

**BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL  
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

\_\_\_\_\_) )  
IN RE JOHNSON & JOHNSON “BABY )  
POWDER” and “SHOWER TO SHOWER”) )  
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND) MDL Docket No. 2738  
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION )  
\_\_\_\_\_) )

**RESPONSE OF DEFENDANTS JOHNSON & JOHNSON AND JOHNSON & JOHNSON  
CONSUMER COMPANIES TO MOTION FOR TRANSFER AND COORDINATION OF  
PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407**

Defendants Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies (collectively, “J&J” or “the Company”) respectfully submit this response to the Motion For Transfer that has been filed by movant Tanashiska Lumas.

J&J agrees with movant that there is a group of overlapping cases involving the Company’s talcum powder products (“talc products”) that should be transferred by the Panel to a single district court for coordinated pretrial proceedings. But J&J disagrees with movant’s proposal that the Southern District of Illinois be the transferee forum. Taking account of the factors the Panel ordinarily considers in selecting a transferee forum, J&J believes that the most appropriate location for this multidistrict proceeding is the District of New Jersey (preferably assigned to Judge Freda Wolfson) or, in the alternative, the Western District of Oklahoma (preferably assigned to Judge Timothy DeGiusti). The schedule of actions attached to this memorandum includes a complete list of cases that should be subject to transfer.

**BACKGROUND**

There are presently at least 18 individual actions pending in federal courts across the country in which the plaintiffs allege that perineal use of cosmetic talc products manufactured and marketed by J&J caused them to suffer ovarian cancer. Based on these allegations, plaintiffs

in these suits seek various forms of relief, including damages for alleged personal injuries and punitive damages.

On July 15, 2015, movant Tanashiska Lumas, whose case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois before Judge Staci M. Yandle, filed a motion with the Panel to transfer the pending federal actions for coordinated pretrial proceedings. (*See* Br. In Supp. Of Pl.’s Mot. For Transfer Of Actions Pursuant To 28 U.S.C. § 1407 (“Pl.’s Br.”), Dkt. No. 1-1.) Movant suggests that the Panel transfer the cases to the Southern District of Illinois before Judge David R. Herndon. (*Id.* at 2.)

In her papers, movant correctly notes that, in a series of actions, various claimants have filed individual suits involving personal injuries allegedly attributable to the talc products. Each case raises overlapping factual allegations about the safety and testing of the talc products and asserts similar causes of action in seeking to recover for alleged personal injuries. *See, e.g., Chakalos v. Johnson & Johnson*, No. 3:14-cv-07079 (D.N.J); *Robb v. Johnson & Johnson*, No. 5:16-cv-00620 (W.D. Okla.); *Bors v. Johnson & Johnson*, No. 2:16-cv-02866 (E.D. Pa.). In all instances, the underlying factual and legal allegations are sufficiently similar to merit coordinated treatment under the Panel’s rules. Defendants thus support movant’s proposal to create a multidistrict litigation proceeding to coordinate pretrial proceedings for all cases involving similar allegations.

### **ARGUMENT**

The actions listed in the motion (along with the additional actions set forth in the attached schedule) involve overlapping factual allegations regarding the alleged risks of the talc products and would thus benefit from coordinated pretrial proceedings. While J&J agrees with the movant on the need for a coordinated proceeding, J&J believes that the District of New Jersey

(preferably before Judge Wolfson) or the Western District of Oklahoma (preferably before Judge DeGiusti) would be more appropriate forums than the Southern District of Illinois for coordinated pretrial proceedings related to the talc products.

**A. The District Of New Jersey Is The Most Appropriate Venue For The Talc Product Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding.**

The talc product actions are presently pending before district courts in more than a dozen districts that are scattered across the United States, from California to New Jersey (e.g., N.D. Ill., E.D. Cal., N.D. Cal., M.D. Tenn., W.D. Okla., M.D. La.). (*See* Schedule of Actions.) Under the Panel’s traditional selection criteria for determining a forum for multidistrict proceedings, it would be most appropriate to transfer the related actions to the District of New Jersey, for four reasons.

*First*, Judge Wolfson currently presides over the case at the most advanced stage: *Chakalos v. Johnson & Johnson et al.*, No. 3:14-cv-07079 (D.N.J). The action was removed to federal court on November 11, 2014, and discovery – including depositions – has commenced and is ongoing. Because this action is the most advanced of any of the federal court actions with regard to the amount of discovery that has been conducted, Judge Wolfson is the most familiar with the issues and well-equipped to coordinate discovery among all of the actions. *See, e.g., In re Refined Petrol Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, 528 F. Supp. 2d 1365, 1367 (J.P.M.L. 2007) (observing that the action pending in the transferee district was the “most advanced”).

*Second*, the District of New Jersey is the most convenient location. Section 1407(a) specifically provides that the “convenience of parties and witnesses” is a relevant consideration in the centralization decision. Defendant Johnson & Johnson is headquartered in New Brunswick, New Jersey, and many of the relevant documents and witnesses are located there. As such, coordinating the actions in the District of New Jersey will facilitate swift and convenient

discovery and allow plaintiffs access to the court and to witnesses in one trip. *See In Re Live Concert Antitrust Litig.*, 429 F. Supp. 2d 1363, 1364 (J.P.M.L. 2006) (noting the location of defendant Clear Channel’s headquarters as a relevant factor in the selection of transferee district); *In re Avandia Mktg., Sales Practices & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 528 F. Supp. 2d 1339, 1340-41 (J.P.M.L. 2007) (transferring the centralized cases to a district where the pharmaceutical manufacturer defendant had its principal place of business and where many relevant documents and witnesses would therefore be located); *In re Am. Airlines, Inc., Privacy Litig.*, 342 F. Supp. 2d 1355, 1357 (J.P.M.L. 2004) (“The Panel is persuaded that the Northern District of Texas is an appropriate transferee forum for this docket. We note that . . . this district is more conveniently located for most parties and witnesses than the Eastern District of New York . . . .”); *In re Gen. Motors Corp. Dex-Cool Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 293 F. Supp. 2d 1381, 1382 (J.P.M.L. 2003) (noting the proximity of the transferee district to documents and witnesses).

