

1 Joseph G. Petrosinelli (*pro hac vice*)  
2 John E. Joiner (*pro hac vice*)  
3 Williams & Connolly LLP  
4 725 12th Street, NW  
5 Washington, DC 20005  
6 202-434-5000  
7 202-434-5029 (facsimile)  
8 jpetrosinelli@wc.com  
9 jjoiner@wc.com

7 Loren H. Brown (*pro hac vice*)  
8 DLA Piper LLP (US)  
9 1251 Avenue of the Americas  
10 New York, NY 10020-1104  
11 212-335-4000  
12 212-884-8546 (facsimile)  
13 loren.brown@dlapiper.com

11 Matthew A. Holian (Cal. Bar No. 211728)  
12 DLA Piper LLP (US)  
13 33 Arch Street, 26th Floor  
14 Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1447  
15 617-406-6009  
16 617-406-6109 (facsimile)  
17 matt.holian@dlapiper.com

16 Attorneys for Defendant Pfizer Inc.

17  
18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
19 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20  
21 IN RE: VIAGRA (SILDENAFIL CITRATE)  
22 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 16-md-02691-RS

MDL No. 2691

23 This Document Relates to:  
24  
25 ALL ACTIONS

**DEFENDANT PFIZER’S POSITION  
STATEMENT FOR INITIAL CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION..... 1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND ..... 2

    A. Viagra and Erectile Dysfunction. .... 2

    B. Regulatory Approval ..... 2

    C. Prior Viagra Litigation and Current Litigation Status ..... 3

THE SCIENTIFIC RECORD ..... 4

THE REGULATORY RECORD ..... 8

THE THRESHOLD CRITICAL ISSUE IN THIS LITIGATION ..... 10

OTHER FACTUAL AND LEGAL ISSUES ..... 12

CONCLUSION ..... 13

## INTRODUCTION

1  
2 In 2015—seventeen years after Viagra was approved by the Food and Drug Administration  
3 as safe and effective and became available to patients—several men began filing lawsuits alleging  
4 that they used Viagra for unspecified time periods at unspecified intervals, and that such use  
5 caused or exacerbated their melanoma. These claims lack any reliable scientific basis. Viagra has  
6 been one of the most studied medications in the past twenty years, and none of the more than 100  
7 clinical trials involving many thousands of patients suggests a link between Viagra use and  
8 melanoma. This litigation, instead, was prompted by the April 2014 publication of a single  
9 observational study—the “Li study”—which performed a statistical analysis of responses to  
10 questionnaires and reported an association between Viagra use in 2000 and the development of  
11 melanoma at some point during the following ten years. The authors, however, “acknowledge[d]”  
12 their study had “limitations” and expressly stated the reported results could not “prove cause and  
13 effect” and should not alter the current clinical use of Viagra.

14 Plaintiffs’ claims also find no support in the regulatory record. No regulatory agency—  
15 anywhere—has found the causal relationship now asserted by Plaintiffs or otherwise suggested it  
16 has any validity. To the contrary, the European Medicines Agency, after publication of the Li  
17 study, considered the issue at length in 2014 and concluded that “[a] causal relationship between  
18 the use of sildenafil [Viagra] and the risk for melanoma skin cancer is not supported by the data  
19 currently available.”

20 In light of this record, Pfizer respectfully suggests that threshold consideration of the issue  
21 of general causation—whether Plaintiffs have reliable scientific evidence that Viagra can cause  
22 melanoma—would best serve the interests of all parties and streamline the litigation. The Manual  
23 for Complex Litigation counsels in favor of such discovery phasing in these circumstances, and  
24 numerous other MDL courts, including those in the recent *Incretin Products* MDL (C.D. Cal.,  
25 Battaglia, J.), the *Bextra and Celebrex* MDL (N.D. Cal., Breyer, J.), and a prior *Viagra* MDL (D.  
26 Minn., Magnuson, J.), all structured discovery such that the issue of general causation was  
27 considered and decided early in the proceedings.

28

## **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

### **A. Viagra and Erectile Dysfunction.**

Pfizer manufactures and distributes Viagra (sildenafil citrate), an oral medication indicated for the treatment of erectile dysfunction. Erectile dysfunction—or ED—is a serious disorder that affects approximately 30 million men in the United States, and 150 million men worldwide. ED has a number of causes. It may result from such varying physical and mental conditions as high blood pressure, heart disease, and diabetes; excessive smoking and obesity; and depression and stress. Certain medications can contribute to ED or make it worse. The impact of undiagnosed or untreated ED can be profound—ED may lead to feelings of depression, anxiety, and low self-esteem, and may strain intimate relationships.

In general terms, Viagra treats ED by increasing blood flow to the penis such that an erection can occur. It does so by selectively inhibiting an enzyme known as phosphodiesterase type 5, or PDE5 (thus making Viagra part of a class of medications known as “PDE5 inhibitors”). This selective inhibition of PDE5 allows blood vessels to dilate, increasing blood flow to the penis tissue and producing an erection.

