

#1058  
2-4-11  
MS.

**WEITZ & LUXENBERG**  
A New York Professional Corporation  
210 Lake Drive East, Suite 101  
Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002  
(856) 755-1115 Telephone  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**BAILEY PERRIN BAILEY**  
440 Louisiana Street, Suite 2100  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713) 425-7100 Telephone

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**FILED**  
FEB 04 2011  
JUDGE JESSICA R. MAHER

KARA RIGGS, a minor by her Guardian and  
mother, SHEILA RIGGS, Individually, and  
KARA RIGGS, Individually,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON COMPANY;  
JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA PRODUCTS,  
L.P. a/k/a JANSSEN, L.P., a/k/a JANSSEN  
PHARMACEUTICA, L.P., a/k/a JANSSEN  
PHARMACEUTICA, INC.  
Defendants.

: SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
: LAW DIVISION  
: MIDDLESEX COUNTY  
:  
:  
: CIVIL ACTION  
:  
: CASE CODE 274  
: (Risperdal/Seroquel/Zyprexa Litigation)  
:  
: DOCKET NO. MID-L-6925-06 (MT)  
:  
: **ORDER REMOVING ANDREA**  
: **MCGINNIS, ESQ. PRO HAC VICE**

**WHEREAS**, plaintiff, by and through his attorneys, Bailey Perrin Bailey, upon notice to all interested parties, have moved before this Court for the removal of Andrea McGinnis' *pro hac vice* status, the Court having considered the papers submitted in support thereof; and for other good cause shown.

**IT IS** on this 4<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2011, hereby

**ORDERED** that the motion is granted, and Andrea McGinnis is removed from practicing *pro hac vice* before this Court, pursuant to R. 1:21-2, for all purposes and in all proceedings connected with all cases subject to Case Management Order No. 1, it is further

**ORDERED** that the Clerk of this Court shall forward a copy of this Order to the Treasurer of the New Jersey Fund for Client Protection, and it is further

<sup>filed to</sup>  
**ORDERED** that a copy of this Order shall be served by the attorneys for plaintiff upon  
the ~~defendant~~ within seven (7) days of their receipt thereof.

  
HON. JESSICA R. MAYER, J.S.C.

\_\_\_\_\_ opposed  
/ \_\_\_\_\_ unopposed

UNOPPOSED

"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 can be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers."

---