



deadline. (Dkt. No. 1494). However, none of these Plaintiffs provided the required medical authorizations forms with the PFSs and all have material deficiencies. The other six (6) Plaintiffs have not produced a PFS or responded to Pfizer's motion.

#### **A. Legal Standard**

A defendant may move to dismiss any claim against it if the plaintiff fails to prosecute, fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or fails to comply with a Court order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The Court may also dismiss an action for failure to obey a discovery order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2). In determining whether dismissal is appropriate, the Court should consider "(i) the degree of personal responsibility of the plaintiff; (ii) the amount of prejudice caused the defendant; (iii) the existence of a history of deliberately proceeding in a dilatory fashion, and (iv) the existence of a sanction less drastic than dismissal." *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989). However, these four factors "are not a rigid four-prong test," and "the propriety of a dismissal . . . depends on the particular circumstances of the case." *Ballard*, 882 F.2d at 95.

Furthermore, "[r]igid application of these factors is unnecessary if the district court provided an 'explicit and clear' warning that the failure to comply with the order would result in dismissal of the case." *Bailey v. Edwards*, 573 F. App'x 268, 269 (4th Cir. 2014); *see also Coles v. Northcutt*, 574 F. App'x 268 (4th Cir. 2014) ("[G]enerally, a district court does not abuse its discretion in dismissing an action when a party fails to comply with a reasonable court order after being warned of the consequences of neglecting the court's direction.").

Courts are given broad discretion in managing an MDL docket with thousands of cases. *See, e.g., In re Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 496 F.3d 863, 867 (8th Cir. 2007). Because MDLs were created by Congress to encourage efficiency, "MDL courts

must be able to establish schedules with firm cutoff dates if the coordinated cases are to move in a diligent fashion toward resolution by motion, settlement, or trial.” *Id.* (internal quotations omitted). Thus, MDL courts have “greater discretion to organize, coordinate and adjudicate its proceedings, including the dismissal of cases for failure to comply with its orders.” *Id.*

### **B. Non-responsive Plaintiffs**

With regard to the six Plaintiffs that have failed to provide any response, the Court finds dismissal with prejudice appropriate. By Court order, completed Plaintiff Fact Sheets were due in these cases months ago. (*See* CMO 5, Dkt. No. 110). In CMO 6, the Court explicitly stated that

Any Plaintiff who fails to comply with any discovery obligations imposed by CMO 5 or by this Order within the time periods set forth herein — including provision of a PFS or required authorizations and other Mandatory Disclosures — may be subject to having her claims, as well as any derivative claim(s), dismissed if good cause is shown. Good cause shall exist where there is a material deficiency in responding to the required discovery, i.e., one that prejudices Pfizer through a failure to provide necessary information, thereby impeding Pfizer’s access to material and relevant evidence.

(Dkt. No. 148 at 6).<sup>2</sup>

The Order goes on to state that when a Plaintiff fails to materially comply with her obligations under CMO 5, Pfizer’s counsel must send a notice of the material deficiency to Plaintiff’s counsel and allow Plaintiff fourteen days to cure the alleged material deficiency. (*Id.*) If the deficiency is not cured within that time or within an agreed extension, Pfizer may move for dismissal with prejudice, as it has done here. (*Id.*).

These Plaintiff Fact Sheets are basic facts needed for Pfizer to assess the quality of these cases, and failure to provide such information prejudices Pfizer in this litigation. *See In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1234 (9th Cir. 2009) (“[T]he

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs agreed and consented to this Order.

purpose of the Plaintiff's Fact Sheet was to give each defendant the specific information necessary to defend the case against it, and that without this device, a defendant was unable to mount its defense because it had no information about the plaintiff or the plaintiff's injuries outside the allegations of the complaint."); *In re Guidant Corp.*, 496 F.3d at 867 ("Given the time pressure on a defendant that must investigate the claims of nearly 1,400 plaintiffs, we consider the danger of prejudice substantial."). Plaintiffs' delay also impacts the other approximately 5,000 plaintiffs in this litigation "by unfairly diverting the time and attention of the court away from their timely claims to that of [these plaintiffs]." *In re Guidant Corp.*, 496 F.3d at 867.

