

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

Theresa Wysocki,	:	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND
	:	FOR JURY TRIAL
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Case No. _____
SANOFI S.A.,	:	
AVENTIS PHARMA S.A.,	:	
SANOFI US SERVICES INC., and	:	
SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, Theresa Wysocki (“Plaintiff”), residing in Palatine within the State of Illinois, by and through her undersigned counsel, hereby submits the following Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial against Defendants Sanofi S.A., Aventis Pharma S.A., Sanofi U.S. Services Inc., and Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC, (“Defendants”) and alleges the following upon personal knowledge and belief, and investigation of counsel:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This case involves the prescription, chemotherapy drug Taxotere, with the active ingredient docetaxel, (“Taxotere”) which is manufactured, sold, distributed and promoted by Defendants for the treatment of various types of cancer, including breast cancer.

2. Taxotere can cause serious medical problems, including permanent alopecia, or hair loss. Permanent alopecia is a disfiguring condition, especially for women.

3. Defendants engaged in aggressive marketing and advertising campaigns for Taxotere that misled the consumers of Taxotere and the medical community as to the drug’s safety and efficacy. As a result, consumers have suffered injuries including permanent alopecia.

**PARTIES**

4. Plaintiff is a natural person and a citizen of the State of Illinois and used the prescription Taxotere as prescribed and directed by her physician.

5. Defendant Sanofi S.A. is a corporation or Société Anonyme organized and existing under the laws of France, having its principal place of business at 54 rue La Boétie, 75008 Paris, France. Defendants Aventis Pharma S.A., Sanofi U.S. Services Inc., and Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC are wholly-owned subsidiaries of Defendant Sanofi S.A., which owns 100% of the financial and voting member interest in these Defendants.

6. Defendant Aventis Pharma S.A. is a corporation or Société Anonyme organized and existing under the laws of France, having its principal place of business at 20 avenue Raymond Aron, 92160, Antony, France.

7. Defendant Sanofi U.S. Services Inc. is a Delaware corporation, which has its principal place of business at 55 Corporate Drive, Bridgewater, New Jersey 08807. Defendant Sanofi U.S. Services Inc. was formerly known as Sanofi-Aventis U.S. Inc.

8. Defendant Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC is a Delaware limited liability company, which has its principal place of business at 55 Corporate Drive, Bridgewater, New Jersey 08807. Defendant Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC does not have any members that are citizens, residents, or domiciles of the State of Illinois.

9. By way of background, in 1999 French company Rhône-Poulenc Rorer S.A., and its U.S. subsidiary, merged with the German corporation Hoechst Marion Roussel, and its U.S. subsidiary, to form Aventis Pharma S.A. and Aventis Pharmaceuticals in the U.S. In 2004, Sanofi-Synthelabo merged with Aventis to form Sanofi-Aventis in France and the United States. In 2011, Sanofi-Aventis S.A. changed its name to Sanofi S.A.

10. At all relevant times, Defendants acted in conjunction with other affiliated, related, jointly owned and/or controlled entities or subsidiaries, including each other, in the development, marketing, production, labeling, promoting, packaging, advertising, and/or selling of Taxotere. Defendants acted jointly and/or as each other's agents, within the course and scope of the agency, with respect to the conduct alleged in this Complaint, such that any individuality and separateness between Defendants had ceased and these Defendants became the alter-ego of one another and are jointly-liable for their misconduct and wrongful acts as alleged herein.

11. As the corporate parent of these wholly-owned subsidiaries, Sanofi S.A. directs and controls the operations of Aventis Pharma S.A., Sanofi U.S. Services Inc., and Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC. Accordingly, there exists, and at all relevant times herein existed, a unity of interest, ownership, and conduct between Sanofi S.A., Aventis Pharma S.A., Sanofi U.S. Services Inc., and Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC, with regard to the manufacture, distribution, development, testing, and labeling of the Taxotere and other related conduct, such that any individuality and separateness between Defendants had ceased and these Defendants became the alter-ego of one another.

12. Sanofi S.A., through its various affiliates, wholly-owned subsidiaries, and predecessor companies, including Sanofi U.S. Services Inc., Aventis Pharma S.A. and Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC, has been directly involved in and has overseen the invention, development, clinical trials, and strategy for marketing, distributing, selling, and promoting Taxotere throughout the United States and the world.

13. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, engaged in interstate commerce when they advertised, promoted, supplied, and sold to distributors and retailers for resale to physicians, hospitals, medical practitioners, and the general public the pharmaceutical product, Taxotere, in this judicial district.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants and this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because there is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and Defendants and because the amount in controversy between Plaintiff and Defendants exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and cost, and because, among other reasons, Defendants have significant contacts with this district by virtue of doing business within this judicial district.

15. Venue is proper within this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) because Plaintiff is a citizen and resides in this district and because a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred within this district.

**DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATORY APPROVAL OF TAXOTERE**

16. Chemotherapy is the use of anti-cancer drugs to treat cancer. Chemotherapy can stop the growth of a tumor, shrink the size of a tumor, kill cancer cells that have spread to other parts of the body, and decrease the chance that cancer will recur.

17. Among the family of chemotherapy drugs are Taxanes. Taxanes block cell growth by interfering with microtubules which are cellular structures that help move chromosomes during mitosis. Taxane agents include Taxotere and Taxol (paclitaxel).

18. Taxol was developed, manufactured, and distributed by Bristol-Myers Squibb. Taxol first received U.S. Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) approval in December 1992.

19. Rhône-Poulenc Rorer S.A., a predecessor of Aventis Pharma S.A., received the initial patent for the formulation and computation of Taxotere, and initially sought FDA approval for Taxotere through its U.S. representative in 1994. The FDA unanimously recommended rejecting approval of Taxotere, because Taxotere was more toxic than Taxol, and more studies of docetaxel’s side effects were needed.

20. The FDA approved Taxotere on May 14, 1996 for treating locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer after when prior chemotherapy treatments failed.

21. After this initial FDA approval, the FDA granted approval for additional indications for Taxotere. In doing so, Defendants claimed superiority over other chemotherapy products approved for breast cancer treatment.

### **MISLEADING MARKETING OF TAXOTERE IN THE UNITED STATES**

22. In marketing Taxotere, Defendants continually have made false claims of superior efficacy and omitted safety information.

#### ***False Claims of Superior Efficacy***

23. On or about November 12, 2003, the FDA sent a warning letter to Aventis Pharmaceuticals North America objecting to the dissemination of three violative direct-to-consumer print advertisements for Taxotere.

24. The FDA found the advertisements misleading because “they suggest that Taxotere is more effective than has been demonstrated by substantial evidence or substantial clinical experience.”

25. In its November correspondence, the FDA also noted that it had previously requested that a “Dear Doctor” letter be destroyed because it made misleading, effectiveness claims overstating the drug’s survival benefits. The FDA was “particularly concerned” about the “Dear Doctor” letter.

26. In 2008, a study, *Weekly Paclitaxel in the Adjuvant Treatment of Breast Cancer*, was published in the New England Journal of Medicine. The study compared the efficacy of docetaxel (Taxotere) and paclitaxel (Taxol) in the adjuvant treatment of breast cancer.

27. The study concluded that weekly paclitaxel with doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide were more effective than docetaxel in improving disease-free and overall survival in women with breast cancer.

28. Following this study, FDA issued another letter on April 16, 2009, stating that promotional material for Taxotere again had unsubstantiated superiority claims and overstatements of efficacy.

29. Specifically, the FDA found that the promotional material “misleadingly suggest that Taxotere is superior to paclitaxel in the treatment of patients with locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer after failure of prior chemotherapy, and overstate the efficacy of Taxotere. FDA is unaware of substantial evidence to support these claims.”

30. A Qui Tam lawsuit was also filed against Sanofi-Aventis U.S. Inc. and affiliated entities in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania by a former employee. In the lawsuit, Sanofi-Aventis, its predecessors and its affiliates are accused of engaging in a fraudulent marketing scheme, paying kickbacks, and providing other unlawful incentives to entice doctors to use Taxotere. *See U.S. ex rel. Gohil v. Sanofi-Aventis U.S. Inc., Civil Action No. 02-2964 (E.D. Pa. 2015).*

### ***Omitted Safety Information***

31. Although alopecia can be a common side effect related to chemotherapy drugs, permanent alopecia is not. Defendants, through their publications and marketing materials, misled physicians, health care professions and the public, including Plaintiff, in the United States regarding the risk of permanent alopecia.

