

TC
#2081

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
A Delaware Limited Liability Partnership
500 Campus Drive
Florham Park, New Jersey 07932-1047
(973) 360-1100
Attorneys for Defendants
Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
(f/k/a Janssen Pharmaceutica Inc.) and
Johnson & Johnson

FILED
JUL 17 2009
Judge Jamie D. Happas

IN RE: RISPERDAL/SEROQUEL/
ZYPREXA LITIGATION

: SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
: LAW DIVISION : MIDDLESEX COUNTY
:
: CASE NO. 274

:
: CIVIL ACTION

THIS ORDER APPLIES TO :
David Anderson v. Johnson & Johnson, et al., :
Docket No. MID-L-1596-06MT :

:
: **ORDER**
: **RETURN DATE: July 17, 2009**
:

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court by Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, attorneys for Defendants Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (f/k/a Janssen Pharmaceutica Inc.)¹ and Johnson & Johnson, to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for failure to comply with the terms and provisions of Case Management Orders 4 and 4A; such dismissals being authorized by Case Management Order No. 4A; 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 17th day of July, 2009;

¹ Janssen L.P. has been canceled.

ORDERED that Defendants' motion is hereby **GRANTED** and that the above-captioned Complaint is **DISMISSED** without prejudice against Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson, who were erroneously designated in the Complaint as Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc., Janssen Pharmaceutica, L.P., and Johnson & Johnson Company pursuant to Case Management Order No. 4A; and it is further

ORDERED that, in the event that plaintiff fails to vacate this Order on or before September 16, 2009, Defendants may move for an Order of Dismissal with prejudice pursuant to the procedure set forth in R. 4:23-5(a)(2); and it is further

ORDERED that a signed copy of this Order be served on all counsel within 7 days of the date hereof.



Jamie D. Happas, J.S.C.

X Unopposed
____ Opposed

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.