**Third**, the District of New Jersey has a present caseload that would enable the court to handle a multidistrict litigation proceeding. The district is only the 39th-busiest district court by pending cases per judge. *See* <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/federal-court-management-statistics-march-2016>. Moreover, it had one of the fastest median times among all district courts from filing to disposition in civil cases in 2010 – 8.4 months – and only 6.1% of the civil cases currently pending in the district are more than three years old. *Id.* These factors further support transfer to that court. *See In re Tyco Int’l, Ltd. Sec. Litig.*, MDL No. 1335, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5551, at \*3 (J.P.M.L. Apr. 26, 2000) (coordinating proceedings in district where “the docket [was] significantly less congested than that of the other preferably suggested transferee district”); *In re Am. Family Publishers Bus. Practices Litig.*, MDL No. 1235, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12514, at \*4-5 (J.P.M.L. Aug. 12, 1998) (“District of New Jersey is the

appropriate transferee forum for this docket . . . [because] the New Jersey court’s docket is less congested than the docket in the Middle District of Florida . . .”).

**Fourth**, Judge Wolfson has previously presided over three MDL proceedings: *In re Plavix Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation* (MDL-2418), *In re Great Southern Life Insurance Co. Sales Practices Litigation* (MDL-1214), and *In re Fosamax (Alendronate Sodium) Products Liability Litigation* (MDL-2243).<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Judge Wolfson clearly has the necessary experience to preside over this MDL proceeding. *See In re Blood Reagents Antitrust Litig.*, 652 F. Supp. 2d 1373, 1374 (J.P.M.L. 2009) (“Centralization in this district permits the Panel to effect the Section 1407 assignment to a judge with experience presiding over multidistrict litigation . . . .”); *In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig “DeepWater Horizon” in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010*, 731 F. Supp. 2d 1352, 1355 (J.P.M.L. 2010) (“Considering all of the applicable factors, we have asked Judge Carl J. Barbier to serve as transferee judge” because “during his twelve years on the bench, [he] has gained considerable MDL experience”); *In re Bank of Am. Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP) Contract Litig.*, 746 F. Supp. 2d 1359, 1361 (J.P.M.L. 2010) (sending coordinated proceedings to Judge Rya W. Zobel, who had “a wealth of prior MDL experience” and was “sure to lead [the] litigation on an expeditious course”). While Judge Wolfson is currently presiding over two MDL proceedings, one of those proceedings (MDL 2243, *In re Fosamax*), has only 30 pending actions currently, down from a historical high of 1,208. For these reasons, J&J believes that the District of New Jersey would be the most appropriate forum for the talc product MDL proceeding, preferably assigned to Judge Wolfson.

---

<sup>1</sup> This MDL proceeding was originally presided over by Judge Joel A. Pisano but was reassigned to Judge Wolfson in June 2015.

**B. Alternatively, The Western District of Oklahoma Would Also Be An Appropriate Venue For The Talc Product Multidistrict Litigation Proceeding.**

If the Panel elects not to transfer the talc product cases to the District of New Jersey before Judge Wolfson, J&J believes that the Western District of Oklahoma would also be an appropriate forum for the MDL proceeding, preferably before Judge DeGiusti, for four reasons.

*First*, like Judge Wolfson, Judge DeGiusti is already overseeing a talc product case – the *Robb* action. The Panel often considers courts with pending cases for potential transfer. *See In re 100% Grated Parmesan Cheese Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.*, MDL Nos. 2705, 2707 & 2708, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71766, at \*9 (J.P.M.L. June 2, 2016) (“Finally, centralization in this district allows us to assign this litigation to Judge Gary Feinerman, an able and experienced jurist who has not had the opportunity to preside over an MDL. Judge Feinerman currently presides over one potential tag-along action involving Kraft, Target, and SuperValu. We are confident that he will steer this litigation on a prudent course.”); *see also In re Premera Blue Cross Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 110 F. Supp. 3d 1358, 1360 (J.P.M.L. 2015) (centralizing in the District of Oregon despite only one action pending there, and the other actions all pending in the same district); *In re Bair Hugger Forced Air Warming Devices Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 148 F. Supp. 3d 1383, 1386 (J.P.M.L. 2015) (centralizing in the District of Minnesota, despite more mature cases pending in the District of Kansas and Southern District of Texas).

*Second*, the Western District of Oklahoma also has a present caseload that would enable the district to handle a multidistrict litigation proceeding. The district is only the 86th-busiest district court in the country (out of 94) by pending cases per judge. *See* <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/federal-court-management-statistics-march-2016>. In addition, filings have declined in the Western District every year since 2011, and the District is

only the 69th-busiest in the country by civil filings per judge. Moreover, there are currently only two MDL proceedings pending in the Western District of Oklahoma: *In re Cox Enterprises, Inc., Set-Top Cable Television Box Antitrust Litigation* (MDL 2048) and *In re Transdata, Inc. Smart Meters Patent Litigation* (MDL 2309). Both proceedings, neither of which is assigned to Judge DeGiusti, involve only a very small number of cases (MDL 2048 has only two active pending cases and MDL 2309 has only five). Accordingly, the District has resources available to devote to management of a talc MDL proceeding. *See In re Am. Airlines, Inc.*, 342 F. Supp. 2d at 1357 (sending proceedings to the Northern District of Texas because “the Texas district has the resources available to manage this litigation”).

**Third**, Judge DeGiusti is not presently overseeing an MDL proceeding, and would therefore likely have significant time to devote to the talc product litigation. *See* [http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/sites/jpml/files/Pending\\_MDL\\_Dockets\\_By\\_District-July-15-2016.pdf](http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/sites/jpml/files/Pending_MDL_Dockets_By_District-July-15-2016.pdf). Moreover, Judge DeGiusti is an experienced jurist who has served on the bench since 2007 but has not yet had the opportunity to preside over an MDL proceeding, giving him both the “time and experience” to oversee the litigation. *See, e.g., In re Cheerios Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.*, 655 F. Supp. 2d 1368, 1369 (J.P.M.L. 2009) (assigning first MDL proceeding to Judge Sheridan; “One of the five constituent actions is already pending in that district, and Judge Peter G. Sheridan, who is presiding over that action, has the time and experience to steer this litigation on a prudent course.”); *In re Zimmer Durom Hip Cup Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 717 F. Supp. 2d 1376, 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2010) (assigning first MDL proceeding to Judge Wigenton; “We conclude that the District of New Jersey is an appropriate transferee district for pretrial proceedings in this litigation. A substantial majority of the constituent actions are pending in

that district, and Judge Susan D. Wigenton has the time and experience to steer this MDL on a prudent course.”).