The information requested should be readily available to Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs bear responsibility for their failure to adequately supply such information. Plaintiffs have failed to provide such information despite multiple warnings from the Court and follow-up by Pfizer, and *Plaintiffs have provided no reason whatsoever for their failure to comply with this Court's order.* This behavior is at least "a blatant disregard for the deadlines and procedure imposed by the court." *In re Guidant Corp.*, 496 F.3d at 867.

Therefore, the Court finds that dismissal with prejudice is appropriate. *See In re Phenylpropanolamine*, 460 F.3d at 1233-34 (affirming district court's dismissal of actions with prejudice for failure to cure deficiencies in Plaintiff Fact Sheets by the deadlines in the Court's case management order); *In re Guidant Corp.*, 496 F.3d at 867-68 (affirming district court's refusal to set aside dismissal with prejudice for failure to serve Plaintiff Fact Sheets as required by court order).

### C. Other Plaintiffs

The Court has repeatedly warned Plaintiffs that it will dismiss cases with prejudice where they do not provide adequate PFSs and accompanying authorizations. (*E.g.*, CMO 64, Dkt. No. 1345, at 5; CMO 35, Dkt. No. 916, at 5). Here, Plaintiffs' disclosures are obviously deficient. They have failed to provide medical authorizations specifically required by the Court's orders, and their PFSs are missing material information, such as their alleged injuries, dosage information, and date of diabetes diagnosis. The Court finds that these Plaintiffs have not made a serious, good faith effort to comply with the Court's orders. Therefore, the Court dismisses these cases without prejudice and with the conditions stated below. They may rejoin the MDL once they have complied with the Court's orders.

### D. Conclusion

Pfizer's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 1434) is **GRANTED IN PART**. The claims of the following Plaintiffs are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**:

<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Case No.</b>
Hamrick, Sherry	2:15-cv-04136
Mugan, Mary	2:15-cv-04136
Page, Betty	2:15-cv-04136
Van Zile, Valerie	2:15-cv-04136
Blalock-Carter, Pamela	2:15-cv-04645
Johnson, Shelia	2:15-cv-04645

The claims of the following Plaintiffs

<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Case No.</b>
Brice, Barbara	2:15-cv-04136
Carlson, Evelyn	2:15-cv-04136
Grose, Sharon	2:15-cv-04136
James, Bonnie	2:15-cv-04136
Jones, Pearl	2:15-cv-04136
Lagrippa, Terri	2:15-cv-04136
Moore, Patricia	2:15-cv-04136
Muraviov, Norma	2:15-cv-04136

Nicholson, Karen	2:15-cv-04136
Starling, Mary	2:15-cv-04136
Taylor, Helen	2:15-cv-04136
Tysor, Sandra	2:15-cv-04136
Vail, Peggy	2:15-cv-04136
Warfield, Barbara	2:15-cv-04136
Yaker, Ruth	2:15-cv-04136
Ashley, Gloria	2:15-cv-04645
Price, Nanci	2:15-cv-04645
Robinson, Chenetta	2:15-cv-04645

are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** but with the following conditions:

If Plaintiff seeks to refile her action against Pfizer,

- (1) She must do so in the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina or other federal district court;
- (2) She must file a “Single-Plaintiff Complaint.” A “Single-Plaintiff Complaint” is a complaint filed: (1) by an individual plaintiff; (2) by a plaintiff and family member plaintiffs; or (3) on behalf of the estate of a deceased individual, together with any family members and/or beneficiaries of such estate;
- (3) She must not oppose transfer to this MDL proceeding;
- (4) She must not name a defendant that defeats federal diversity jurisdiction; and
- (5) She must serve a completed Plaintiff Fact Sheet and accompanying disclosures and medical authorizations on Pfizer in accordance with CMO 5 and Amended CMO 6 *before* filing suit and attach a certificate of service reflecting that she has done so to her complaint.

Plaintiffs are advised that if they attempt to refile their suits without complying with the above conditions, the Court may dismiss their second suit with prejudice.

With regard to *Martin v. Pfizer*, Case No. 2:15-cv-04223 and *Ross v. Pfizer*, Case No. 2:15-cv-04345, the motion is **DENIED AS MOOT**, as these Plaintiffs have dismissed their cases by stipulation.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Court Judge

June 9, 2016  
Charleston, South Carolina