

Jerrold S. Parker
Jason Mark
Melanie H. Muhlstock
PARKER & WAICHMAN, LLP
111 Great Neck Road, 1st Floor
Great Neck, New York 11021-5402
Telephone: (516) 466-6500

FILED

DEC 15 2006

BRYAN D. GARRUTO, J.S.C

W. Mark Lanier
Richard D. Meadow
THE LANIER LAW FIRM PLLC
126 East 56th Street, 6th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 421-2800

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

MELISSA KAYE BROWN and GLENN
ALLEN BROWN.

Plaintiffs,

vs.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JOHNSON &
JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT. LLC. and
ORTHO-MCNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL.
INC.,

Defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

DOCKET NO.: MID-L-5446-05-MT

IN RE: ORTHO EVRA BIRTH CONTROL
PATCH LITIGATION
CASE NO.: 275

Civil Action

ORDER

JACQULYNE L. ALUMBAUGH and
JAMES MICHAEL ALUMBAUGH.

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JOHNSON &
JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, LLC. and
ORTHO-MCNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL,
INC.

Defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

DOCKET NO.: MID-L-6209-05-MT

IN RE: ORTHO EVRA BIRTH CONTROL
PATCH LITIGATION
CASE NO.: 275

Civil Action

LARISSA GRIFFIN-SPONSLER,

Plaintiff.

vs.

**JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JOHNSON &
JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, LLC. and
ORTHO-MCNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL,
INC**

Defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

DOCKET NO.: MID-L-6227-05-MT

IN **RE:** ORTHO EVRA BIRTH CONTROL
PATCH LITIGATION
CASE NO.: **275**

Civil Action

KIMBERLY JANEL PIERCE,

Plaintiff.

v.

**JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JOHNSON &
JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, LLC. and
DRTHO-MCNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL,
INC.**

Defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

DOCKET NO.: MID-L-007291-05-MT

IN RE: ORTHO EVRA BIRTH CONTROL
PATCH LITIGATION
CASE NO.: **275**

Civil Action

This matter **having** been brought before the Court upon the motion of Plaintiffs, by and through their attorneys, for an Order granting the Plaintiffs' motion for a **protective** order pursuant to R. 4:10-3 and precluding the defendants from videotaping Plaintiffs' counsel at depositions in **the** absence of **an** express agreement to the contrary, upon due notice to **all** parties; **and** the Court having considered the matter; and for good cause shown,

IT **IS** on this 15 day of December, 2006,

ORDERED that the Plaintiffs' motion be **and** hereby is denied; **and** it is further

ORDERED that the Defendants **may**, at their own **expense, have a** second camera at videotaped depositions of company witnesses to videotape the questioner; **and** it is **further**

ORDERED that the Plaintiffs may, at their **own expense**, arrange for a third camera at videotaped depositions of company witnesses to videotape the lawyer defending the deposition; and it is further

ORDERED that the parties shall share in the expense of the synchronization of the videotapes, in any editing of the tapes, on a *50-50* basis; and it is further

ORDERED that, nothing in this Order shall be construed to mean that the videotapes of the lawyers may be shown at trial. Counsel's objections *to* showing the videotape of counsel at the time of trial are reserved; and it is further

ORDERED that a copy of this **Order** shall be served upon all counsel within 7 days from the **date** hereof.


/ ~ ~ aDaGarruto, J.S.C.

 unopposed

 X **opposed**