*Finally*, the *Robb* action is pending in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, which has a large airport with nonstop air service from many cities around the country, including Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Houston, Las Vegas, Newark, Phoenix, St. Louis, and Washington, D.C. Oklahoma City is also centrally located, which mitigates travel burdens. Thus, while it is not as convenient a location for the parties as the District of New Jersey, it is still readily accessible from airports throughout the country.

For these reasons, J&J believes that the Western District of Oklahoma would also be an appropriate forum for the talc products MDL proceeding, preferably assigned to Judge DeGiusti.

**C. The Southern District Of Illinois Is An Inappropriate Transferee Venue.**

Movant seeks coordination in the Southern District of Illinois because it allegedly “possesses unique characteristics” that are particularly well-suited for this litigation. However, none of the reasons given by movant is unique to the Southern District of Illinois.

*First*, movant contends that the Southern District is geographically convenient, but New Jersey and Oklahoma are at least equally geographically convenient, and all are served by a major airport with convenient nonstop flights from around the country. Although plaintiff argues that the state court actions in St. Louis, Missouri should be a factor because the proximity of Southern Illinois to St. Louis will purportedly aid in convenient discovery, there are similar actions pending in state courts throughout the country, including a coordinated action in New Jersey, that are currently being prepared for trial. As of July 26, J&J had been served in 182 pending cases in New Jersey state court. Two of those cases are fully worked up, and the parties have submitted dispositive motions and briefing on exclusions of expert testimony. One of those cases – *Carl v. Johnson & Johnson*, No. ATL-L-6546-14 (N.J. Super. Law Div. Atlantic County)



– is set for trial beginning in October 2016, and the second case – *Balderrama v. Johnson & Johnson*, No. ATL-L-6540-14 (N.J. Super. Law Div. Atlantic County) – is set for trial beginning in January 2017. In short, if the presence of pending or coordinated state court cases counsels in favor of assignment of the MDL proceeding to any particular federal district, that district is New Jersey.

**Second**, movant touts the Southern District of Illinois as uniquely capable of “provid[ing] an efficient disposition of these” cases, but that court is already over-burdened as the **seventh-busiest** district court in the country by pending civil cases per judge.

<http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/federal-court-management-statistics-march-2016>. It is also ranked 93rd of 94 – **second to last** – in terms of time from filing to resolution of civil cases. *Id.*<sup>2</sup>

While movant supports her argument for transfer to the Southern District of Illinois by arguing that “civil cases proceeded to trial in 19 months” there (Mot. at 12), this statistic is unhelpful because the sample size is so small (just 16 cases in the Southern District of Illinois proceeded to trial during that period, out of the thousands of cases resolved in the same time period), and because the central task of an MDL judge is not to try cases but to manage pretrial proceedings. The more relevant statistic is the median time to disposition of cases by any means, which reflects a court’s efficiency in handling the broad range of issues that can arise in the course of managing a large number of cases (including the vast majority of cases that are

---

<sup>2</sup> Defendants understand that the district is about to be even busier. On July 6, 2016, Judge Rosenstengel entered an order in the *In re Depakote* consolidated proceeding stating that she intends to “ensure that the majority, if not all, of the cases pending in this district are tried by the end of 2017.” See Order at 1-2, *In re Depakote*, No. 3:12-cv-00052 (S.D. Ill. Filed July 6, 2016) (attached as Ex. 1). That docket includes approximately 129 cases involving approximately 691 plaintiffs. *Id.* at 1. According to Judge Rosenstengel, “it appears that” her trial plan will be “a massive undertaking involving all of this district’s resources.” *Id.*

resolved without trial). And by that measure, both the District of New Jersey (*7.5 months* median time of disposition) and the Western District of Oklahoma (*8.5 months* median time of disposition) were far speedier than the Southern District of Illinois (*18.7 months*) in 2014. See <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/c-5/federal-judicial-caseload-statistics/2014/03/31> (cited in Mot. at 12).

*Third*, movant also identifies Judge Herndon as uniquely capable of overseeing MDL litigation, but Judge Herndon is currently presiding over two MDL proceedings. While MDL 2385, *In re Pradaxa (Dabigatran Etexilate) Products Liability Litigation*, currently has only four pending cases, MDL 2100, *In re Yasmin and Yaz (Drospirenone) Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, still has more than 1,600 pending cases.

[http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/sites/jpml/files/Pending\\_MDL\\_Dockets\\_By\\_District-July-15-2016.pdf](http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/sites/jpml/files/Pending_MDL_Dockets_By_District-July-15-2016.pdf).

For all of these reasons, the Southern District of Illinois is an inappropriate transferee district for the talc products MDL proceeding.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> One group of plaintiffs also requests, in the alternative, that the Panel transfer the cases to the Southern District of Mississippi before Judge Sul Ozerden in Gulfport, Mississippi. (See Pl.’s Resp. Br. In Supp. Of Mot. For Consolidation & Transfer Pursuant To 28 U.S.C. § 1407 ¶ 14, ECF No. 28 (J.P.M.L. filed Aug. 3, 2016).) But that venue will be extremely inconvenient for the counsel and parties to this litigation. The Gulfport-Biloxi airport is a small, regional airport that only services a few cities in the Southern United States. Even the plaintiffs who offer Gulfport as an alternative MDL forum implicitly concede its inconvenience, by noting that the closest convenient airports are in Mobile, Alabama, and New Orleans, Louisiana. (*Id.*) Those cities are 75 and 80 miles away, respectively, from Gulfport, making it an ill-suited locale for litigation that involves parties scattered throughout the United States. See *In re Jamster Mktg. Litig.*, 427 F. Supp. 2d 1366, 1368 (J.P.M.L. 2006) (denying plaintiff’s preference for the Eastern District of Arkansas and transferring to the Southern District of California, which “provides an accessible metropolitan location that is equipped with the resources that this docket is likely to require”); *In re Educ. Testing Serv. Plt 7-12 Test Scoring Litig.*, 350 F. Supp. 2d 1363, 1365 (J.P.M.L. 2004) (transferring to “an accessible, metropolitan location” “[g]iven the range of locations of parties and putative class members in this docket and the geographic dispersal of current and anticipated constituent actions”).