32. In the November 2003 FDA letter referenced above, the FDA states that the advertisements for Taxotere omit and minimize the risk information. According to the FDA’s

letter, the advertisements do not discuss common side effects associated with Taxotere, including hair loss.

33. On or about May 28, 2007, Defendants issued a press release touting the efficacy of Taxotere based upon a clinical study, GEICAM 9805.

34. However, Defendants failed to inform the public and health care providers that in the GEICAM 9805 study, alopecia persisted into the follow-up period (10 years and 5 months was the median follow-up time) and was observed to be ongoing in 9.2% of the patients taking Taxotere.

35. Despite Defendants' knowledge of the relevant findings from the GEICAM 9805 study, as well as reports of patients who had taken Taxotere and suffered from permanent alopecia, Defendants failed to provide accurate information and proper warnings to physicians, healthcare providers, and patients in the United States, including Plaintiff. Defendants failed to inform physicians, healthcare providers, and the public that patients who take Taxotere are at a significantly increased risk of suffering from permanent alopecia.

36. While Defendants did advise physicians, patients, and regulatory agencies in other countries, including Canada and the European Union, that Taxotere causes an increased risk of permanent alopecia, such warnings do not appear in information published by Defendants in the United States prior to December 2015.

#### **PLAINTIFF'S TREATMENT WITH TAXOTERE AND RESULTING INJURIES**

37. On or around August 19, 2014, Plaintiff underwent a lumpectomy.

38. Following the lumpectomy, Plaintiff met her oncologist to discuss chemotherapy treatment.

39. Plaintiff subsequently underwent chemotherapy, which included Taxotere, from approximately September 2014 to January 2015. Before or during Plaintiff's treatment with Taxotere, neither Plaintiff nor her healthcare providers were aware of or informed by Defendants that permanent alopecia can occur following treatment with Taxotere.

40. After undergoing chemotherapy with Taxotere, Plaintiff suffered from permanent alopecia as a result of receiving chemotherapy.

41. Women who experience permanent alopecia suffer great mental anguish as well as economic damages, including but not limited to loss of work or inability to work due to significant psychological damage.

42. There were already products on the market at least as effective as Taxotere that did not subject users to the same risk of permanent alopecia, but users of Taxotere were not presented with the opportunity to make an informed choice as to whether the benefits of Taxotere were worth its associated risks.

43. Defendants engaged in a pattern of deception by overstating the benefits of Taxotere as compared to other alternatives while simultaneously failing to warn of the risk of permanent alopecia.

44. As a direct result of Defendants' wrongful and deceptive acts, users of Taxotere, including Plaintiff, were exposed to the risk of permanent alopecia without any warning and without the claimed increased efficacy.

45. As a direct result of Defendants' failure to warn patients of the risk of permanent alopecia in the United States, thousands of women, including Plaintiff, as well as their health care providers, were deprived of the opportunity to make an informed decision as to whether the benefits of using Taxotere over other comparable products was justified.



46. Plaintiff files this lawsuit within two (2) years of first suspecting that the Taxotere was the cause of appreciable harm sustained by Plaintiff, within two (2) years of first suspecting or having reason to suspect any wrongdoing, and within the applicable limitations period of first discovering their injuries and the wrongful conduct that cause such injuries. Plaintiff could not by the exercise of reasonable diligence have discovered any wrongdoing, nor could Plaintiff have discovered the causes of her injuries at an earlier time because some injuries occurred without initial perceptible trauma or harm, and when Plaintiff's injuries were discovered, their causes were not immediately known.

47. Until recently, Plaintiff did not suspect, nor did she have reason to suspect, that wrongdoing had caused her injuries. In addition, Plaintiff did not have reason to suspect the tortious nature of the conduct causing the injuries, until recently and has filed the herein action well within the applicable statute of limitations period. Plaintiff had no knowledge of the wrongful conduct of the Defendants as set forth herein, nor did Plaintiff have access to the information regarding other injuries and complaints in the possession of Defendants. Additionally, Plaintiff was prevented from discovering this information sooner because Defendant misrepresented and continue to misrepresent to the public, to the medical profession and to Plaintiff that Taxotere is safe and free from serious side effects. Defendants have fraudulently concealed facts and information that could have led Plaintiff to an earlier discovery of potential causes of action.

