

P-44
ENTX

MASTER DOCKET NO. 2005-59499

In Re:
Texas State Vioxx Litigation
This Document Relates to All Cases

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS
157TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

PRETRIAL ORDER No. 8
Rules and Procedures Relating to
All Cases Filed or Transferred On or After November 9, 2007

This Order applies to all plaintiffs who file personal injury claims directly in, or whose claims are transferred into this Texas Coordinated Proceeding, Case No. 2005-59499 ("Proceeding"), on or after November 9, 2007 ("Post 11.09 Plaintiffs"). Persons who represent themselves *pro se* in this Proceeding shall comply fully with all obligations required of counsel by this Order, unless otherwise stated.

I. PRESERVATION NOTICE REQUIREMENT

- A. Within ten (10) days of the transfer of a case into this Proceeding, counsel -- or if a plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the plaintiff -- shall be responsible for ensuring that all records in the possession of the plaintiffs' pharmacies and healthcare providers as described in paragraph (B) below have been preserved, collected and reviewed. Within ten (10) days of the transfer into this Proceeding, counsel shall notify the individuals or entities listed below in Paragraph B, by registered mail, that they may have records relevant to the putative plaintiff's ("Plaintiff or Plaintiff's") claim ("Claim") in the In Re Vioxx® Litigation ("Litigation") and that any records relating to the Plaintiff must be preserved pursuant to Case Management Order No. 2 entered by this Court on October 19, 2005 (the "Notice"), pending collection by the Plaintiff. Plaintiffs proceeding *pro se* must notify the individuals or entities listed below in Paragraph 2 within ten (10) days of the transfer into this Proceeding.

FILED
Theresa Chang
District Clerk
NOV 09 2007
Time: _____
Harris County, Texas
By _____
Deputy

- B. The following individuals or entities must be notified pursuant to Paragraph 1 above:
1. All Pharmacies that dispensed any medications to the Plaintiff for the period from January 1, 1995 to the present;
 2. All Physicians, Medical Facilities, other Healthcare Providers and/or others persons (“other Providers”) who Plaintiff claims provided any samples of Vioxx to the Plaintiff;
 3. All Physicians, Medical Facilities and/or other Healthcare Providers who prescribed Vioxx for the Plaintiff;
 4. All Physicians and/or other Healthcare Providers who treated Plaintiff for the period from January 1, 1995 to the present; and
 5. If Plaintiff is seeking lost wages, all of his employers for the period from three years prior to the date for which he is seeking lost wages through the last day for which Plaintiff is seeking lost wages.
- C. A copy of Case Management Order No. 2 shall be attached to the Notice and all copies of the Notice shall be preserved by Counsel for Plaintiff for so long as the claim remains pending in this Proceeding.
- D. Within ten (10) days of the transfer of the case into this Proceeding, Plaintiff shall serve a statement listing the names and addresses of all individuals or entities to which Notices were sent, along with copies of the Notices and a signed certification that the Notices were sent as required by this Order. Service by Plaintiffs shall be made in accordance with the service procedures of Case Management Order No. 2.
- E. Plaintiffs who fail to fully comply with the requirements of this Order shall be given notice by e-mail or fax from Defendants’ Liaison Counsel or his designee and shall be provided thirty (30) additional days to cure such deficiency (“Cure Period”). No other extensions will be granted, except for good cause shown. If Plaintiff fails to cure the deficiency within the Cure Period, Defendant’s Liaison Counsel shall file a Motion to Show Cause why the claim should not be dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiff shall thereupon have thirty (30) days to respond to the Notice to Show Cause. Any failure to respond to the Motion within the required period of time shall lead to the dismissal of the claim with prejudice, except for good cause shown.
- F. Plaintiff may not seek to introduce into evidence at trial any document or information asserting that Vioxx was dispensed by a pharmacy or that Vioxx was provided to the Plaintiff as a sample if a Notice were not sent to the Plaintiff’s pharmacy, physician, other healthcare provider and/or Other Provider as required by this Order, except upon leave of court for good cause shown. A Plaintiff who fails to comply with this Order may also be subject to other sanctions or orders.

