

COUGHLIN DUFFY LLP
 350 Mount Kemble Avenue
 P.O. Box 1917
 Morristown, New Jersey 07962-1917
 (973) 267-0058
*Attorneys for Defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP,
 AstraZeneca LP, Astra USA, Inc., KBI Sub Inc., and Zeneca Inc.*

FILED

APR 04 2008

Judge Jamie D. Happas

JESSE DESTEFANO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ASTRAZENECA
 PHARMACEUTICALS LP, et al.,

Defendants.

:
 : SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
 : LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY
 :
 : DOCKET NO. MID-L-9904-06-MT
 :
 : CIVIL ACTION
 :
 : In Re Risperdal/Seroquel/Zyprexa Litigation
 : Case No. 274
 :
 : **ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE**
 :
 : **RETURN DATE: April 4, 2008**
 :

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court by Coughlin Duffy LLP, attorneys for Defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, AstraZeneca LP, Astra USA, Inc., KBI Sub Inc., and Zeneca Inc. (collectively “AstraZeneca”) to dismiss plaintiff’s Amended Complaint with prejudice for failure to provide an executed Acknowledgment and/or executed authorizations with the Short Form Plaintiff Fact Sheet (“Short Form PFS”) pursuant to Case Management Order No. 4 (“CMO 4”), §§ II.B. and II.C; the Court having entered an Order of Dismissal without prejudice, dated December 19, 2007, that expressly authorizes a dismissal with prejudice in the event plaintiff fails to vacate that Order of Dismissal without prejudice on or before March 16, 2008; and plaintiff having failed to provide an executed Acknowledgment and/or executed authorizations with the Short Form PFS and having failed to vacate the Order of Dismissal without prejudice on or before March 16, 2008; and for good cause shown;

IT IS on this 4th day of April, 2008;

ORDERED that AstraZeneca's motion is hereby **GRANTED**, and that plaintiff's Amended Complaint is **DISMISSED** with prejudice against all parties – served and unserved; and it is further

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

Jamie D. Happas

Jamie D. Happas, J.S.C.

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.