48. As alleged herein, as a direct, proximate, and legal result of Defendants' negligence and wrongful conduct, and the unreasonably dangerous and defective characteristics of the drug, Plaintiff suffered severe and permanent physical and emotional injuries, including, but not limited to permanent alopecia. Plaintiff has endured pain and suffering, has suffered economic loss, and

will continue to incur such losses in the future. Plaintiff seeks actual and punitive damages from Defendants as alleged herein.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**STRICT LIABILITY – FAILURE TO WARN**

49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein each of the allegations heretofore set forth in this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

50. Taxotere manufactured and/or supplied by Defendants was defective due to inadequate warnings or instructions because Defendants knew or should have known that the product created significant risks of serious bodily harm to consumers, and they failed to adequately warn consumers and/or their health care providers of such risks. The Taxotere manufactured and/or supplied by Defendants was defective due to inadequate post-marketing warnings or instructions because, after Defendants knew or should have known of the risk of serious bodily harm from the use of Taxotere, Defendants failed to provide an adequate warning to consumers and/or their health care providers of the product, knowing the product could cause serious injury.

51. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiff's reasonably anticipated use of Taxotere as manufactured, designed, sold, supplied, marketed and/or introduced into the stream of commerce by Defendants, Plaintiff suffered serious injury, harm, damages, economic and non-economic loss and will continue to suffer such harm, damages and losses in the future.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**NEGLIGENCE**

52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth in this Complaint as though set forth herein.

53. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants had a duty to properly manufacture, design, formulate, compound, test, produce, process, assemble, inspect, research, distribute,

market, label, package, distribute, prepare for use, sell, prescribe and adequately warn of the risks and dangers of Taxotere.

54. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants negligently and carelessly manufactured, designed, formulated, distributed, compounded, produced, processed, assembled, inspected, distributed, marketed, labeled, packaged, prepared for use and sold Taxotere and failed to adequately test and warn of the risks and dangers of Taxotere.

55. Despite the fact that Defendants knew or should have known that Taxotere caused unreasonable, dangerous side effects, Defendants continued to market Taxotere to consumers including Plaintiff, when there were safer alternative chemotherapy treatments available, which were just as effective.

56. Defendants knew or should have known that consumers such as Plaintiff would foreseeably suffer injury as a result of Defendants' failure to exercise ordinary care as described above.

57. Defendants' negligence was a proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries, harm and economic loss which Plaintiff suffered, and will continue to suffer, as described and prayed for herein.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**FRAUD**

58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference here each of the allegations set forth in this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

59. Defendants, from the time they first tested, studied, researched, evaluated, endorsed, manufactured, marketed and distributed Taxotere, and up to the present, willfully deceived Plaintiff by concealing from them, Plaintiff's physicians and the general public, the true facts concerning Taxotere, which the Defendants had a duty to disclose.

60. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants conducted a sales and marketing campaign to promote the sale of Taxotere and willfully deceive Plaintiff, Plaintiff's physicians and the general public as to the benefits, health risks and consequences of using Taxotere. Defendants knew of the foregoing, that using Taxotere is hazardous to health, that Taxotere is not more effective than safer alternatives available, and that Taxotere has a propensity to cause serious injuries to its users, including but not limited to the injuries Plaintiff suffered.

61. Defendants concealed and suppressed the true facts concerning Taxotere with the intent to defraud Plaintiff, in that Defendants knew that Plaintiff's physicians would not prescribe Taxotere, and Plaintiff would not have used Taxotere, if they were aware of the true facts concerning its dangers.

62. As a result of Defendants' fraudulent and deceitful conduct, Plaintiff suffered injuries and damages as alleged herein.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION –**  
**PUNITIVE DAMAGES**

63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth in this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

64. The acts, conduct, and omissions of Defendants, as alleged throughout this Complaint, were willful and malicious. Defendants committed these acts with a conscious disregard for the rights of Plaintiff and other Taxotere users and for the primary purpose of increasing Defendants' profits from the sale and distribution of Taxotere. Defendants' outrageous and unconscionable conduct warrants an award of exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

65. Prior to the manufacturing, sale, and distribution of Taxotere, Defendants knew that said medication was in a defective condition as previously described herein and knew that those

who were prescribed the medication would experience and did experience severe physical, mental, and emotional injuries. Further, Defendants, through their officers, directors, managers, and agents, knew that the medication presented a substantial and unreasonable risk of harm to the public, including Plaintiff and as such, Defendants unreasonably subjected consumers of said drugs to risk of serious and permanent injury from using Taxotere.