II. DISCOVERY REQUIREMENTS

- A. Within forty-five (45) days of the transfer of his or her case into this Proceeding, all Post 11.09 Plaintiffs who claim to have suffered an injury as a result of the use of Vioxx must produce the following information:
1. All pharmacy records regarding the dispensing of drugs to the Plaintiff for the period from January 1, 1995 to the present, along with a signed certification from the respective pharmacy or pharmacies indicating that the production is complete.
 2. If any death is claimed, a statement to that effect along with a copy of the death certificate and autopsy report, if one was performed;
 3. All medical records relating to the Plaintiff from all healthcare providers requested in the Amended and Supplemental Plaintiff Profile Form for the period from January 1, 1995 to the present, along with a signed certification from each Healthcare Provider who has records relating to the Plaintiff indicating that all records in the possession, custody or control of the Provider have been produced.
 4. An Amended Plaintiff Profile Form (attached as Exhibit A), records requested therein, and executed Authorizations for Release of Records pursuant to Case Management Order No. 2. Service by Plaintiffs shall be made in accordance with the service procedures of Case Management Order No. 2.
 5. Answers to the Interrogatories set out in Exhibit B. Service by Plaintiffs shall be made in accordance with the service procedures of Case Management Order No. 2.
 6. An affidavit signed by the Plaintiff (i) attesting that records have been collected from all pharmacies that dispensed drugs to, or for, the plaintiff; (ii) attesting that all medical records described in paragraph (3) above have been collected; and (iii) attesting that all records collected pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) have been produced pursuant to the Order, along with an index or list identifying the source of the records. Service by Plaintiffs shall be made in accordance with the service procedures of Case Management Order No. 2.
 7. A Rule 195.5 case-specific expert report from a medical expert attesting (i) that the Plaintiff suffered an injury and (ii) that Vioxx caused the injury. The case specific expert report must include (i) an explanation of the basis of the attestation that Vioxx caused the plaintiff to suffer the injury; (ii) an identification of any other causes that were considered in formulating the opinion; (iii) a description of the specific injuries allegedly suffered; and (iv) an identification of all documents relied on by the expert

in forming his opinions. Service by Plaintiffs shall be made in accordance with the service procedures of Case Management Order No. 2.

- B. If any of the documents described in paragraphs A (1), (2) and (3) do not exist, the Plaintiff shall state that fact in his or her affidavit and the reason why they do not exist and provide a certified "No Records Statement" from the pharmacy or healthcare provider.
- C. Plaintiffs who fail fully to comply with the requirements of the Order shall be given notice by e-mail or fax from Defendants' Liaison Counsel or his designee and shall be provided thirty (30) additional days to cure such deficiency ("Cure Period"). No other extensions will be granted, except for good cause shown. If Plaintiff fails to cure the deficiency within the Cure Period, Defendant's Liaison Counsel shall file a Motion to Show Cause why the claim should not be dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiff shall thereupon have thirty (30) days to respond to the Notice to Show Cause. Any failure to respond to the Motion within the required period of time shall lead to the dismissal of the claim with prejudice.
- D. Nothing in this Order abrogates or replaces each Plaintiff's obligation to submit the Plaintiff Profile Form, authorizations, and other materials required under Case Management Order No. 2. The Plaintiff need not re-submit a Plaintiff Profile Form if one has already been submitted with respect to his or her claim.

III. ATTORNEYS FEES FOR POST 11.09 PLAINTIFFS

This Court finds that:

- A. The Status of the Litigation:
 - 1. Prior to September 30, 2004, approximately 400 lawsuits had been filed against Merck & Co. by plaintiffs alleging various injuries from the use of Vioxx. In New Jersey, an Order had been entered on May 20, 2003 establishing a coordinated proceeding for Vioxx litigants and, on September 30, 2002, an Order was entered in California for the same purpose.
 - 2. On September 30, 2004, Merck withdrew Vioxx from the market. The withdrawal of Vioxx led to extensive publicity nationwide in newspapers and magazines, on television and radio, and across the Internet. While plaintiffs' counsel had extensively advertised seeking clients to pursue claims against Merck relating to the use of Vioxx before September 30, 2004, that advertising increased markedly throughout the country after the withdrawal. Like the publicity relating to the withdrawal, the advertising apprised the public of possible claims they might have against Merck in connection with the use of Vioxx.