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, defendants respectfully request that the Panel transfer the actions identified on the attached schedule either to the District of New Jersey (preferably before Judge Wolfson) or the Western District of Oklahoma (preferably before Judge DeGiusti) for coordinated pretrial proceedings.

Dated: August 5, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

Gene M. Williams  
Kathleen Frazier  
Scott A. James  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
600 Travis, Suite 3400  
Houston, TX 77002  
(713) 227-8008

/s/ John H. Beisner  
John H. Beisner  
Jessica D. Miller  
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP  
1440 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 371-7000

Mark C. Hegarty  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108  
(816) 474-6550

*Attorneys for Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.*

# **EXHIBIT 1**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

IN RE DEPAKOTE:	)	
	)	
RHEALYN ALEXANDER, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 12-CV-52-NJR-SCW
	)	
ABBOTT LABORATORIES, INC.,	)	LEAD CONSOLIDATED CASE
	)	
Defendant.	)	

ORDER

ROSENSTENGEL, District Judge:

This Court currently has 129 cases, involving approximately 691 plaintiffs, pending on its docket. The first cases were filed in 2012, and cases continue to be filed each month. One bellwether case was tried in this Court in March 2015, and three other cases have been tried since then in other venues. At this point, three additional cases are set for trial in this district later this year. A case scheduled for trial in June 2016 has been continued generally in light of the unavailability of Plaintiffs' liability expert.

As the Court noted in its Order dated April 25, 2016 (Doc. 467), global settlement efforts have failed. Thus, it appears that a massive undertaking involving all of this district's resources will be required to try the majority of cases on the Court's docket. At the current pace of case resolution, the undersigned has calculated it will take over 34 years to close each case on the docket. The undersigned is currently consulting with Chief Judge Michael J. Reagan and the Circuit Executive for the Seventh Circuit to obtain the resources necessary to ensure that the majority, if not all, of the cases pending in this

district are tried by the end of 2017. This will obviously mean that many claims will necessarily be tried together at the same time, with multiple judges in several courthouses. While the issues are complicated and joint trials may in some circumstances be impracticable, at this point the Court can only focus on finding common issues to try, and extensive efforts will be spent to identify where the issues overlap.

While the Court recognizes trying all the cases by the end of 2017 is an ambitious timeframe, counsel is reminded that the majority of these cases have been pending in this district for almost four years. Unfortunately, it appears that the “bellwether” process has failed for these cases, given that there have been four Depakote trials in this country since 2013, and yet only *one* of hundreds of cases (in another district court—following a jury trial) has settled. The Court is also mindful that there are many attorneys representing both sides of this litigation, and both sides have significant resources to accomplish the work that needs to be done.

The parties are advised that the Court is now considering a variety of methods to allow for the joint and expedient resolution of all claims, including bifurcation of the issues, limitation of testimony, shortened trials, and, of course, to the extent possible, multiple trials of claims involving the same label and/or other overlapping issues. These methods will assist the Court in its obligation to “secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination” of these cases (*see* FED. R. CIV. P. 1) and are consistent with Rule 42.

In order to allow the Court to select groups of similar claims for trial, the parties are **ORDERED** to conduct the deposition of the prescribing physician(s) in the 132 cases attached as Exhibit A within **90 days** of the date of this Order. The parties shall report the following information to the Court within **14 days** of each deposition: (1) a summary of the physician's testimony, including the details of the prescribing decision, the indication, and the warning given; (2) the relevant Depakote label; (3) details concerning the warnings given as reflected in the medical records, and (4) any other relevant information related to the individual claim. The parties shall file a *joint* report (not to exceed five pages) for each deposed prescriber and, to the extent counsel is unable to agree on a summary of the testimony, counsel shall state their respective positions separately within the *same document* and attach a copy of the complete deposition transcript.

Counsel for Plaintiffs shall alert the Court concerning any prescribing physicians who cannot be located and/or produced for deposition within this timeframe as soon as possible but in any event before the expiration of the 90 day deadline and/or move for voluntary dismissal of those individual claims. Subpoena requests for depositions of any recalcitrant prescribing physicians will be liberally granted. The Court will review the summaries of the prescribing physician testimony as they are submitted and determine whether the case should proceed to a deposition of the mother and/or full discovery on that claim. The Court also will continue to review the pending cases and select the next group of cases to proceed with prescriber depositions.

Finally, because trial counsel will be consumed in the coming months with conducting these depositions and preparing mass cases for trial, both sides are *strongly encouraged* to retain independent, separate settlement counsel to pursue the possibility that at least some of these claims could be resolved without a trial and the inevitable costly appeal that will follow. While the Court's suggestion of this tactic has fallen on deaf ears in the past, it continues to be quite apparent that trial counsel is focused on trying individual claims, something the Court cannot do for the next 34 years. The parties shall continue to consult with the mediators in this case, attorneys Randi Ellis and John Perry, in an effort to resolve at least some of the cases on the Court's docket.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: July 6, 2016**

Handwritten signature of Nancy J. Rosenstengel in black ink, with a circular seal of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland partially visible behind the signature.

---

**NANCY J. ROSENSTENGEL**  
**United States District Judge**



**BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON  
“BABY POWDER” and “SHOWER  
TO SHOWER” MARKETING, SALES  
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS  
LIABILITY LITIGATION

**MDL DOCKET NO. 2738**

**SCHEDULE OF ACTIONS**

<b><u>Plaintiffs</u></b>	<b><u>Defendants</u></b>	<b><u>Div/City</u></b>	<b><u>Civil Action No.</u></b>	<b><u>Judge</u></b>
<b>E.D. Cal.</b>				
Mona Estrada	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	Sacramento	2:14-cv-01051-TLN-KJN	District Judge Troy L. Nunley
<b>N.D. Cal.</b>				
Dolores Gould	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	Oakland	4:16-cv-03838-DMR	Magistrate Judge Donna M. Ryu
<b>M.D. Ga.</b>				
Cammy D. Marchetti, Michael A. Marchetti	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc., Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., Johnson & Johnson Consumer Products Company, Imerys Talc America, Inc.	Columbus	4:16-cv-00227-CDL	Judge Clay D. Land

<b><u>Plaintiffs</u></b>	<b><u>Defendants</u></b>	<b><u>Div/City</u></b>	<b><u>Civil Action No.</u></b>	<b><u>Judge</u></b>
Brenda Traylor	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc., f/k/a Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., and Imerys Talc America, Inc., f/k/a Luzenac America, Inc.	Columbu	4:16-cv-00263-CDL	Judge Clay D. Land
<b>N.D. Ill.</b>				
Tod Alan Musgrove	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	Chicago	1:16-cv-06847	Honorable Matthew F. Kennelly
<b>S.D. Ill.</b>				
Tanashiska Lumas	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	East St. Louis	3:16-cv-00741-SMY-PMF	Judge Staci M. Yandle
Barbara Mihalich	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	East St. Louis	3:14-cv-00600-DRH-SCW	Judge David R. Herndon
<b>W.D. Ky.</b>				
Carol A. Casey, Thomas Casey	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc., Imerys Talc America, Inc., Personal Care Products Council	Louisville	3:16-cv-00477-GNS	Judge Greg N. Stivers

<b><u>Plaintiffs</u></b>	<b><u>Defendants</u></b>	<b><u>Div/City</u></b>	<b><u>Civil Action No.</u></b>	<b><u>Judge</u></b>
<b>M.D. La.</b>				
Elouise Anderson	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	Baton Rouge	3:16-cv-00447-JWD-EWD	Judge John W. deGravelles
<b>N.D. Miss.</b>				
Ada Rich-Williams	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	Aberdeen Division	1:16-cv-00121-SA-DAS	District Judge Sharion Aycock
<b>E.D. Mo.</b>				
Charles Fenstermaker, Sisi Harris	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., Imerys Talc America, Inc., Personal Care Products Council	St. Louis	4:16-cv-00938-JAR	Judge John A. Ross
Mary Gallow, Tammy Abell, Diana Ahlbin, Marva Aimes, Susan Aldridge, Cindy Angel, Terri Baranich, Cheryle Bechtold, Shirleen Begaye, Jeri Berry, Sandra Brandon, Renessa Brown, Alvetta Carroll, Lynette Cephas, Somben Cromer,	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc., Imerys Talc America, Inc.	St. Louis	4:16-cv-01123-JAR	Judge John A. Ross

<u>Plaintiffs</u>	<u>Defendants</u>	<u>Div/City</u>	<u>Civil Action No.</u>	<u>Judge</u>
Maureen Cummings, David Dishman, Joan Dittrich, Brenda Downey, Ignacio Dozier, Suzanne Dukewits, Alma Jean Eastman, Candice Ellison, Marilyn Farrell, Karen Ferro, Casaundra Fletcher, Chanthony Foreman, Faith Fowler, Willie R. Givens, Christa Goeb, Freya Gordon, Brenda Gray, Brenda Griffin, Patricia Hatch, Dolores Haynes, Sarah Jane Hilton, Lexi Holland, Deborah Jean Horton, Lakishia Howard, Andrea Hutchinson, Sharon Kay Jackson, Barbara Jones, Barbara Kaplan, Linda Knox, Terri Lake, Jauice Lamar- Davis, Debry Lanear, Angela Leach-Jayroe, Mevlude Lika, Barbara Landry, Maria Lazo, Cathy				

<u>Plaintiffs</u>	<u>Defendants</u>	<u>Div/City</u>	<u>Civil Action No.</u>	<u>Judge</u>
Lorenz, Lynda Mack, Maria Martinez, Aminta McCarthy, Monique McCormick, Karen McQuillen, Barbara Miles, Sharon Monahan, Mary Morris, Angela Morton, Judith Murray, Rosa Muse, Debbie Netterville, Donna Nuzzo, Lori Opperman, Dorothy Packer, Carrie Perkins, Belinda Peters, Mary Poppins, Tiffany Provitt, Regina Scott, Kantina Shannon, Richard Snell, Melissa Stretz, Eveline Thayer, Mateline Patricia Thomas, Debbie Kay Thompson, Sara Tibbetts, Timothy Tremmel, Julie Wallen, Kenah Wheeler, Toni Wood, Lydia Busbin, Lou Jean Gregory, Darrell McCroskey, Carmen				

<b><u>Plaintiffs</u></b>	<b><u>Defendants</u></b>	<b><u>Div/City</u></b>	<b><u>Civil Action No.</u></b>	<b><u>Judge</u></b>
Jennette, Ana Maquire				

<u>Plaintiffs</u>	<u>Defendants</u>	<u>Div/City</u>	<u>Civil Action No.</u>	<u>Judge</u>
<b>W.D. Mo.</b>				
Delores Cerrone-Kennedy, Josh Kennedy	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., Imerys Talc America Inc., and Personal Care Products Council Foundation, <i>formerly known as</i> Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association	St. Joseph	5:16-cv-06091-HFS	District Judge Howard F. Sachs
<b>D.N.J.</b>				
James Chakalos	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., Imerys Talc America, Inc. <i>formerly known as</i> Luzenac America, Inc., John Does/Jane Does 1-30, and Unknown Businesses and/or Corporations A-Z	Trenton	3:14-cv-07079-FLW-LHG	Judge Freda L. Wolfson

<u>Plaintiffs</u>	<u>Defendants</u>	<u>Div/City</u>	<u>Civil Action No.</u>	<u>Judge</u>
<b>D.N.M.</b>				
Angela Lovato, Katie Basbagill, Syble Brewer, Dawn Durbin, Angela Fede, Barbara Ficacci, Toni Gross, Patricia Hines, Mary Jaubert, Roberta Johanson, Pamela Kidd, Al Martinez, Donila Martinez, Arthur Smoller, Barbara Vincent	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, LLC, Imerys Talc America, Inc., Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.,	Albuquerque	1:16-cv-00610-KG-KBM	Judge Kenneth J. Gonzales



