

DOUGLAS AND LONDON, P.C.
Michael A. London, Esq.
Attorney ID # 048501997
59 Maiden Lane, 6th Floor
New York, NY 10038
212-566-7500
Attorneys for Plaintiff ETTA BAKER

FILED
SEPTEMBER 10, 2021
HON. BRUCE J. KAPLAN, J.S.C.

-----X	IN RE ZOSTAVAX LITIGATION
ETTA BAKER; an individual,	
	SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW
Plaintiffs,	JERSEY LAW DIVISION –
-against-	MIDDLESEX COUNTY
	CASE NO.: L-003516-20
MERCK & CO., INC. and MERCK SHARP &	MASTER DOCKET NO.: 629
DOHME CORP.,	
Defendants.	<u>ORDER</u>
-----X	

THIS MATTER being opened to the Court by Douglas & London, P.C., attorneys for Plaintiff, Etta Baker, and Movant, Rosette M. Mullins, for an Order permitting substitution of deceased Plaintiff Etta Baker by Rosette M. Mullins, as Administrator of the Estate of Etta Baker, and for an Order amending the caption to reflect same, such that the caption will read “Rosette M. Mullins as Administrator of the Estate of Etta Baker v. Merck & Co., Inc. and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.” and the Court having considered the moving papers, the respective Certification of Michael A. London, Esq. and annexed exhibits submitted in support of the motion, and for good cause shown;

IT IS this 10 day of September, 2021

ORDERED that the Motion is **GRANTED** and Movant Rosette M. Mullins, as Administrator of the Estate of Etta Baker, is substituted for the deceased Plaintiff Etta Baker; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the caption will be amended to read “Rosette M. Mullins as Administrator of the Estate of Etta Baker v. Merck & Co., Inc. and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.”; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file and serve an amended Complaint within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Order; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that this Order shall be deemed served upon its filing to eCourts. Movant shall serve this Order on all parties not electronically served within seven (7) days of the date of this Order in accordance with R. 1:5-1(a).

/s/ Bruce J. Kaplan

HON. BRUCE J. KAPLAN, J.S.C.

UNOPPOSED

Having reviewed the within Motion, the Court finds it to be meritorious on its face, in compliance with R. 4:34-1, and unopposed. It therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers in accordance with R. 1:6-2.