### **B. Regulatory Approval.**

The Food and Drug Administration approved Viagra in March 1998, after evaluating the available scientific evidence and determining that Viagra “is safe and effective for use as recommended” in the product label. Nearly ten years of study and testing by Pfizer preceded FDA’s approval. During this time, Pfizer conducted 71 FDA-supervised clinical studies involving thousands of men. Eleven of these studies were double-blind, placebo-controlled trials, the “gold standard for determining the relationship of an agent to a health outcome or adverse side effect.” Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence (Reference Guide to Epidemiology) (Third Ed.) at 555. None of these studies suggests any link between Viagra and melanoma. Viagra now has been approved in more than 140 countries; it has been used by more than 28 million men in the United States and more than 68 million men worldwide.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Sildenafil, the active ingredient in Viagra, also was approved by FDA in 2005 (under the separate brand name Revatio) as a safe and effective treatment for pulmonary arterial hypertension

1           **C.       Prior Viagra Litigation and Current Litigation Status.**

2           This is the third “wave” of Viagra litigation. In a first wave of litigation, plaintiffs alleged  
3 that Viagra caused heart attacks, strokes, and other cardiovascular injuries. Those allegations were  
4 unsupported by the scientific record, and the courts in many of those cases accordingly excluded  
5 the proffered opinions of plaintiffs’ experts as unreliable and entered judgment for Pfizer. *See,*  
6 *e.g., Brumley v. Pfizer Inc.*, 200 F.R.D. 596 & 149 F. Supp. 2d 305 (S.D. Tex. 2001) (excluding  
7 expert testimony that Viagra causes heart attacks and granting summary judgment for Pfizer);  
8 *Selig v. Pfizer Inc.*, 735 N.Y.S.2d 549, 551 (1st Dep’t), *leave to appeal denied*, 745 N.Y.S.2d 502  
9 (N.Y. 2002) (affirming exclusion of plaintiffs’ expert in three cases where no “clinical data” or  
10 “other scientific evidence” supported “causal link between . . . Viagra and heart attacks”). The  
11 remaining plaintiffs either dismissed their cases voluntarily or settled them for *de minimis*  
12 amounts.

13           In a second wave of litigation, plaintiffs alleged that Viagra caused an eye condition called  
14 non-arteritic anterior ischemic optic neuropathy, or NAION. In 2006, those cases were  
15 coordinated in an MDL proceeding in the District of Minnesota, *see In re Viagra Prods. Liab.*  
16 *Litig.*, MDL No. 1724 (Magnuson, J.), where, like the first wave of Viagra cases, they were found  
17 to be without any reliable scientific basis. The MDL court, after an initial phase of general  
18 causation discovery, excluded all of plaintiffs’ experts under *Daubert*, thereby ending the  
19 litigation, *see In re Viagra Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 572 F. Supp. 2d 1071 (D. Minn. 2008) (excluding  
20 all but one of plaintiffs’ experts); *In re Viagra Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 658 F. Supp. 2d 936 (D. Minn.  
21 2009) (excluding plaintiffs’ remaining expert).

22           In this third wave of litigation, Plaintiffs now allege that Viagra caused or exacerbated  
23 their melanoma. And here too there is no reliable scientific evidence to support Plaintiffs’ claims.  
24 Plaintiffs began filing their cases in early 2015, in the wake of an observational study—the Li

25  
26 (PAH), a serious and potentially fatal vascular disease. Pfizer conducted separate clinical trials of  
27 Revatio, in both men and women, which likewise did not suggest any link between sildenafil and  
28 melanoma.

1 study, in which the lead researchers expressly stated that the study results do not establish a cause  
2 and effect relationship between Viagra use and melanoma, *see infra* at 4-8—and the plaintiff  
3 lawyer advertising that followed the study. As of this submission, there are 109 cases pending in  
4 seven jurisdictions—102 cases in this Court, five cases in four other federal districts awaiting  
5 transfer here, and two cases in state courts. *See Ex. 1 (List of Actions)*. Pfizer has not answered  
6 any of the federal complaints, and none of the cases has advanced to any material degree, with the  
7 exception of two of the earliest filed cases, which were pending before Judge Ozerden in the  
8 Southern District of Mississippi; after full briefing, Judge Ozerden dismissed both cases with  
9 prejudice on statute of limitations grounds, *see Tanner v. Pfizer, Inc.*, No. 1:15cv75-HSO-JCG,  
10 2015 WL 6133207 (S.D. Miss. Oct. 19, 2015); *O’Neill v. Pfizer, Inc.*, No. 1:15cv76-HSO-JCG  
11 (S.D. Miss. Oct. 19, 2015), ECF No. 14. In the state court actions, Pfizer’s motion to dismiss the  
12 Second Amended Petition for lack of personal jurisdiction is pending in an 89-plaintiff case filed  
13 in Missouri, *see Parker v. Pfizer, Inc.*, No. 1522-CC00318-01 (St. Louis City Cir. Ct.), and Pfizer  
14 has answered and served initial disclosures in a case filed in Arizona, *see Baggott v. Pfizer, Inc.*,  
15 No. C20153927 (Pima County Sup. Ct.), but discovery has not further progressed.

### 16 THE SCIENTIFIC RECORD

17 Melanoma is a form of skin cancer involving melanocytes, which are cells that color the  
18 skin. It is a disease caused by, among other things, excessive exposure to natural or artificial  
19 sunlight, exposure to certain environmental factors, and genetic factors (such as having certain  
20 changes in genes linked to melanoma). In the United States, melanoma occurs at a rate of 28.5  
21 cases per 100,000 men, and it is estimated there will be 76,380 new cases diagnosed here in men  
22 and women in 2016. If caught early, the five-year survival rate is around 95%.

23 Pfizer believes an initial phase of general causation discovery would show that there is no  
24 reliable scientific evidence that Viagra causes or exacerbates melanoma. For more than fifteen  
25 years the scientific record has continued to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of Viagra that was  
26 demonstrated in pre-approval trials and studies. To date, Pfizer has conducted 136 clinical trials  
27 of Viagra, 74 of which were double-blind placebo-controlled clinical trials. Those studies do not  
28

1 show any relationship between Viagra and melanoma. Many other scientists have studied Viagra  
2 (or Revatio) as well, and those studies likewise have not suggested any link between use of the  
3 medication and melanoma.

4 Plaintiffs base their claims on a handful of studies, none of which was a double-blind,  
5 placebo-controlled clinical trial, and only one of which involved human patients. That one study,  
6 the Li study, suggested an 84% increased risk of melanoma in men who used Viagra at least once  
7 within the three months preceding the baseline survey date (HR: 1.84; 95% CI, 1.04-3.22).<sup>2</sup> The  
8 Li study analyzed data from prior surveys of Massachusetts healthcare professionals, which were  
9 not specifically designed to study Viagra use or to collect data on any other PDE5 inhibitors. *See*  
10 Wen-Qin Li et al., JAMA INTERN. MED. 2014; 174(6):964-70. The study has significant  
11 limitations, which the authors themselves “acknowledge[d].” For example, because the study was  
12 not designed to evaluate PDE5 inhibitors, the study participants were asked only once, in 2000,  
13 about whether they had recently or ever used Viagra. Absent from the study—and not collected—  
14 is any information regarding the frequency and duration of use of Viagra, if any, or any other  
15 erectile dysfunction medications in the fourteen years between 2000 and the date of publication.  
16 This means that if a man took one Viagra pill on one occasion during some unidentified year  
17 before 2000, and developed melanoma in, say, 2010, he would be counted as a Viagra user, and  
18 the study authors would count his melanoma in their calculations supporting an increased risk of  
19 melanoma in Viagra users. The study’s sample size, moreover, was “modest” at best—the data  
20 included only 142 total melanomas in all groups, 17 of which were in men who had ever used  
21 Viagra. And Viagra users were more likely to be older, have a higher BMI, and have a history of  
22 six or more severe or blistering sunburns, suggesting that they had a greater baseline risk of  
23 developing melanoma before ever taking Viagra.

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>2</sup> In a particular study, the ratio of an event happening in people exposed to a medication compared  
26 to those not exposed to a medication may be expressed as a “hazard ratio” (or HR), a “relative  
27 risk” (or RR), or an “odds ratio” (or OR). (The technical differences between those statistical  
28 measures are not important for present purposes.) The “confidence interval” (or CI) “is, in simple  
terms, the ‘margin of error’” for the risk measure. *In re Bextra & Celebrex Mktg. Sales Pracs. &  
Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 524 F. Supp. 1166, 1172, 1174 (N.D. Cal. 2007).

1 In light of these and other limitations, the authors advised that their “results should be  
2 interpreted cautiously and are insufficient to alter current clinical recommendations.” *Id.* at 969.  
3 They expressly stated: “Our study cannot prove cause and effect.” *Id.*

4 Notably, a 2015 observational study (the “Loeb study”) conducted in response to the Li  
5 study found a statistical 21% increased risk of melanoma in men taking all PDE5 inhibitors (OR:  
6 1.21, 95% CI, 1.08-1.36) but concluded that the study results were inconsistent with a causal  
7 relationship. *See* Stacy Loeb et al., JAMA 2015; 313(24): 2449-55. The Loeb study, which,  
8 unlike the Li study, was based on six years of detailed prescription data, showed no relationship  
9 between the risk of melanoma and the amount of Viagra taken by a patient. That is, the risk of  
10 melanoma was not highest among those men who were most prescribed Viagra or another PDE5  
11 inhibitor, but instead, and counterintuitively, was significantly higher in men who filled a single—  
12 just *one*—such prescription. Men who filled *multiple* prescriptions for Viagra or another PDE5  
13 inhibitor were *not* at a significantly increased risk of developing melanoma. Further, if, as  
14 Plaintiffs allege, PDE5 inhibition leads to the occurrence or exacerbation of melanoma, then  
15 presumably those PDE5 inhibitors with a longer half-life (meaning those PDE5 inhibitors that are  
16 retained in the body for a longer period of time after ingestion) should be associated with a higher  
17 risk of melanoma. The results in the Loeb study, however, did not bear that out, as the rate of  
18 melanoma among men who used any of the studied PDE5 inhibitors, including those with half-  
19 lives longer than Viagra’s, was virtually identical. Nor was the Loeb study consistent with  
20 Plaintiffs’ allegation that Viagra exacerbates melanoma—it found no increased risk of more  
21 advanced (stages 2-4) melanoma and, indeed, the risk of metastatic melanoma (as compared to  
22 stage 0 or 1 melanoma) was *lower* in Viagra users than nonusers. For all of these reasons, the  
23 Loeb study authors recognized both that this “pattern of association raises questions about whether  
24 this association is causal” and that “the observed association may reflect confounding by lifestyle  
25 factors associated with both PDE5 inhibitor use and low-stage melanoma.”<sup>3</sup>

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>3</sup> In discussing the study findings, lead author Dr. Stacy Loeb stated: “While medications for  
28 erectile dysfunction come with serious risk of a drop in blood pressure if taken together with other  
medicines called nitrates, overall they are safe medications, and our results suggest that physicians



1 In addition to the Li study, Plaintiffs rely on a few studies in mice or rats (known as in vivo  
2 studies) or in human cells tested in a laboratory (known as in vitro studies), none of which  
3 involved tests in actual humans. But those studies cannot establish that Viagra causes melanoma,  
4 for any number of reasons. *First*, none of the experiments show that Viagra is capable of  
5 transforming a normal skin cell into a melanoma cell. Some of the experiments attempt to address  
6 whether Viagra can cause already-cancerous melanoma cells to multiply faster (grow) or spread to  
7 other organs (metastasize), but none of the experiments even attempt to establish that Viagra use  
8 initiates the cancer process in the first place. *Second*, even among the studies that address the  
9 growth or spread of melanoma cells, the findings are inconsistent and contradictory. One of the  
10 studies purports to show that chronic Viagra exposure at high doses increases melanoma cell  
11 growth or increases the likelihood that the melanoma will spread, while others show that Viagra  
12 exposure *decreases* melanoma cell growth or that Viagra exposure has no effect on the spread of  
13 the melanoma. *Third*, even in the mouse and cell experiments that purport to show an effect on  
14 melanoma cell growth, those findings apply only to certain rare melanoma cells that produce high  
15 amounts of a protein known as PDE5A, which is true of only a fraction of human melanoma cells.  
16 And *fourth*, even for the experiments that involve those rare melanoma cells, the findings from  
17 these animal and cell experiments cannot be extrapolated to humans because: (a) the doses of  
18 Viagra used were much higher than what patients receive in the real world (for example, in one  
19 study, mice received more than 150 times the dose that an average man would receive, even if he  
20 took the highest dose of Viagra); (b) Viagra was administered constantly, whereas patients  
21 typically take Viagra intermittently, and it clears the body quickly; and (c) the effects of a  
22 medication in living humans cannot be predicted reliably based on tests in mice or on human cells  
23 in a test tube. *See* Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence (The Admissibility of Expert  
24

---

25 should not be concerned that the drugs cause melanoma[.]... Overall the pattern of the  
26 relationship did not support that these medicines cause melanoma.” NYU Press Release (June 23,  
27 2015), *Viagra Does Something Very Important – But It Is Unlikely to Cause Melanoma, Researchers  
28 Conclude*, <http://nyulangone.org/press-releases/viagra-does-something-very-important-but-it-is-unlikely-to-cause-melanoma-researchers-conclude> (last visited May 5, 2016).

1 Testimony) (Third Ed.) at 23 (“Opinions based on animal studies have been rejected because of  
2 reservations about extrapolating from animals to humans or because the plaintiff’s extrapolated  
3 dose was lower than the animals.”).

4 The scientific record contains no reliable evidence—because it does not exist—of a causal  
5 relationship between Viagra use and the development or exacerbation of melanoma.

### 6 **THE REGULATORY RECORD**

7 Before publication of the Li study, there was no suggestion—during the many years that  
8 Viagra had been on the market—of an association between the medication and melanoma. In July  
9 2014, after the Li study was published, the Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee  
10 (PRAC) of the European Medicines Agency (the European equivalent to the FDA) sought to  
11 further investigate and evaluate the “signal” first reported in Li. PRAC accordingly requested that  
12 Pfizer provide a cumulative review of the available data; the review was to be comprehensive in  
13 scope and address, among other things, the published literature, including the Li study, as well as  
14 any mechanistic studies, epidemiological studies, and clinical trials.

15 After receiving Pfizer’s extensive analysis of the available data and studying the issue for  
16 several months, PRAC issued its Preliminary Assessment Report in October 2014. *See*  
17 *Preliminary PRAC rapporteur assessment report on the signal of melanoma with sildenafil*, EMA  
18 PRAC (Oct. 13, 2014). Regarding the Li study, PRAC observed it “has several important  
19 limitations . . . and insufficient data for a meaningful study.” *Id.* at 7. Regarding the alleged  
20 association between Viagra use and melanoma, PRAC concluded “there is no data to indicate, or  
21 support a causal role for sildenafil [Viagra] on an increased risk for melanoma. Non-causal  
22 reasons should be considered for the observed relationship between sildenafil use and the risk for  
23 melanoma skin cancer. . . . No further action is considered necessary.” *Id.* at 19. PRAC issued its  
24 Final Assessment Report in December 2014, confirming its recommendations. The Final Report,  
25 too, was unequivocal in its findings: “[N]on-clinical data did not support a causal mechanism,  
26 clinical studies and post-marketing data did not indicate an increased risk for melanoma skin  
27 cancer in sildenafil users, and . . . no plausible biological mechanism was confirmed.”  
28

1 Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee, Minutes of the meeting on 3-6 November 2014,  
2 at 29. As such, “[n]o changes to the product information of sildenafil containing medicines  
3 [Viagra] are required at this point in time.” *Id.*

4 The FDA has not asked for any submissions regarding the Li study or regarding Viagra  
5 and melanoma generally. In February 2016, the agency instead notified Pfizer that a “Tracked  
6 Safety Issue,” or TSI, had been created for all PDE5 inhibitors (including Viagra) regarding a  
7 potential risk of skin melanomas. TSIs are created when FDA, in the course of its routine  
8 monitoring, identifies a *potential* signal of a safety issue with an FDA-approved medication. TSIs  
9 are placed into one of three categories, in decreasing order of significance—emergency, priority,  
10 and standard. *See* Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Draft Guidance, *Classifying*  
11 *Significant Postmarketing Drug Safety Issues*, at 1 (Mar. 2012); *id.* at 5 (“When the safety issue  
12 does not appear to fall clearly into either the priority or standard class, CDER will err on the side  
13 of caution and classify it as a priority issue.”). FDA has classified the TSI regarding PDE5  
14 inhibitors as “standard.”<sup>4</sup>

15 Often, it is adverse event reporting—in particular a spike in adverse event reporting—that  
16 leads to the creation of a TSI. Adverse event reports can be submitted to FDA or to a  
17 pharmaceutical company such as Pfizer by physicians, patients, family members, attorneys, and  
18 others (indeed, literally anyone can submit a report), regarding any purported undesirable  
19 experience with a particular medication. Pfizer submits to FDA any adverse event reports it  
20 receives, including personal injury lawsuits filed against the company involving one of its  
21 medications. From whatever source (including lawsuits), the reports are compiled in FDA’s

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 <sup>4</sup> As explained by the FDA, “[t]he appearance of a drug on each quarterly list does not mean that  
24 FDA has concluded that the drug has the listed risk. It also does not mean that FDA has identified  
25 a causal relationship between the drug and the listed risk.” Center for Drug Evaluation and  
26 Research, Office of Surveillance and Epidemiology, Policy and Procedures: *FDA Posting of*  
27 *Potential Signals of Serious Risks Identified by the Adverse Event Reporting System*, at 2 (Mar. 29,  
28 2011). *See also* FDA, *Potential Signals of Serious Risks/New Safety Information Identified from*  
*the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS)*, <http://tinyurl.com/z5efjly> (last visited May 4,  
2016) (FDA’s website expressly “emphasize[s]” that TSI inclusion “does not mean that FDA has  
determined that the drug has the risk.”).

1 Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS). Adverse event “reports do not provide reliable  
 2 scientific evidence of causation. Rather, they are merely compilations of occurrences, and have  
 3 been rejected as reliable scientific evidence supporting an expert opinion that *Daubert* requires.”  
 4 *Cloud v. Pfizer, Inc.*, 198 F. Supp. 2d 1118, 1133 (D. Ariz. 2001); *see Rimbart v. Eli Lilly & Co.*,  
 5 2009 WL 2208570, at \*11 (July 21, 2009) (“The lack of a control group makes it impossible to  
 6 state whether the adverse events observed were a result of Prozac, part of natural history and  
 7 fluctuations of depression, or caused by other factors.”).

8 What is notable here is that Plaintiffs themselves are largely (if not entirely) behind the  
 9 increase in adverse event reporting regarding Viagra and melanoma. A review of the FDA’s  
 10 FAERS database for the last few years confirms that, historically, reports regarding patients who  
 11 used Viagra and also were diagnosed with melanoma were sporadic, and received at a very low  
 12 rate, until approximately February 2015, when the rate increased sharply—and that increase was  
 13 due to the fact that Pfizer dutifully reported to FDA each of the lawsuits that various Plaintiffs  
 14 here began filing. When the litigation-instigated reports submitted by, or on behalf of, or  
 15 regarding, Plaintiffs are removed from the analysis, the reporting rates remain at their historical  
 16 level. At issue here, then, is not a naturally occurring increase in adverse event reporting, but one  
 17 driven by Plaintiffs and the filing of their complaints.<sup>5</sup>

### 18 **THE THRESHOLD CRITICAL ISSUE IN THIS LITIGATION**

19 The threshold critical issue in this litigation is general causation—“whether the substance  
 20 at issue had the capacity to cause the harm alleged, that is, could the substance at issue cause the  
 21 type of harm complained about.” *O’Neill v. Sherwin-Williams Co.*, 2009 WL 2997026, at \*2  
 22 (C.D. Cal. 2009); *see also In re Bextra & Celebrex Mktg. Sales Pracs. & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 524 F.  
 23 Supp. at 1175 (“general causation inquiry is whether exposure to the challenged substance ‘at the  
 24

25 <sup>5</sup> As FDA guidance notes, FAERS data “may be affected by the submission of incomplete or  
 26 duplicate reports, under-reporting, or reporting stimulated by publicity or litigation.” FDA  
 27 cautions that “these factors should be considered when interpreting a high reporting rate.” CDER,  
 28 *Guidance for Industry: Good Pharmacovigilance Practices and Pharmacoepidemiologic  
 Assessment*, at 9, 12 (Mar. 2005).

1 level of exposure alleged by the plaintiffs is capable of causing the alleged injuries”) (quoting *In*  
2 *re Hanford Nuclear Reservation Litig.*, 292 F.3d 1124, 1133 (9th Cir. 2002)). To establish general  
3 causation, then, Plaintiffs must prove—with reliable expert testimony that satisfies *Daubert*—that  
4 Viagra is capable of causing melanoma. *See, e.g., Casey v. Ohio Med. Prods.*, 877 F. Supp. 1380,  
5 1381 (N.D. Cal. 1995) (“opinion on general causation [was] not sufficiently based on scientific  
6 reliability and methodology to be admitted into evidence”); *Hall v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, 947  
7 F. Supp. 1387, 1413 (D. Or. 1996) (“expert opinion on . . . ‘general causation’ must be derived  
8 from scientifically valid methodology”).

9       The initial resolution of this threshold issue will streamline the litigation, if not dispose of  
10 it entirely. *See Norris v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, 397 F.3d 878, 881 (10th Cir. 2005) (“Plaintiff  
11 must first demonstrate general causation because without general causation, there can be no  
12 specific causation.”). As such, the Court should adopt a schedule that prioritizes discovery  
13 regarding general causation, to be followed by motions practice on that issue. The Manual for  
14 Complex Litigation (“Manual”) contemplates such “phased, sequenced, or targeted discovery” and  
15 advises that “[f]or effective discovery control, initial discovery should focus on matters—  
16 witnesses, documents, information—that appear pivotal.” Annotated Manual for Complex  
17 Litigation (4th ed. 2004) § 11.422 at 69. General causation by its nature is such a pivotal issue,  
18 and in fact the Manual expressly identifies issues worthy of being “taken up early in the litigation”  
19 as including “whether the facts and expert evidence support a finding that the products or acts in  
20 question have the capacity to cause the type of injuries alleged.” *Id.* § 22.634 at 519.

21       Other MDL courts in products liability matters have structured discovery to address  
22 general causation as a threshold issue, before the litigation reaches more advanced stages. *See,*  
23 *e.g., In Re Incretin Mimetics Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL No. 2452, No.13-md-2452-AJB (C.D. Cal.  
24 Feb. 18, 2014) (Initial Case Management Scheduling Order Regarding General Causation) (“initial  
25 discovery and document production will be limited to whether the requested information has some  
26 tendency in logic to prove or disprove whether Defendants’ incretin mimetic drugs cause  
27 pancreatic cancer”); *In re Bextra & Celebrex Mktg. Sales Practices & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL  
28

1 No. 1699, Case No. M:05-CV-01699-CRB (N.D. Cal. March 16, 2007) (Pretrial Order No. 21).  
2 The court presiding over the prior Viagra MDL entered just such an order—directing that “[t]he  
3 first phase of discovery for all cases shall be focused on the sole issue of general causation” and,  
4 with the exception of the completion of Plaintiff’s Fact Sheets, staying “[a]ll fact and/or expert  
5 discovery on issues other than general causation issues.” *In re Viagra Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL  
6 No. 1724 (D. Minn. June 30, 2006) (Scheduling Order Relating to Phase I of Discovery, at 1, 2).  
7 The court ruled that “targeted discovery and resolution of the issue of general causation serves the  
8 interest of all parties and the Court, promotes judicial efficiency, and prevents the potential waste  
9 of the parties’ and the Court’s resources.” *Id.* at 1-2.

10         Given the scientific record here, Pfizer respectfully suggests that it is in the best interests  
11 of all parties to conduct an initial phase of fact discovery limited to the issue of general causation,  
12 to be followed by expert reports and appropriate *Daubert* motions practice directed to that issue.  
13 As of the date of this submission, the parties (Pfizer’s counsel and Plaintiffs’ proposed lead  
14 counsel) have discussed this issue informally, and it is Pfizer’s understanding that Plaintiffs are  
15 agreeable in concept to such a discovery phasing. The parties plan to formally meet and confer  
16 before June 15 to determine whether they can agree on the scope of, and schedule for, an initial  
17 phase of general causation discovery to propose to the Court or, alternatively, if they are unable to  
18 agree, will so advise the Court at the June 15 conference and request that the Court decide the  
19 issue after further briefing.

20   **OTHER FACTUAL AND LEGAL ISSUES**

21         In addition to general causation, there are a host of other factual and legal issues that may  
22 warrant consideration at some point in the proceedings, including the following:

- 23             • For each Plaintiff, there are fact questions of an inherently individual nature,  
24             including those regarding the plaintiff’s personal medical history (both before and  
25             after alleged Viagra usage); family medical history; use of Viagra (including dose,  
26             duration, and frequency of use); use of other medications (prescription and  
27             nonprescription); and sun exposure;

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- Whether Plaintiffs can reliably demonstrate specific causation, *i.e.*, that their own alleged melanoma was caused by Viagra use and not other factors;
- Whether some or all of Plaintiffs’ claims are subject to dismissal, in whole or in part, for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6);
- Whether Plaintiffs’ allegations sounding in fraud satisfy the pleading requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b); and
- Whether Plaintiffs’ claims are barred under the relevant statute(s) of limitation.

**CONCLUSION**

Pfizer will be prepared to address these and all other issues identified in Pretrial Order #1 at the June 15, 2016 conference.

1 Dated: May 9, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

2

BY: /s/ John E. Joiner

3

4

Joseph G. Petrosinelli (*pro hac vice*)

5

John E. Joiner (*pro hac vice*)

6

Williams & Connolly LLP

7

725 12th Street, NW

8

Washington, DC 20005

9

202-434-5000

202-434-5029 (facsimile)

jpetrosinelli@wc.com

jjoiner@wc.com

10

Loren H. Brown (*pro hac vice*)

11

DLA Piper LLP (US)

12

1251 Avenue of the Americas

13

New York, NY 10020-1104

14

212-335-4000

212-884-8546 (facsimile)

loren.brown@dlapiper.com

15

Matthew A. Holian (Cal. Bar No. 211728)

16

DLA Piper LLP (US)

17

33 Arch Street, 26th Floor

18

Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1447

617-406-6009

617-406-6109 (facsimile)

matt.holian@dlapiper.com

19

20

Attorneys for Defendant Pfizer Inc.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, John E. Joiner, hereby certify that on this 9th day of May, 2016, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Court using the CM/ECF system.