<u>Plaintiffs</u>	<u>Defendants</u>	<u>Div/City</u>	<u>Civil Action No.</u>	<u>Judge</u>
<b>W.D. Okla.</b>				
Mary R, Robb, Melissa Ann Aguilar, Fredy Aguilar	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	Oklahoma City	5:16-cv-00620-D	Honorable Timothy D. DeGiusti
<b>E.D. Pa.</b>				
Nancy Bors	Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., Imerys Talc America, Inc. <i>formerly known as</i> Luzenac America, Inc., and Personal Care Products Council Foundation, <i>formerly known as</i> Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association	Philadelphia	2:16-cv-02866-MAK	Honorable Mark A. Kearney
<b>M.D. Tenn.</b>				
Patricia Kuhn	Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.	Columbia	1:16-cv-00055	Chief Judge Kevin H. Sharp

**BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON  
“BABY POWDER” and “SHOWER  
TO SHOWER” MARKETING, SALES  
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS  
LIABILITY LITIGATION

**MDL DOCKET NO. 2738**

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

In compliance with Rule 4.1(a) of the Rules of Procedure for the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Interested Party Response and this Proof of Service were electronically filed with the Clerk of the JPML by using the CM/ECF and was served on all counsel or parties in manners indicated on August 5, 2016 to the following:

Charles F. Barrett  
[cbarrett@nealharwell.com](mailto:cbarrett@nealharwell.com),  
[dgarrison@nealharwell.com](mailto:dgarrison@nealharwell.com)

*Kuhn v. Johnson & Johnson*;  
Case No. 1:16-cv-00055-KHS (M.D. Tenn.)

Brian J McCormick, Jr.  
[bmccormick@rossfeller Casey.com](mailto:bmccormick@rossfeller Casey.com),  
[earend@rossfeller Casey.com](mailto:earend@rossfeller Casey.com)

*Bors v. Johnson & Johnson, et al.*;  
Case No. 2:16-cv-02866-MAK (E.D. Penn.)

Richard Runft Barrett  
[rrb@rrblawfirm.net](mailto:rrb@rrblawfirm.net),  
[ccmirick@barrettlawgroup.com](mailto:ccmirick@barrettlawgroup.com)

*Rich-Williams v. Johnson & Johnson*;  
Case No. 1:16-cv-00121-SA-DAS  
(N.D. Miss.)

Timothy Gordon Blood  
[tblood@bholaw.com](mailto:tblood@bholaw.com), [efile@bholaw.com](mailto:efile@bholaw.com),  
[proach@bholaw.com](mailto:proach@bholaw.com), [sboot@bholaw.com](mailto:sboot@bholaw.com)

Matthew David Powers  
[mpowers@omm.com](mailto:mpowers@omm.com)

Thomas J. O'Reardon, II  
[toreardon@bholaw.com](mailto:toreardon@bholaw.com)

Charles Lance Gould, PHV

[lance.gould@beasleyallen.com](mailto:lance.gould@beasleyallen.com)

Alison Douillard Hawthorne, PHV

[alison.hawthorne@beasleyallen.com](mailto:alison.hawthorne@beasleyallen.com)

W. Daniel PHV Miles, III

[dee.miles@beasleyallen.com](mailto:dee.miles@beasleyallen.com)

Paula Michelle Roach

[pbrown@bholaw.com](mailto:pbrown@bholaw.com)

*Estrada v. Johnson & Johnson*;

Case No. 2:14-cv-01051-TLN-KJN (E. D. Cal.)

Stewart M. Weltman  
[sweltman@boodlaw.com](mailto:sweltman@boodlaw.com),  
[bjabaay@boodlaw.com](mailto:bjabaay@boodlaw.com)  
Warren T. Burns  
[wburns@burnscharest.com](mailto:wburns@burnscharest.com),  
[abynum@burnscharest.com](mailto:abynum@burnscharest.com),  
[mkweik@burnscharest.com](mailto:mkweik@burnscharest.com),  
[rlicon@burnscharest.com](mailto:rlicon@burnscharest.com)  
Daniel H Charest  
[dcharest@burnscharest.com](mailto:dcharest@burnscharest.com)  
Korey A Nelson  
[knelson@burnscharest.com](mailto:knelson@burnscharest.com)  
David Andrew Golanty  
[dgolanty@boodlaw.com](mailto:dgolanty@boodlaw.com)  
Amanda K Klevorn  
[aklevorn@burnscharest.com](mailto:aklevorn@burnscharest.com)

*Musgrove v. Johnson & Johnson*;  
Case No. 1:16-cv-06847 (N.D. Ill.)

Don Barrett  
[dbarrett@barrettlawgroup.com](mailto:dbarrett@barrettlawgroup.com),  
[charles@cfbfirm.com](mailto:charles@cfbfirm.com), [dawn@cfbfirm.com](mailto:dawn@cfbfirm.com),  
[linarisc@hbsslaw.com](mailto:linarisc@hbsslaw.com),  
[ntmaddux@barrettlawgroup.com](mailto:ntmaddux@barrettlawgroup.com)  
Katherine Barrett Riley  
[kbriley@barrettlawgroup.com](mailto:kbriley@barrettlawgroup.com)  
David Malcolm McMullan, Jr.  
[dmcullan@barrettlawgroup.com](mailto:dmcullan@barrettlawgroup.com)  
Sterling Starns  
[sstarns@barrettlawgroup.com](mailto:sstarns@barrettlawgroup.com)  
Cary Littlejohn  
[clittlejohn@barrettlawgroup.com](mailto:clittlejohn@barrettlawgroup.com)  
Brandi Hamilton  
[bhamilton@barrettlawgroup.com](mailto:bhamilton@barrettlawgroup.com)

*Lumas v. Johnson & Johnson, et al.*;  
Cause No. 3:16-cv00741 (S.D. Ill.)

Phillip G Whaley  
[pwhaley@ryanwhaley.com](mailto:pwhaley@ryanwhaley.com)  
Mary Quinn-Cooper  
[maryquinn.cooper@mcafeetaft.com](mailto:maryquinn.cooper@mcafeetaft.com)  
Vani R Singhal  
[vani.singhal@mcafeetaft.com](mailto:vani.singhal@mcafeetaft.com)

Warren T. Burns  
[wburns@burnscharest.com](mailto:wburns@burnscharest.com),  
[abynum@burnscharest.com](mailto:abynum@burnscharest.com),  
[mkweik@burnscharest.com](mailto:mkweik@burnscharest.com),  
[rlicon@burnscharest.com](mailto:rlicon@burnscharest.com)  
Daniel H Charest  
[dcharest@burnscharest.com](mailto:dcharest@burnscharest.com)  
Korey A Nelson  
[knelson@burnscharest.com](mailto:knelson@burnscharest.com)  
Amanda K Klevorn  
[aklevorn@burnscharest.com](mailto:aklevorn@burnscharest.com)

*Anderson v. Johnson & Johnson*;  
Case No. 3:16-cv-00447-JWD-EWD (M.D.  
La.)

