the PFS must be produced to the extend they are in Plaintiff's possession.

Paragraph 17 of CMO 3# addresses non-compliance with the aforementioned requirements. Specifically, any Plaintiff who fails to comply with their PFS obligations as outlined in CMO #3 may have their claims dismissed. If Defendant has not received a PFS that is substantially complete, as previously described, from a Plaintiff within 30 days following the prescribed due date, Defendant must

send a Notice of Overdue Discovery to Plaintiff's counsel identifying the discovery overdue and explaining that unless Plaintiff complies with the Court's discovery order, the case may be dismissed. If Defendant has still not received a completed PFS within 30 days of the notice, Defendant was allowed to move before this Court for an Order dismissing the Complaint without prejudice. Upon filing, Plaintiff had 30 days to file a response either (1) certifying Plaintiff has served Defendant with a completed PFS, that Defendant has received it, and attaching appropriate documentation of that receipt or (2) opposition to the motion.

If this Court grants Defendant's motion to dismiss without prejudice, Plaintiff has 90 days to serve Defendant with a completed PFS or moves to vacate the dismissal. If Plaintiff fails to do so within 90 days after the entry of the Order of Dismissal without Prejudice, the order will be converted to a Dismissal with Prejudice upon Defendant's motion.

II. The Present Motion

Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss 10 separate claims by various defendants. Attached as Exhibit A to the Motion is a list of each individual Plaintiff, their Attorney, the PFS Due Date, and the Date the Notice of Overdue Discovery was sent. 1 of these motions was subsequently voluntarily dismissed. The remaining 9 Defendants, as listed in Exhibit A of this Memorandum Decision, have failed to respond to repeated requests by Defense Counsel for their PFS. All pending motions were unopposed.

The time allowed to cure has lapsed. Defendants had ample notice of their outstanding discovery, as well as the consequences to failing to cure their deficiencies. For those reasons, in accordance with CMO #3, paragraph 17, this Court GRANTS Defendant's motion to dismiss without prejudice these 12 complaints for failure to provide PFS. Plaintiffs have 90 days from entry of this order to serve Defendant with a completed PFS or this dismissal without prejudice will be converted to a dismissal with prejudice upon Defendant's motion.

ⁱ Originally, Defendant filed 10 motions. 1 of those were subsequently voluntarily dismissed.