BY: /s/ John E. Joiner

# **Exhibit 1**

**EXHIBIT 1 TO DEFENDANT PFIZER'S POSITION STATEMENT  
FOR INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

**I. CASES FILED IN OR TRANSFERRED TO THIS COURT.**

As of May 9, 2016, the following cases have been filed in this Court or transferred here pursuant to an Order of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation:

| <b>Case Name</b>  | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| Ron Rosenwein, Individually and on behalf of the Estate of Lloyd Rosenwein v. Pfizer, Inc.      | 3:16-cv-1896       | N.D. Cal.            |
| Charles Cusimano and Cindy Cusimano v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-1898       | N.D. Cal.            |
| Larry LeBlanc and Diane LeBlanc v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-1897       | N.D. Cal.            |
| Joe Holley v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-1899       | N.D. Cal.            |
| Julienne J. Wood, as Trustee for the next of kin of John W. Wood, Jr., Deceased v. Pfizer, Inc. | 3:16-cv-01874      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Michael Gardiner v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-1900       | N.D. Cal.            |
| Robert Eubanks and Teresa R. Eubanks v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-02145      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Faircloth, Roy Roger v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-02223      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Harold Troy v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-02214      | N.D. Cal.            |
| James A. Tune v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-02220      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Claude Linley v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-02121      | N.D. Cal.            |

| <b>Case Name</b>   | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| Willard Hoffman v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-02020      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Edwin Kelly v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-02005      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Sue Matthews, individually and on behalf of the heirs and estate of Robin Matthews, deceased, v. Pfizer, Inc., a Delaware corporation                              | 3:16-cv-02119      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Dennis Andrews v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:15-cv-04884      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Amador Herrera v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:15-cv-04888      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Lyle Toole v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:15-cv-04989      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Autumn Allen, Personal Representative of the Estate of Wilfred Phillips v. Pfizer, Inc., a corporation of the State of Delaware doing business in Maine            | 3:16-cv-02143      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Lance Warren v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 1:15-cv-5206       | N.D. Cal.            |
| Edmond Nicholas v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:15-cv-5251       | N.D. Cal.            |
| Henri Geier v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-02074      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Edward D. Corboy, Jr. v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 1:16-00247         | N.D. Cal.            |
| Danielle Schoenrock, individually and as Special Administrator on behalf of the heirs and estate of Curtis Stern, deceased v. Pfizer, Inc., a Delaware corporation | 3:16-cv-02144      | N.D. Cal.            |

| <b>Case Name</b>                    | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Martin Mott v. Pfizer, Inc.         | 3:16-cv-02177      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Terrence Hayes v. Pfizer, Inc.      | 3:16-cv-01093      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Michael Smith v. Pfizer, Inc.       | 3:16-cv-01183      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Thomas Brownfield v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01182      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Joao Delgado v. Pfizer, Inc.        | 3:16-cv-01464      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Michael W. Giovando v. Pfizer, Inc. | 3:16-cv-01607      | N.D. Cal.            |
| James L. Gutherie v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01601      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Gerald K. Brown v. Pfizer, Inc.     | 3:16-cv-01594      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Robert R. Lunato v. Pfizer, Inc.    | 3:16-cv-01646      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Richard P. Carter v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 4:16-cv-01645      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Michael S. Riggs v. Pfizer, Inc.    | 4:16-cv-01647      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Paul J. Riley v. Pfizer, Inc.       | 4:16-cv-01654      | N.D. Cal.            |
| John A. Wendling v. Pfizer, Inc.    | 3:16-cv-01652      | N.D. Cal.            |

| <b>Case Name</b>                    | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Vernon D. Ware, Jr. v. Pfizer, Inc. | 3:16-cv-01649      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Michael L. Piersol v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 4:16-cv-01653      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Larry Maddux, Sr. v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01675      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Joseph Barnes, III v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-01674      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Stephen Crossland v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01673      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Ronald Willoughby v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01681      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Paul O'Malley v. Pfizer, Inc.       | 3:16-cv-01682      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Lennart Anderson v. Pfizer, Inc.    | 4:16-cv-01683      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Charles Christensen v. Pfizer, Inc. | 3:16-cv-01684      | N.D. Cal.            |
| John Reinwald v. Pfizer, Inc.       | 3:16-cv-01685      | N.D. Cal.            |
| James Mulvaney v. Pfizer, Inc.      | 4:16-cv-01713      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Kenneth Jansen, Jr. v. Pfizer, Inc. | 3:16-cv-01715      | N.D. Cal.            |
| David B. Anderson v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 4:16-cv-01719      | N.D. Cal.            |

| <b>Case Name</b>                      | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Lyle Maxey v. Pfizer, Inc.            | 3:16-cv-01716      | N.D. Cal.            |
| John Switalski v. Pfizer, Inc.        | 3:16-cv-01718      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Robert A. Tucker v. Pfizer, Inc       | 3:16-cv-01734      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Gregory Grant v. Pfizer, Inc.         | 3:16-cv-01731      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Russell L. Kight v. Pfizer, Inc.      | 3:16-cv-01733      | N.D. Cal.            |
| James W. Reeder v. Pfizer, Inc.       | 4:16-cv-01742      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Robert Irving v. Pfizer, Inc.         | 3:16-cv-01753      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Wilbert J. Couvillion v. Pfizer, Inc. | 3:16-cv-01746      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Gregory P. Urbanski v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01750      | N.D. Cal.            |
| John W. Smith, Jr. v. Pfizer, Inc.    | 3:16-cv-01749      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Carl B. Hedwall v. Pfizer, Inc.       | 3:16-cv-01759      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Pierce P. Ryan v. Pfizer, Inc.        | 3:16-cv-01757      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Joseph S. Popovec v. Pfizer Inc.      | 4:16-cv-01758      | N.D. Cal.            |