Thomas P. Rosenfeld  
[tom@ghalaw.com](mailto:tom@ghalaw.com), [jwoodward@ghalaw.com](mailto:jwoodward@ghalaw.com),  
[lisas@ghalaw.com](mailto:lisas@ghalaw.com)  
Mark C. Goldenberg  
[Mark@ghalaw.com](mailto:Mark@ghalaw.com)  
Dan H. Ball  
[dhball@bryancave.com](mailto:dhball@bryancave.com)  
Richard B. Goetz  
[rgoetz@omm.com](mailto:rgoetz@omm.com)  
Kevin P. Green  
[kevin@ghalaw.com](mailto:kevin@ghalaw.com), [jwoodward@ghalaw.com](mailto:jwoodward@ghalaw.com),  
[lisas@ghalaw.com](mailto:lisas@ghalaw.com)  
Matthew David Powers  
[mpowers@omm.com](mailto:mpowers@omm.com)  
Victoria L. Weatherford  
[vweatherford@omm.com](mailto:vweatherford@omm.com)  
Timothy J. Hasken  
[tim.hasken@bryancave.com](mailto:tim.hasken@bryancave.com)  
Nathaniel R. Carroll  
[nathaniel.carroll@gmail.com](mailto:nathaniel.carroll@gmail.com)  
Timothy G. Blood  
[tblood@bholaw.com](mailto:tblood@bholaw.com)  
Ann E. Callis  
[acallis@ghalaw.com](mailto:acallis@ghalaw.com)  
Paula R. Brown  
[pbrown@bholaw.com](mailto:pbrown@bholaw.com)

Nancy M. Erfle  
[nerfle@gordonrees.com](mailto:nerfle@gordonrees.com)

Sarah J Timberlake  
[stimmerlake@dsla.com](mailto:stimmerlake@dsla.com)

Jason A Ryan  
[jryan@ryanwhaley.com](mailto:jryan@ryanwhaley.com)

Matthew J Sill  
[Matt@sill-law.com](mailto:Matt@sill-law.com), [david@sill-law.com](mailto:david@sill-law.com),  
[kristi@sill-law.com](mailto:kristi@sill-law.com), [lindar@sill-law.com](mailto:lindar@sill-law.com),  
[tosha@sill-law.com](mailto:tosha@sill-law.com)

*Robb v. Johnson & Johnson, et al.*;  
Case No. 5:16-cv-00620-D (W.D. Okl.)

Susan M Sharko  
[susan.sharko@dbr.com](mailto:susan.sharko@dbr.com)  
LORNA A. DOTRO  
[ldotro@coughlinduffy.com](mailto:ldotro@coughlinduffy.com)

Mark K Silver  
[msilver@coughlinduffy.com](mailto:msilver@coughlinduffy.com)

Michael James Kuharski  
[mkuharski@klawny.com](mailto:mkuharski@klawny.com)

Julie Lynn Tersigni  
[julie.tersigni@dbr.com](mailto:julie.tersigni@dbr.com)

*Chakalos v. Johnson & Johnson, et al.*;  
Case No. 3:14-cv-07079-FLW-LHG (D.N.J.)

*Mihalich v. Johnson & Johnson*;  
Case No. 3:14-cv-00600-DRH-SCW (S.D. Ill.)

Ben Franklin Pierce Gore  
[pgore@prattattorneys.com](mailto:pgore@prattattorneys.com),  
[rtrazo@prattattorneys.com](mailto:rtrazo@prattattorneys.com)

*Gould v. Johnson & Johnson*;  
Case No. 3:16-cv-03838 (N.D. Cal.)

Susan Becker  
[becker@paulmcinnes.com](mailto:becker@paulmcinnes.com)

Jack D. McInnes, V  
[mcinnes@paulmcinnes.com](mailto:mcinnes@paulmcinnes.com)

Richard M. Paul, III  
[paul@paulmcinnes.com](mailto:paul@paulmcinnes.com)

Ashlea Schwarz  
[ashlea@paulmcinnes.com](mailto:ashlea@paulmcinnes.com)

*Cerrone-Kennedy v. Johnson & Johnson, et al.*;  
Case No. 5:16-cv-06091-HFS (W.D. Mo.)

**Via First-Class Mail:**

Ann B. Oldfather  
Robert Sean Deskins  
Oldfather Law Firm  
1330 S. Third Street  
Louisville, KY 40208  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs Carol A. Casey and Thomas Casey*

Jennifer A. Moore  
Grossman & Moore, PLLC  
401 W. Main Street, Suite 1810  
Louisville, KY 40202  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs Carol A. Casey and Thomas Casey*

Carol D. Browning  
Stites & Harbison, PLLC - Louisville

400 W. Market Street, Suite 1800  
Louisville, KY 40202-3352  
*Counsel for Defendants Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.,  
and Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc.*

Nancy M. Erfle  
Gordon & Rees LLP - Portland  
121 SW Morrison Street, Suite 1575  
Portland, OR 97204  
*Counsel for Defendant Imerys Talc America, Inc.*

Susan S. Wettle  
Frost Brown Todd LLC - Louisville  
400 W. Market Street, 32nd Floor  
Louisville, KY 40202-3363  
*Counsel for Defendant Imerys Talc America, Inc.*

David T. Schaefer  
Ryan A. Morrison  
Dinsmore & Shohl LLP - Louisville  
101 S. Fifth Street, Suite 2500  
Louisville, KY 40202  
*Counsel for Defendant Personal Care Products Council*

J. David Brittingham  
Dinsmore & Shohl  
255 E. 5th Street, Suite 1900  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
*Counsel for Defendant Personal Care Products Council*

Sarah Izfar  
Thomas T. Locke  
Seyfarth Shaw LLP - DC  
975 F Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-1454  
*Counsel for Defendant Personal Care Products Council*

