

Eileen Oakes Muskett, Esquire  
Attorney ID 020731994  
Fox Rothschild LLP  
Midtown Building, Suite 400  
1301 Atlantic Avenue  
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401  
Phone: 609-348-4515  
Attorney for Defendants, Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.

FILED

November 22, 2023

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

JANE BOONE,  vs.  MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.,	Plaintiff    Defendant.
--	-------------------------------------

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

FOSAMAX LITIGATION

DOCKET NO. MID-L-9378-14

CIVIL ACTION CASE NO. 282

**ORDER**

**WHEREAS**, Defendant Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., by and through its attorneys Fox Rothschild LLP, upon notice to all interested parties, has moved before this Court for the dismissal of this matter against Defendants in this matter; On August 4, 2023, this Court dismissed the claims against Merck without prejudice for failure to effectuate the probate process to appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate. The Court having read and considered the papers submitted in this matter, for the reasons set forth herein, and for good cause having been shown;

**IT IS** on this 22nd day of November, 2023;

**ORDERED** that Merck's Motion to Dismiss with prejudice **is hereby GRANTED**; and it is further

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff JANE BOONE's Complaint is hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** as to Defendants Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.; and it is further

**ORDERED** that service of this Order shall be deemed effectuated upon all parties upon its upload to eCourts. Pursuant to *R. 1:5-1(a)*, movant shall serve a copy of this Order on all parties

not served electronically within seven (7) days of the date of this Order.

151 *Bruce J. Kaplan*  
HONORABLE BRUCE J. KAPLAN, J.S.C.

UNOPPOSED

### Statement of Reasons

This matter having been brought before the Court upon motion by Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., by and through its attorneys Fox Rothschild LLP, for an Order to Dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice pursuant to R. 4:23-5(a)(2) for failure to effectuate the probate process to appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate. The Court has read and reviewed the papers submitted and notes that Plaintiff has not filed an opposition.

By way of relevant procedural history, this Merck filed a motion to dismiss without prejudice on July 13, 2023. On August 4, 2023, this Court granted Defendants' unopposed motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice for failing to effectuate the probate process to appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate. In addition to dismissing Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice, the Court's August 4, 2023, Order provided Plaintiff with 60 days to come into compliance and appoint a formal estate representative or Defendants may move to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice. Defendant Merck brings the instant motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice because more than 60 days has passed since this case was dismissed without prejudice and Plaintiff's next of kin has failed to appoint a formal estate representative and substitute the estate as the Plaintiff in this matter.

In light of Plaintiff's failure to comply with this Court's Orders and in light of the additional time provided previously, this Court will be entering an Order dismissing this case with prejudice. The Court finds that despite notice and opportunity, Plaintiff has not provided the outstanding discovery, has not reinstated the complaint, or filed opposition.

In so doing, the Court notes pursuant to R. 4:23-5(a)(2), if "an order of dismissal ... without prejudice has been entered pursuant to paragraph (a)(1) of this rule and not thereafter vacated, the party entitled to the discovery may, after the expiration of 60 days from the date of the order, move on notice for an order of dismissal with prejudice." It is well-settled that "dismissal with prejudice is the ultimate sanction, [and that] it will normally be ordered only when no lesser sanction will suffice to erase the prejudice suffered by the non-delinquent party," Zaccardi v. Becker, 88 N.J. 245, 253 (1982) (internal citations omitted), "or when the litigant rather than the attorney was at fault." Ibid. (citing Schlosser v. Kragen, 111 N.J. Super. 337, 341 (1970)).

Our Supreme Court has also held that, "[t]he dismissal of a party's cause of action, with prejudice, is drastic and is generally not to be invoked except in those cases where the order for discovery goes to the very foundation of the cause of action ... or where refusal to comply is deliberate and contumacious." Schlosser, 111 N.J. Super. at 341 (citing Tsibikas v. Morrof, 5 N.J. Super. 306 (App. Div. 1949)).

The unfortunate reality is given the length of time of non-compliance, and the lack of any opposition, the Court finds there is no “lesser sanction” that can suffice to remedy the violations of this Court’s order.

More than sixty (60) days have passed since Plaintiff’s Complaint was dismissed without prejudice and Plaintiff has failed to substitute the estate, has failed to file a Motion to Reinstate the case, and Plaintiff has failed to object to the requested relief. As a result, Defendant Merck’s motion to dismiss with prejudice is granted.