

FILED  
12/16/16

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)

FILED  
JAN 05 2017  
JUDGE JESSICA R. MAYER

William Grosse and Barbara Grosse  
  
Plaintiffs

v.

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-10119-14

**ORDER TO AMEND COMPLAINT TO  
SUBSTITUTE JOHN DOE  
DEFENDANTS TO DEFENDANT  
WATSON 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 his Complaint to include the following defendant: Watson 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 6<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2017.

**ORDERED** that the caption of the above Complaint be amended to "William Gross and Barbara Gross 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 AND WATSON LABORATORIES, INC."; and it is

further ordered that counsel for plaintiffs shall serve a copy of this Order <sup>be posted online for all</sup> ~~on counsel for~~  
<sup>counsel</sup> defendant within seven (7) days of the date of this Order.

**UNOPPOSED**

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

Motion  Opposed

Unopposed

- counsel for Watson having submitted a letter stating no "opposition" to the motion but not waiving any defenses that may be applicable 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."