| <b>Case Name</b>  | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| DelRay R. Stephens v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-01760      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Thomas J. Brown v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01751      | N.D. Cal.            |
| John J. Schultz v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01761      | N.D. Cal.            |
| George Ripps v. Pfizer Inc.   | 4:16-cv-01748      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Randy A. Jumper v. Pfizer Inc.  | 3:16-cv-01767      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Norma S. Chaney, Individually and as Personal Representative of the Estate of Mickey Chaney, Deceased v. Pfizer Inc.    | 3:16-cv-01766      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Peter M. Cox v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-01769      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Mark D. Callahan v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-01770      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Harris A. Branaman v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-01771      | N.D. Cal.            |
| Pamela W. Coots, Individually and as Administrator of the Estate of Kenneth Coots, Deceased v. Pfizer Inc.              | 3:16-cv-02178      | N.D. Cal.            |
| James V. Patrick v. Pfizer Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01782      | N.D. Cal             |
| Tony D. Brown v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01780      | N.D. Cal             |
| Sandra K. Coyle, Individually and as Personal Representative of the Estate of Lester H. Coyle, deceased. v. Pfizer Inc. | 3:16-cv-01783      | N.D. Cal             |



| <b>Case Name</b>                     | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| John Henry v. Pfizer, Inc.           | 3:16-cv-01779      | N.D. Cal             |
| Raymond L. Rose v. Pfizer Inc.       | 3:16-cv-01785      | N.D. Cal             |
| Timothy J. Meline v. Pfizer Inc.     | 3:16-cv-01791      | N.D. Cal             |
| Bruce Garber v. Pfizer Inc.          | 3:16-cv-01795      | N.D. Cal             |
| James T. Black v. Pfizer Inc.        | 3:16-cv-01796      | N.D. Cal             |
| John C. Wallace v. Pfizer Inc.       | 3:16-cv-01792      | N.D. Cal             |
| Edward Callaci v. Pfizer, Inc.       | 3:16-cv-01793      | N.D. Cal             |
| John Soltesz v. Pfizer, Inc.         | 3:16-cv-01798      | N.D. Cal             |
| Jimmie A. Christensen v. Pfizer Inc. | 3:16-cv-01801      | N.D. Cal             |
| Richard L. DeSalvo v. Pfizer Inc.    | 3:16-cv-01797      | N.D. Cal             |
| Roy C. Lusch v. Pfizer Inc.          | 3:16-cv-01802      | N.D. Cal             |
| James M. Porter v. Pfizer Inc.       | 3:16-cv-01800      | N.D. Cal             |
| Eugene C. Hendrickson v. Pfizer Inc. | 3:16-cv-01799      | N.D. Cal             |

| <b>Case Name</b>                 | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Barry Diederich v. Pfizer Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01804      | N.D. Cal             |
| Allen L. Lechtman v. Pfizer Inc. | 3:16-cv-01805      | N.D. Cal             |
| Chester Jones v. Pfizer Inc.     | 3:16-cv-01809      | N.D. Cal             |
| Thomas Riederer v. Pfizer Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01806      | N.D. Cal             |
| Francis Hughes v. Pfizer Inc.    | 3:16-cv-01808      | N.D. Cal             |
| James Davenport v. Pfizer Inc.   | 4:16-cv-1807       | N.D. Cal             |
| Brian M. White v. Pfizer, Inc.   | 3:16-cv-01972      | N.D. Cal             |
| Larry Shultz v. Pfizer, Inc.     | 3:16-cv-01988      | N.D. Cal             |
| Dorn L. Schmidt v. Pfizer, Inc.  | 3:16-cv-01999      | N.D. Cal             |
| Seamus O. Calkins v. Pfizer inc. | 3:16-cv-02316      | N.D. Cal.            |
| David Cohen v. Pfizer, Inc.      | 3:16-cv-01778      | N.D. Cal             |
| Dan Darr v. Pfizer, Inc.         | 3:16-cv-01781      | N.D. Cal             |

| <b>Case Name</b>               | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Barry Milligan v. Pfizer, Inc. | 3:16-cv-02067      | N.D. Cal.            |

**II. CASES FILED IN FEDERAL COURT BUT NOT YET TRANSFERRED TO THIS COURT.**

As of May 9, 2016, the following cases have been filed in federal courts in other jurisdictions, but have not yet been transferred here pursuant to an Order of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. Pfizer has filed Notices of Potential Tag-Along Actions with the JPML regarding these cases.

| <b>Case Name</b>                    | <b>Case Number</b> | <b>Pending Court</b> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Kenneth L. McDaniel v. Pfizer, Inc. | 2:16-cv-00553      | N.D. Ala.            |
| Scott Winfrey v. Pfizer Inc.        | 1:16-cv-01112      | N.D. Ga.             |
| Ronnie L. Mounts v. Pfizer, Inc.    | 2:16-cv-03217      | S.D. W.Va.           |
| Thomas Watts v. Pfizer Inc.         | 1:16-cv-01124      | N.D. Ga.             |
| Jody Fyfe v. Pfizer, Inc.           | 1:16-cv-02985      | S.D.N.Y.             |

**III. CASES FILED IN FEDERAL COURT BUT NOT YET TRANSFERRED TO THIS COURT.**

As of May 9, 2016, the following cases are pending in state court.

| Case Name                                | Case Number     | Pending Court                   |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Thomas P. Baggott v. Pfizer, Inc.        | C20153927       | Ariz. Super. Ct.; Pima Cnty.    |
| Paul Parker v. Pfizer, Inc. <sup>1</sup> | 1522-CC00318-01 | Circuit Court, City of St Louis |

---

<sup>1</sup> There are 89 total plaintiffs in this case.