

Heidi E. Hilgendorff, Esq. (NJ ID NO. 028181998)
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
A Delaware Limited Liability Partnership
600 Campus Drive
Florham Park, New Jersey 07932-1047
(973) 360-1100
Attorneys for Defendants
Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
(f/k/a Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
f/k/a Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc.) and Johnson & Johnson

FILED

MAR 06 2015

JUDGE JESSICA R. MAYER

FILED

FEB 20 2015

JUDGE JESSICA R. MAYER

#2438
O'Connell
#6710
03/06/15

IN RE: RISPERDAL/SEROQUEL/
ZYPREXA LITIGATION

: SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
: LAW DIVISION : MIDDLESEX COUNTY
: CASE NO. 274
:

: CIVIL ACTION

THIS ORDER APPLIES TO :
Wayne Hall v. Johnson & Johnson, et al.
Docket No. MID-L-6710-06 MT

: **ORDER**

: *mark C*
: **RETURN DATE: FEBRUARY 20, 2015**
:
:

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court by Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, attorneys for Defendants Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (f/k/a Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaccuticals, Inc., f/k/a Janssen Pharmaccutica, Inc.)¹ and Johnson & Johnson, to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice; such dismissals being authorized by Case Management Orders No. 4 and 4A; the Court having considered the papers submitted; and the Court having heard the arguments of counsel, ~~if any~~; and for good cause shown;


IT IS ON THIS 6th day of March, 2015;

ORDERED that Defendants' motion is hereby **GRANTED** and that the above-captioned Complaint is **DISMISSED** with prejudice against Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (f/k/a Ortho-

¹ Janssen L.P. has been canceled.

McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., f/k/a Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc.) and Johnson & Johnson, who were erroneously designated in the Complaint as Johnson & Johnson Company and Janssen Pharmaceutica Products, L.P., pursuant to Case Management Order Nos. 4 and 4A; and it is further

ORDERED that a signed copy of this Order be posted for all counsel.



Hon. Jessica R. Mayer, J.S.C.

Unopposed

Opposed - Plaintiff's counsel having complied with the requirements of E 4:23-5.

After reviewing the above motion, I find it to be meritorious on its face and is unopposed. Pursuant to R. 1:6-2, it will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers."