

Ellen Relkin
WEITZ & LUXENBERG
A New York Professional Corporation
220 Lake Drive East, Suite 210
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002
(856) 755-1115
Attorneys for Plaintiff(s)

2017
01-06-17
JAN 06 2017
RECEIVED CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT

Rosalyn Dones

Plaintiff,

vs.

WYETH LLC, WYETH INC., WYETH
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., INDIVIDUALLY
AND D/B/A ESI LEDERLE, INC., WYETH
HOLDINGS CORPORATION, INDIVIDUALLY
AND d/b/a LEDERLE, JOHN DOE DRUG
COMPANY DEFENDANTS, JOHN DOE
DRUG DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS

Defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX
COUNTY

IN RE: REGLAN LITIGATION
Case No. 289

DOCKET: MID-L-10112-14 CT

**ORDER TO AMEND COMPLAINT TO
SUBSTITUTE JOHN DOE
DEFENDANTS TO DEFENDANTS
PLIVA, INC., INDIVIDUALLY AND
F/K/A SIDMAK LABORATORIES,
INC.**

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court upon motion by plaintiffs, on a motion pursuant to R. 4:9-1 for an Order granting plaintiff leave to amend her Complaint to include the following defendant: Pliva, Inc., Individually and F/K/A Sidmak Laboratories, Inc., in substitution for John Doe Defendants; and the Court having read the moving papers ~~and the opposition, if any, thereto; and having considered the arguments of counsel;~~ and for good cause shown;


IT IS on this 6th day of January, 2017,

ORDERED that the caption of the above Complaint be amended to "Rosalyn Dones v. WYETH LLC, WYETH PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., INDIVIDUALLY AND d/b/a ESI LEDERLE, INC., WYETH, INC., WYETH HOLDINGS CORPORATION, INDIVIDUALLY AND d/b/a

LEDERLE, PLIVA, INC., INDIVIDUALLY AND F/K/A SIDMAK LABORATORIES, INC.?"

and it is further ordered that ~~counsel for plaintiffs shall serve~~ ^{be posted online for all} a copy of this Order ~~on counsel for~~
~~counsel~~
defendant within seven (7) days of the date of this Order.

UNOPPOSED



HON. JESSICA R. MAYER, J.S.C

Motion _____ Opposed

Unopposed - counsel for PLIVA having submitted a letter stating no "opposition" to the motion but not waiving any defenses that may be appropriate to the amended pleading.

"Having reviewed the above motion, I find it to be meritorious on its face and is unopposed. Pursuant to R. 1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers."