

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
on  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE  
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2804

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

**CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO –3)**

On December 5, 2017, the Panel transferred 62 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See* F.Supp.3d (J.P.M.L. 2017). Since that time, 124 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Northern District of Ohio. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Dan A. Polster.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Northern District of Ohio and assigned to Judge Polster.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Northern District of Ohio for the reasons stated in the order of December 5, 2017, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Dan A. Polster.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

Inasmuch as no objection is pending at this time, the stay is lifted.
Jan 10, 2018
CLERK'S OFFICE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

FOR THE PANEL:



Jeffery N. Lüthi  
Clerk of the Panel

**IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE  
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2804

**SCHEDULE CTO-3 – TAG-ALONG ACTIONS**

<u>DIST</u>	<u>DIV.</u>	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	<u>CASE CAPTION</u>
ALABAMA MIDDLE			
ALM	1	17-00838	Houston County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al
ALM	2	17-00836	City of Greenville, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al
ALM	2	17-00840	City of Opp, Alabama v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
ALABAMA NORTHERN			
ALN	3	17-02086	The Town of Cherokee Alabama et al v. Purdue Pharma LP et al
FLORIDA SOUTHERN			
FLS	9	17-81384	City of Delray Beach v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al
GEORGIA NORTHERN			
GAN	4	<del>17-04757</del>	<del>The County of Fulton v. Purdue Pharma, LP et al</del> <b>Opposed 1/4/18</b>
ILLINOIS CENTRAL			
ILC	3	17-03293	People of the State of Illinois et al v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al
ILLINOIS SOUTHERN			
ILS	3	17-01338	People of the State of Illinois et al v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
ILS	3	17-01340	People of the State of Illinois et al v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
ILS	3	17-01342	People of the State of Illinois et al v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
INDIANA SOUTHERN			
INS	1	17-04591	CITY OF NEW CASTLE v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P. et al

## KANSAS

KS	6	17-01313	Sedgwick County Board of Commissioners v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
----	---	----------	--

## KENTUCKY EASTERN

KYE	0	17-00130	Rowan County Fiscal Court v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
-----	---	----------	---

## KENTUCKY WESTERN

KYW	1	17-00196	The Fiscal Court of Allen County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al
KYW	3	17-00727	The Fiscal Court of Bullitt County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al
KYW	4	17-00157	The Fiscal Court of Hopkins County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al

## LOUISIANA MIDDLE

<del>LAM</del>	<del>3</del>	<del>17-01766</del>	<del>Louisiana Health Service &amp; Indemnity Company d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana et al v. Purdue Pharma, LP et al</del> <b>Opposed 1/10/18</b>
----------------	--------------	---------------------	---

## MASSACHUSETTS

MA	3	17-30175	City of Greenfield, v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
----	---	----------	---

## MISSISSIPPI NORTHERN

MSN	4	17-00189	Sunflower County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al
MSN	4	17-00190	Humphreys County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al
MSN	4	17-00191	Washington County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al

## MISSISSIPPI SOUTHERN

MSS	2	17-00199	Lawrence County, Mississippi v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
MSS	2	17-00200	Jefferson Davis County, Mississippi v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al
MSS	3	17-01012	Rush Health Systems, Inc. v. McKesson Corporation et al
MSS	5	17-00150	Claiborne County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al

## MISSOURI WESTERN

MOW	5	17-06141	
-----	---	----------	--

Buchanan County, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen  
Drug Corporation et al

## MONTANA

MT 4 17-00130 County of Cascade v. Purdue Pharma et al

## NEW JERSEY

~~NJ 2 17-13433 CITY OF PATERSON v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P. et al~~  
Opposed 1/10/18

## NORTH CAROLINA EASTERN

NCE 7 17-00241 New Hanover County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al

## NORTH CAROLINA MIDDLE

NCM 1 17-01085 YADKIN COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA v.  
AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG CORPORATION et al

NCM 1 17-01114 ROCKINGHAM COUNTY v.  
AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG CORPORATION et al

## OHIO SOUTHERN

OHS 2 17-01064 Darke County Board of County Commissioners v.  
Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al

OHS 2 17-01097 Logan County Board of County Commissioners v.  
Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al

OHS 2 17-01102 The City of Columbus v. PURDUE PHARMA L.P. et al

OHS 2 17-01105 Coshocton County Board of County Commissioners v.  
Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al

## OREGON

Opposed 1/10/18 ~~OR 3 17-02010 County of Multnomah v. Purdue Pharma, LP et al~~

## PUERTO RICO

PR 3 17-02364 Municipality of Guayanilla v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al

PR 3 17-02371 Municipality of Loiza, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al

## TENNESSEE MIDDLE

TNM 2 17-00078 Smith County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al

## TEXAS EASTERN

TXE 4 17-00845 County Of Hopkins v. Endo Health Solutions Inc. et al

TEXAS SOUTHERN

TXS            4            17-03756            County of Montgomery v Purdue Pharma LP