UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
SHAQUIL BYRD,	
PLAINTIFF, V.))) <u>COMPLAINT</u>) 1:14-CV-820 (GTS/RFT)
JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. and JOHNSON & JOHNSON) JURY TRIAL) IS DEMANDED
DEFENDANTS.)

Plaintiff Shaquil Byrd, by and through his attorneys, DeGraff, Foy & Kunz, LLP, complaining of defendants, alleges upon information and belief as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLAIM

1. This action seeks, *inter alia*, damages for personal injury, pain, suffering, economic loss, and the cost of past and future medical care sustained by plaintiff Shaquil Byrd, due to the liability of defendants, based on negligence, strict products liability, and breach of warranty arising from defendants' manufacture, marketing, distribution and sale of the atypical antipsychotic prescription drug Risperidone, known by the trade name¹ "Risperdal" (which includes *Risperdal Consta*, and *Risperdal M-Tab*), which plaintiff was prescribed and treated with from approximately 2001-2008, while still a minor.

JURISDICTION

2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 in that the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of Seventy Five

¹ And hereafter referred to as

Thousand and 00/100 (\$75,000.00) Dollars exclusive of interest and costs, and this action is between the plaintiff, a citizen of New York, and the defendants, corporate citizens of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, or in the alternative, citizens of a state other than New York.

PARTIES

- 3. The plaintiff, Shaquil Byrd, is an individual residing in Albany, New York.
- 4. The defendant Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. ("Janssen") is a foreign corporation organized and existing pursuant to the laws of Pennsylvania (or some state other than New York), with its principal place of business in New Jersey (or some state other than New York).
 - 5. Defendant Janssen is authorized to do business in the State of New York.
- 6. The defendant Johnson & Johnson ("J & J") is a foreign corporation organized and existing pursuant to the laws of New Jersey (or some state other than New York), with its principal place of business in New Jersey (or some state other than New York).
 - 7. Defendant J & J is authorized to do business in the State of New York.
- 8. At all times relevant hereto, defendants Janssen and/or J & J ("defendants") were engaged in the business of designing, developing, manufacturing, testing, inspecting, advertising, selling, transporting, marketing, promoting, and distributing the atypical antipsychotic prescription drug Risperidone, known by the trade name "Risperdal" (which includes *Risperdal Consta*, and *Risperdal M-Tab*), which

plaintiff was prescribed and treated with from approximately 2001-2008, while still a minor.

9. Prior to 2001 defendants did, in the normal course of business, sell, transfer, deliver, or otherwise place in the stream of commerce the aforesaid Risperdal, and conducted business in, and had and continue to have significant, purposeful, and deliberate business contacts with and in the State of New York.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

10. Pursuant to the tolling provisions of (New York's) CPLR § 208, this claim is timely brought, as plaintiff was a minor when his cause of action accrued, and---having been born on July 13, 1993---has yet to reach twenty-one (21) years of age.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Negligence)

- 11. Plaintiff repeats and reallges each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs "1" through "10" above as if fully set forth herein at length.
- 12. From approximately 2001-2008, plaintiff Shaquil Byrd was prescribed and took Risperdal for the purported treatment of his mental health diagnoses.
- 13. During the aforesaid period (and earlier), defendants knew that Risperdal was defective, and that it had a high incidence of serious side effects, including the development of gynecomastia (the growth of male breasts), hyperprolactinemia, and other medical problems.
- 14. Accordingly, defendants knew or should have known that there was a foreseeable risk plaintiff Shaquil Byrd (and similarly-situated patients) would suffer harmful side effects from Risperdal.

- 15. Nevertheless, during the aforesaid period (and earlier), defendants, in their respective efforts to market the drug to the public, concealed and/or considerably minimized Risperdal's significant side effects.
- 16. Specifically, during the aforesaid period (and earlier), defendants failed to disclose to physicians, patients (such as plaintiff Shaquil Byrd), and those similarly situated, that Risperdal was likely to cause gynecomastia, hyperprolactinemia, and other medical problems, and that patients taking Risperdal were at a much higher risk for the development of these complications than patients taking similar medications.
- 17. Further, during the aforesaid period (and earlier), defendants failed to provide sufficient warnings and instructions that would have put plaintiff and/or the general public on notice of the dangers and adverse effects associated with Risperdal, including, gynecomastia, hyperprolactinemia, and other medical problems.
- 18. In light of defendants' full awareness that the drug carried with it an increased risk of patients developing gynecomastia, hyperprolactinemia, and other medical problems, Risperdal was (at all relevant times) defective as marketed, due (among other things) to the inaccuracy/incompleteness of its labeling, instructions, and warnings.
- 19. It was reasonable for plaintiff Shaquil Byrd to rely on defendants' representations regarding the safety and efficacy of Risperdal, and plaintiff did so rely.
- 20. As a direct result of his course of treatment with Risperdal, plaintiff Shaquil Byrd has suffered physical and emotional injuries including the development of gynecomastia and hyperprolactinemia (with accompanying lactation), required multiple

bilateral reduction/removal surgeries, and sustained other serious, painful, disabling, and permanent personal injuries.

- 21. The aforesaid gynecomastia and hyperprolactinemia (with accompanying lactation), multiple surgeries, and other serious, painful, disabling and permanent personal injuries sustained by plaintiff Shaquil Byrd, were directly and proximately caused and/or necessitated by the negligence of the defendants, without any negligence on the part of plaintiff contributing thereto.
- 22. The negligence of the defendants consisted, among other things, of the following:
 - (a) in designing, manufacturing, marketing and/or distributing for sale the drug Risperdal in a dangerous and defective manner, thereby exposing plaintiff Shaquil Byrd (and similarly-situated patients) to an unreasonable risk of harm;
 - (b) in failing to properly, adequately, and appropriately warn plaintiff Shaquil Byrd (and similarly-situated patients) of the risks and dangers associated with Risperdal;
 - (c) in continuing to promote Risperdal as a safe and effective drug, despite patient reports of adverse events, FDA warnings regarding Risperdal's dangers, and FDA requests to modify the warning labels;
 - (d) in designing, manufacturing, and/or distributing for sale the drug Risperdal which did not satisfy or conform to applicable Federal and State statutes, rules and regulations; and
 - (e) in being otherwise careless and negligent.

- 23. As a result of the aforesaid negligence of the defendants, plaintiff Shaquil Byrd suffered serious physical injuries with attendant pain and suffering, required multiple surgeries, and was rendered and continues to be sick, sore, lame, and disabled, which injuries and disabilities will be permanent.
- 24. Plaintiff Shaquil Byrd has incurred and will incur in the future considerable expense for his medical care, hospital care and treatment.
- 25. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff Shaquil Byrd was damaged in an amount to be determined by the Court, but not less than Two Million and 00/100 (\$2,000,000.00) Dollars, together with interest thereon as permitted by law.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Strict Products Liability)

- 26. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs "1" through "25" above as though fully set forth herein at length.
- 27. Upon sale of the aforesaid Risperdal, defendants assumed a strict liability to all persons whom they could reasonably foresee would be injured by the sale of this defectively-designed drug for which appropriate warnings (regarding significant, likely side effects) were never communicated.
- 28. The plaintiff Shaquil Byrd was covered by and included in the aforesaid assumption of strict liability.
- 29. At all times relevant hereto, the drug Risperdal was a defective product (within the meaning of the doctrine of strict products liability) inasmuch as it could not be taken safely, due to its dangerous, hazardous, and defective manufacture, design, labeling/warning, marketing, and condition, as set forth herein.

- 30. The aforesaid Risperdal tablets were---in each and every instance---defective when they left defendants' facilities, and at the time of their sale, and remained defective up until the time of their ingestion by plaintiff Shaquil Byrd, over the course of his years treating with the drug.
- 31. As a direct and proximate result of the defective condition of the aforementioned Risperdal, plaintiff Shaquil Byrd sustained serious physical injuries, pain, suffering and permanent disability.
- 32. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff Shaquil Byrd was damaged in an amount to be determined by the Court, but not less than Two Million and 00/100 (\$2,000,000.00) Dollars, together with interest thereon as permitted by law.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Breach of Express and Implied Warranty)

- 33. Plaintiff repeats and reallges each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs "1" through "32" above as though fully set forth herein at length.
- 34. Upon the manufacture and sale of the aforesaid Risperdal, and prior to its prescription, distribution and ingestion thereof by plaintiff (over the course of his years treating with the drug), defendants made certain express and implied warranties to the consuming public, including plaintiff, concerning (among other things) the safety and efficacy of the drug.
- 35. Upon the manufacture and sale of the aforesaid Risperdal, and prior to its prescription, distribution and ingestion thereof by plaintiff (over the course of his years treating with the drug), defendants expressly and impliedly warranted to the consuming

public, including plaintiff, that the drug was of merchantable quality, and reasonably fit, safe and suitable for its intended purpose.

- 36. The aforesaid Risperdal was not of merchantable quality, nor fit, safe, or suitable for its intended purpose.
- 37. The aforesaid Risperdal did not conform to the express and implied warranties rendered by the defendants.
- 38. Plaintiff Shaquil Byrd was not aware of, and could not have discovered the defective nature of the aforesaid Risperdal, which made the drug unreasonably dangerous, unsafe, unfit, unsuitable for its intended use, and not of merchantable quality.
- 39. The severe, painful, and permanent injuries and disabilities suffered by plaintiff Shaquil Byrd were brought about as a direct and proximate result of the breach of the express and implied warranties by the defendants.
- 40. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff Shaquil Byrd has been damaged in an amount to be determined by the Court, but not less than Two Million and 00/100 (\$2,000,000.00) Dollars, together with interest thereon as permitted by law.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff Shaquil Byrd demands judgment in his favor and against the defendant on each claim for relief (together with interest thereon as permitted by law), costs and disbursements of this action, and such other and further relief as the

Court deems just and proper.

Dated: July 8, 2014

Luke S. Malamood, Esq. Bar Roll No. 517364

DeGRAFF, FOY & KUNZ, LLP

Attorneys for Plaintiff 41 State Street, 9th Floor Albany, New York 12207

518-462-5300

Case 1:14-cv-00820-GTS-RFT Document 1-1 Filed 07/08/14 Page 1 of 1 1:14-cv-820 (GTS/RFT)

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

purpose of initiating the civil de	ocket sheet. <i>(SEE INSTRUC</i>	CTIONS ON NEXT PAGE C	OF THIS FO	RM.)	•	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	FS SHAQUIL BYRD			DEFENDANTS AND JOHNSO	CIIIODZII ZIMII	MACEUTICALS, INC.,
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) DeGraff, Foy & Kunz, LLP			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Mercer County, N (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)			
	eet, Albany, N		T			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPAL PARTIE	S (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintij
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)				PTF DEF M 1	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	双 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	n of Another State	2 2 Incorporated an of Business	nd Principal Place 5 🗓 5
				n or Subject of a Ceign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box O	nly)				
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEE 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRSONER ELTIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other:	X	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 428 USC 157 429 USC 158 429 USC 1609 429 US	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration
	DN Cite the U.S. Civil Str 28 USC Sec Brief description of ca	Appellate Court attite under which you ar tion 1332 ause: Action for IS A CLASS ACTION	r pers	ened Anoth (specify o not cite jurisdictional sta sonal injury	ner District Litigati by) atutes unless diversity):	oroduct liability.
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE -			DOCKET NUMBER	
July 8, 2014		SIGNATURE OF ATT	TORNEY	FECORE		
#0206-2987184	10UNT \$400	APPLYING IFP	<u> </u>	JUDGE	GTS MAG. 1	UDGE DET