Sean Patrick Barth  
Napoli Shkolnik  
103 W. Vandalia Street  
Suite 125  
Edwardsville, IL 62025  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs Charles Fenstermaker and Sisi Harris*

Beth A. Bauer  
Gerard T. Noce

Hepler Broom  
211 North Broadway  
Suite 2700  
St. Louis, MO 63102

*Counsel for Defendants Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.,  
and Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc.*

Mark A. Prost  
Mary Anne Mellow  
Sandberg Phoenix, P.C.  
600 Washington Ave.  
15th Floor  
St. Louis, MO 63101-1313

*Counsel for Defendant Imerys Talc America, Inc.*

Laura K. Beasley  
Joley and Oliver  
8 E. Washington St.  
Belleville, IL 62220

*Counsel for Defendant Personal Care Products Council*

James G. Onder  
Michael J. Quillin  
Stephanie Lynn Rados  
William Wylie Blair  
Onder and Shelton, L.L.C.  
110 East Lockwood  
St. Louis, MO 63119

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Mary Gallow, Tammy Abell, Diana Ahlbin, Marva Aimes, Susan Aldridge,  
Cindy Angel, Terri Baranich, Cheryle Bechtold, Shirleen Begaye, Jeri Berry, Sandra Brandon,  
Renessa Brown, Alvetta Carroll, Lynette Cephas, Somben Cromer, Maureen Cummings, David  
Dishman, Joan Dittrich, Brenda Downey, Ignacio Dozier, Suzanne Dukewits, Alma Jean  
Eastman, Candice Ellison, Marilyn Farrell, Karen Ferro, Casaundra Fletcher, Chanthony  
Foreman, Faith Fowler, Willie R. Givens, Christa Goeb, Freya Gordon, Brenda Gray, Brenda  
Griffin, Patricia Hatch, Dolores Haynes, Sarah Jane Hilton, Lexi Holland, Deborah Jean  
Horton, Lakishia Howard, Andrea Hutchinson, Sharon Kay Jackson, Barbara Jones, Barbara  
Kaplan, Linda Knox, Terri Lake, Jauice Lamar-Davis, Debry Lanear, Angela Leach-Jayroe,  
Mevlude Lika, Barbara Landry, Maria Lazo, Cathy Lorenz, Lynda Mack, Maria Martinez,  
Aminta McCarthy, Monique McCormick, Karen McQuillen, Barbara Miles, Sharon Monahan,  
Mary Morris, Angela Morton, Judith Murray, Rosa Muse, Debbie Netterville, Donna Nuzzo, Lori  
Opperman, Dorothy Packer, Carrie Perkins, Belinda Peters, Mary Poppins, Tiffany Provitt,  
Regina Scott, Kantina Shannon, Richard Snell, Melissa Stretz, Eveline Thayer, Mateline Patricia  
Thomas, Debbie Kay Thompson, Sara Tibbetts, Timothy Tremmel, Julie Wallen, Kenah Wheeler,  
Toni Wood, Lydia Busbin, Lou Jean Gregory, Darrell McCroskey, Carmen Jennette, and Ana  
Maquire*

Turner W. Branch  
Joshua Bradley  
Margaret Moses Branch  
Branch Law Firm  
2025 Rio Grande Blvd, NW  
Albuquerque, NM 87104  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs Angela Lovato, Katie Basbagill, Syble Brewer, Dawn Durbin, Angela Fede, Barbara Ficacci, Toni Gross, Patricia Hines, Mary Jaubert, Roberta Johanson, Pamela Kidd, Al Martinez, Donila Martinez, Arthur Smoller, and Barbara Vincent*

Robert J. Curtis  
Ellen M. Kelly  
Robert Curtis Law Office PA  
215 Central NW, Suite 200  
Albuquerque, NM 87102  
*Counsel for Defendants Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, LLC, and Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.*

Iain L. Kennedy  
Kathleen A. Frazier  
Scott A. James  
Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP  
JPMorgan Chase Tower  
600 Travis Street  
Suite 3400  
Houston, TX 77002  
*Counsel for Defendants Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, LLC, Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc., Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc., Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Products Company*

Lisa Chavez Ortega  
Bruce D. Hall  
Rodey, Dickason, Sloan, Akin & Robb  
PO Box 1888  
Albuquerque, NM 87103-1888  
*Counsel for Defendant Imerys Talc America, Inc.*

Michael R Klatt  
Leslie Benitez  
Gordon and Rees  
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1510  
Austin, TX 78701  
*Counsel for Defendant Imerys Talc America, Inc.*

Nancy M. Erfle  
Gordon and Rees  
121 SW Morrison Street  
Suite 1575  
Portland, OR 97204  
*Counsel for Defendant Imerys Talc America, Inc.*

Patrick A. Dawson  
Robert D. Cheeley  
299 S. Main Street, Suite A  
Alpharetta, GA 30009  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs Cammy D. Marchetti and Michael A. Marchetti*

Roy E. Barnes  
John R. Bevis  
Barnes Law Group LLC  
31 Atlanta Street  
Marietta, GA 30060  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs Cammy D. Marchetti and Michael A. Marchetti*

Leslie Joy Suson  
Zoe Ileana Martinez  
Two Alliance Center  
3560 Lenox Road, Suite 1600  
Atlanta, GA 30326  
*Counsel for Defendants Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc., Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc., and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Products Company*

Leslie Kali Eason  
The Eason Law Firm  
6150 Old National Highway  
Atlanta, GA 30049  
*Counsel for Defendant Imerys Talc America, Inc.*

John H. Beisner  
Jessica D. Miller  
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP  
1440 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
*Counsel for Defendants Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.*

Clerk of the Court  
Georgia Middle District Court  
United States Post Office and Courthouse  
120 12th Street  
Columbus, GA 31901



Clerk of the Court  
Kentucky Western District Court  
Gene Snyder United States Courthouse  
601 West Broadway  
Louisville, KY 40202

Clerk of the Court  
Missouri Eastern District Court  
Thomas F. Eagleton United States Courthouse  
111 South Tenth Street  
St. Louis, MO 63102

Clerk of the Court  
New Mexico District Court  
Pete V. Domenici United States Courthouse  
333 Lomas Boulevard  
Albuquerque, NM 87102

*/s/ Brian Baggetta*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Attorney for Defendants Johnson & Johnson  
and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies,  
Inc.*