66. Despite their knowledge, Defendants, acting through their officers, directors and managing agents for the purpose of enhancing Defendants' profits, knowingly and deliberately failed to remedy the known defects in Taxotere and failed to warn the public, including Plaintiff, of the extreme risk of injury occasioned by said defects inherent in Taxotere. Defendants and their agents, officers, and directors intentionally proceeded with the manufacturing, sale, and distribution and marketing of Taxotere knowing these actions would expose persons to serious danger in order to advance Defendants' pecuniary interest and monetary profits.

67. Defendants' conduct was despicable and so contemptible that it would be looked down upon and despised by ordinary decent people, and was carried on by Defendants with willful and conscious disregard for the safety of Plaintiff, entitling Plaintiff to exemplary damages.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- A. For general damages in a sum in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court;
- B. Medical expenses, past and future, according to proof at the time of trial;
- C. For past and future mental and emotional distress, according to proof;
- D. For punitive or exemplary damages according to proof;
- E. For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law;

- F. Restitution, disgorgement of profits, and other equitable relief;
- G. For attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs of this action; and
- H. For such further relief as this Court deems necessary, just, and proper.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all counts and as to all issues.

Dated: July 7, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Peter J. Flowers  
Peter J. Flowers, Esq.  
Myers & Flowers, LLC  
225 W. Wacker Dr., Suite 1515  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312-214-1017

Timothy J. Becker, Esq. (MN #256663)  
Michael K. Johnson (MN Bar # 258696)  
Peter C. Snowdon (MN Bar # 389642)  
Johnson Becker, PLLC  
33 South 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 4530  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: 612-436-1800  
Fax: 612-436-1801  
Email: tbecker@johnsonbecker.com  
mjohnson@johnsonbecker.com  
psnowdon@johnsonbecker.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

JS 44 (Rev. 3/13)

**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 docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

**I. (a) PLAINTIFFS**  
 Theresa Wysocki

**(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff** Cook  
 (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

**(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)**  
 Peter J. Flowers, Esq.; Myers & Flowers, LLC, 225 W. Wacker Dr., Suite 1515, Chicago, Illinois 60606; Telephone: 312-214-1017

**DEFENDANTS**  
 SANOFI S.A.; AVENTIS PHARMA S.A.; SANOFI US SERVICES INC.; SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant [France]  
 (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

**II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)**

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 U.S. Government Defendant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

**III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)**

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

**IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)**

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability <b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other <b>LABOR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) <b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
<b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<b>PRISONER PETITIONS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <b>Habeas Corpus:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	<b>IMMIGRATION</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions		

**V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)**

1 Original Proceeding     2 Removed from State Court     3 Remanded from Appellate Court     4 Reinstated or Reopened     5 Transferred from Another District (specify)     6 Multidistrict Litigation

**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Enter U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause.)**  
 28 U.S.C. § 1332, Diversity (Pharmaceutical Product Liability)

**VII. Previous Bankruptcy Matters (For nature of suit 422 and 423, enter the case number and judge for any associated bankruptcy matter previously adjudicated by a judge of this Court. Use a separate attachment if necessary.)**

**VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:**  CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.    DEMAND \$ \_\_\_\_\_    CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND:  Yes  No

**IX. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions):** JUDGE John Darrah, Virginia Kendall, John Lee, John Tharp Jr. DOCKET NUMBER 16-cv-03038, 16-cv-04028, 16-cv-05851, 16-cv-06754

**X. This case (check one box)**  Is not a refiling of a previously dismissed action     is a refiling of case number \_\_\_\_\_ previously dismissed by Judge \_\_\_\_\_

DATE 07/07/2016 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD s/ Peter J. Flowers

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

## Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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 docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

**I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

**II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

**III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

**IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.

**V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

**VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

**VII. Previous Bankruptcy Matters** For nature of suit 422 and 423 enter the case number and judge for any associated bankruptcy matter previously adjudicated by a judge of this court. Use a separate attachment if necessary.

**VIII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

**IX. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

**X. Refiling Information.** Place an "X" in one of the two boxes indicating if the case is or is not a refiling of a previously dismissed action. If it is a refiling of a previously dismissed action, insert the case number and judge.

**Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.