



KeyCite Yellow Flag - Negative Treatment

Distinguished by [Russell v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C.](#), M.D.Pa.,
March 2, 2015

2010 WL 4720335

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

This decision was reviewed by West editorial staff and not assigned editorial enhancements.

United States District Court,
E.D. Pennsylvania.

In re [AVANDIA](#) MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION.

This Document Relates to: All Actions.

Avandia MDL No. 1871.

|
No. 2007-MD-1871.

|
Nov. 15, 2010.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Jerome J. Shestack, Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis,
LLP, Philadelphia, PA, pro se.

[Bruce P. Merenstein](#), Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis,
Philadelphia, PA, for Jerome J. Shestack.

PRETRIAL ORDER NO. 121

[CYNTHIA M. RUFE](#), District Judge.

*1 **AND NOW**, this 15th day of November, 2010, upon review of Defendant's Motion for a Lone Pine Order [Doc. No. 769], Plaintiffs' Responses thereto [Doc. No. 798, 800], and Defendant's Reply [Doc. No. 839], the Court notes it shares Defendant's concern that the Plaintiff Fact Sheets are often unsupported by submitted

documents and Plaintiffs have not provided significant support for their stated position that cases can be fairly evaluated based on those Fact Sheets. It is now clear to the Court additional support for Plaintiffs claims is necessary in furtherance of settlement agreements, for the selection of cases for bellwether trials, and for the timely remand of cases to the sending courts for resolution.¹ The Court's overriding concern is the need to objectively identify which of the many thousand plaintiffs have injuries which can credibly be attributed to [Avandia](#) usage, as alleged in their complaints (or Plaintiff Fact Sheets if the filing of a complaint has been tolled). The Order issued below merely requires information which plaintiffs and their counsel should have possessed before filing their claims: proof of [Avandia](#) usage, proof of injury, information about the nature of the injury, and the relation in time of the injury to the [Avandia](#) usage. Accordingly, the Court hereby **GRANTS** Defendant's Motion in part, and **DENIES** the Motion in part, as follows:

1. *Physician Certification of [Avandia](#) Usage and Injury.* In addition to all existing pre-trial disclosure obligations, each plaintiff and claimant, including each personal representative of an estate of any deceased or any incompetent user of [Avandia](#) (collectively, "plaintiff") shall, within the time limits set forth in Paragraph 3 below, serve upon counsel for GSK a signed certification from a licensed physician that includes the following:

- a. plaintiff's name, address, and date of birth;
- b. a determination that the plaintiff used [Avandia](#), along with a listing of the records reviewed by the physician that document such usage and the dates of such usage;
- c. either (1) a determination that the plaintiff suffered one or more injuries listed in Exhibit A to this Order during [Avandia](#) usage or within one year of cessation of [Avandia](#) usage, or (2) a determination that (i) the plaintiff suffered one or more injuries listed in Exhibit A to this Order more than one year after cessation of [Avandia](#) usage and (ii) the [Avandia](#) usage caused such injury or injuries;
- d. an identification of the injury or injuries set forth in Paragraph 1 x; a listing of the records reviewed by the physician that document such injury or injuries; and the dates of the records that document such injury or injuries; and

For Educational Use Only

In re Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products..., Not Reported in...

e. copies of all records listed in Paragraphs 1.b and 1.d.

2. *Documentation of Avandia Usage.* At the same time that each plaintiff serves on counsel for GSK the Physician Certification described in Paragraph 1, each plaintiff must serve GSK counsel with records documenting all period(s) of *Avandia* usage.

*2 3. *Schedule for Serving Physician Certification Pursuant to Paragraph 1 and Usage Documents Pursuant to Paragraph 2:*

a. For all cases filed or made subject to a tolling agreement on or after January 1, 2010 and before the date of this Order, the Physician Certification and Documents shall be served within 60 days of the filing of this Order.

b. For all cases filed or made subject to a tolling agreement on or after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2010, the Physician Certification and Documents shall be served within 90 days of the filing of this Order.

c. For all cases filed or made subject to a tolling agreement on or after January 1, 2008, and before January 1, 2009, the Physician Certification and Documents shall be served within 120 days of the filing of this Order.

d. For all cases filed or made subject to a tolling agreement before January 1, 2008, the Physician Certification and Documents shall be served within 150 days of the filing of this Order.

e. For all cases filed or made subject to a tolling agreement on or after the date of this Order, the Physician Certification and Documents shall be served within 60 days of the filing or the date on which the claim was made subject to a tolling agreement.

f. If any plaintiff is unable to comply with the foregoing

Myocardial Infarction

Acute Coronary Syndrome

Angina Pectoris

deadlines after making reasonable efforts to do so, that plaintiff may apply to the Special Master for an extension of the deadlines for good cause shown; provided, however, that any request for an extension must be made in writing and submitted to the Special Master at least 15 days before the deadline for submission of the Physician Certification and Documents,

4. *Dismissal of Plaintiffs Who Fail to Provide Required Documents.* When any plaintiff fails to provide the documents required by this Order by the required deadline, the Court may, on GSK's motion, dismiss plaintiff's claims with prejudice.

5. *Rule 26 Expert Obligations.* The Physician Certification required by this Order is not a substitute for any Rule 26 expert obligations required under the law or separate order of the Court. No physician who completes a Physician Certification pursuant to this Order is subject to fact or expert discovery solely because of his or her role in completing the Physician Certification.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

EXHIBIT A

The following contains a list of injuries alleged by plaintiffs to be related to *Avandia* use. There may be other specific injuries alleged by plaintiffs, not listed below, that are covered by the "other" category below. GSK has disputed, and continues to dispute, these allegations, and this list has not been endorsed in whole or in part by GSK.

Ischemic Heart Disease

Percutaneous coronary intervention

(PCI)/Coronary Angioplasty

For Educational Use Only

In re Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products..., Not Reported in...

Angina Unstable	Angiogram
Postinfarction Angina	Dyspnea
Prinzmetal Angina	Edema
Coronary Artery Vasospasm	Cardiovascular Accident (Stroke)
Arteriospasm Coronary	Transient ischemic attack
Coronary Artery Occlusion	Heart failure
Coronary Artery Reocclusion	Fluid retention
Coronary Artery Thrombosis	Fracture
Coronary Artery Disorder	Hepatic effects
Coronary Artery Disease or Syndrome	Percutaneous transluminal renal
Coronary Bypass Thrombosis	angioplasty (PTRA), other renal injuries
Stenting	Hypoglycemia
Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting	Hyperlipidemia/Dyslipidemia
Myocardial Ischemia	Hypertension
Arrhythmia	Macular edema

For Educational Use Only

In re Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products..., Not Reported in...

Subendocardial Ischemia

Atrial Fibrillation

Abnormal ECG/EKG

Percutaneous transluminal coronary

Ventricular Tachycardia

angioplasty

Ventricular Fibrillation

Coronary clot extraction

Ventricular Asystole

Thrombolytic therapy

Chest Pain

Liver injury

Cardiac Arrest

Other (identify)

Death

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2010 WL 4720335

All Citations

Footnotes

- ¹ “Lone Pine orders are designed to handle the complex issues and potential burdens of defendants and the courts in mass tort litigation. In the federal courts, such orders are issued under the wide discretion afforded district judges over the management of discovery under Fed.R.Civ.P. 16.”  *Acuna v. Brown & Root, Inc. et. al.*, 200 F.3d 335, 340 (5th Cir.2000).