3. By December 31, 2004, three months after the withdrawal of Vioxx, approximately 923 lawsuits were on file, encompassing approximately 3291 plaintiffs.
4. On August 25, 2005, the Multidistrict Litigation Panel for Texas ruled that cases alleging injury from the use of Vioxx filed in Texas were to be transferred to one district court for coordination. The Panel decided that the cases should be transferred to the 157th District Court of Harris County and appointed the undersigned to conduct the consolidated and coordinated proceedings.
5. By the first year anniversary of the withdrawal of Vioxx, more than 8,900 Vioxx lawsuits had been filed involving more than 18,500 plaintiffs. As of the date of this Order, there are more than 26,800 active Vioxx cases on file in various courts throughout the country, involving more than 47,500 plaintiffs and an additional 13,000 claims on tolling agreements for a total of more than 60,500 claimants. By any measure, the scale of this litigation is large.
6. Discovery in this litigation has also been extensive. More than 54 million pages of documents and a terabyte of data have been produced by Merck pursuant to various requests from plaintiffs' counsel along with another 86 million pages of data from Merck Profile Forms. More than 1,800 depositions have also been taken in the litigation and depositions have consumed more than 2,000 days and comprise more than 380,000 pages of testimony. Also, more than fifteen trials have been conducted, including two in Texas.

B. Pharmaceutical Tort Litigation and Contingent Fees.


1. It is the practice in the United States for lawyers bringing claims on behalf of clients in personal injury actions to be compensated pursuant to contingent fee agreements. That is, the lawyer's fee is contingent on the lawyer's success in the recovery of compensation from another party for his client.
2. In large-scale pharmaceutical tort litigation, it is particularly commonplace for lawyers representing plaintiffs to be compensated through contingent fees.
3. Large-scale pharmaceutical tort litigation (which can be similar to traditional mass tort litigation in scale) can be, and usually is, extraordinarily expensive, particularly in the early stages. It is well understood that proving cases in mass tort litigation, at least at first, is expensive. Experts of various kinds may be needed and discovery from the defendants may take a long time and much effort.

4. However, the cost and risk inherent in prosecuting the first series of claims in a large-scale pharmaceutical tort is not the same throughout the litigation.
 5. Because of the extensive publicity and extensive advertising that followed the withdrawal of Vioxx, users of Vioxx (and their lawyers) have had ample notice of the possibility that they may have a claim against Merck in connection with their use of the drug. The uncertainty of the number of potential claims in a litigation of this magnitude makes the management of this proceeding exceedingly difficult both for the parties and the Court.
- C. The Vioxx Litigation is an extremely mature litigation. To date, MDL and state court lawyers have tried 17 cases, taken over 1,800 depositions, more than 50 million pages of documents have been produced plus an enormous volume of electronic data, and substantial Third Party discovery has occurred. Because of this extensive work done by the Federal Multidistrict Litigation Plaintiffs' Steering Committee ("PSC") and certain state court lawyers, the cost of litigation Vioxx claims has been substantially reduced.
- D. Given the extensive amount of discovery and trial preparation that has been undertaken and already achieved -- as well as the work on, and lessons learned from, bellwether trials conducted in Courts over the last several years -- counsel filing new claims can reasonably expect to expend much less time and resources prosecuting those cases than counsel who have been involved in those proceedings from the beginning, and I encourage counsel to consider such disparity in negotiating attorneys' fees.

IV. PENALTIES FOR FRAUD AND DECEPTION

Any Plaintiff (and his or her attorneys) who submits false or intentionally misleading information, or otherwise attempts to satisfy the documentation requirements of this Order through any form of deception, dishonesty or fraud shall be subject to appropriate sanctions (including monetary sanctions and costs) and dismissal with prejudice pursuant to Texas Rule of Civ. Proc. 215.3.

Signed November 9, 2007



Hon. Randy Wilson



I, Theresa Chang, District Clerk of Harris County, Texas, certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original record filed and or recorded in my office, electronically or hard copy, as it appears on this date
Witness my official hand and seal of office
this November 12, 2007

Certified Document Number: 33775906 Total Pages: 44

THERESA CHANG, DISTRICT CLERK
HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

In accordance with Texas Government Code 406.013 electronically transmitted authenticated documents are valid. If there is a question regarding the validity of this document and or seal please e-mail support@hcdistrictclerk.com