

FILED

JUL 18 2008

Judge Jamie D. Haggas

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, KBI Sub Inc., Zeneca Inc., and Astra USA, Inc.*

PEARLIE JONES,	:	SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
	:	LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	DOCKET NO. MID-L-10507-07-MT
	:	
v.	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
ASTRAZENECA PHARMACEUTICALS LP, et al.,	:	In Re Risperdal/Seroquel/Zyprexa Litigation Case No. 274
	:	
Defendants.	:	ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE
	:	RETURN DATE: July 18, 2008
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court by Coughlin Duffy LLP, attorneys for Defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, AstraZeneca LP, KBI Sub Inc., Zeneca Inc., and Astra USA, Inc. (collectively "AstraZeneca") to dismiss plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice for failure to serve a Short Form Plaintiff Fact Sheet pursuant to Case Management Order No. 4 ("CMO 4"), § II.G.; such dismissal with prejudice being authorized by Case Management Order No. 4A ("CMO 4A"), § II.H.2. in the event a plaintiff fails to vacate an Order of Dismissal without prejudice after the expiration of ninety (90) days from the order of dismissal without prejudice (in this case, on or before June 6, 2008); plaintiff's Complaint having been dismissed without prejudice on March 7, 2008; plaintiff having failed to serve a Short Form


Plaintiff Fact Sheet and having failed to vacate the March 7, 2008 Order of Dismissal without prejudice on or before June 6, 2008; and for good cause shown;

IT IS on this 18 day of July, 2008;

ORDERED that AstraZeneca's motion is hereby GRANTED and that plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as to all parties ~~— and plant AP —~~ pursuant to CMO 4, §II.G. and CMO 4A, §II.H.2.; and it is further

ORDERED that a signed copy of this Order be served on all counsel ^{and plant AP} within seven (7) days of the date hereof; and it is further

Unopposed
 Opposed



Honorable Jamie D. Happas, J.S.C.

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.