

**FILED**

**MARCH 19, 2021**

**FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP**

Eileen Oakes Muskett, Esquire  
Attorney ID 020731994  
Midtown Building, 4<sup>th</sup> floor  
1301 Atlantic Avenue  
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401  
T: 609-348-4515 // F: 609-348-6834

[emuskett@foxrothschild.com](mailto:emuskett@foxrothschild.com)

Attorneys for Defendants, Merck & Co., Inc. and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.

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

JANE LAUDONIA

vs

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

FOSAMAX CASE CODE: 282  
Docket No. MID-L-8107-14

**ORDER WITHDRAWING  
THE PRO HAC VICE ADMISSION OF  
EMMA NEFF, ESQUIRE**

**WHEREAS**, Defendants, Merck & Co., Inc. and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. (“Merck”), by and through its attorneys Fox Rothschild LLP, upon notice to all interest parties, have moved before this Court for an Order withdrawing the pro hac vice admission of Emma Neff, Esquire and the Court having considered the papers submitted in support thereof, and for good cause shown:

**IT IS** on this 19th day of March 2021, hereby;

**ORDERED** that the motion is granted, and the *pro hac vice* admission of Emma Neff, Esquire, is hereby withdrawn for all purposes and in all proceedings in connection with the above-captioned matter, with an effective date of as of the date of this Order, and it is further

**ORDERED** that counsel for Merck shall forward a copy of this Order to the Treasurer of the New Jersey Fund for Client Protection within ten (10) days of the date of this Order, and it is further

**ORDERED** that the posting of this Order on eCourts shall constitute service upon all counsel of record. Pursuant to R. 1:5-1(a), the movant shall serve a copy of this Order upon all parties not served electronically within seven (7) days of receipt of this Order.

**(X) Unopposed**

*/s/ Bruce J. Kaplan*

**Hon. Bruce J. Kaplan, J.S.C.**

Having read and considered the above motion, the Court finds it to be unopposed, meritorious on its face, and in compliance with R. 1:21-2. Pursuant to R. 1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers.