


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



JS-6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ADRIANN GEORGES, Plaintiff, v. NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION, Defendant.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

CASE NO. **2:06-CV-05207-SJO-VBK**  
Assigned to S. James Otero, Courtroom 1

**JUDGMENT ON A JURY VERDICT**

This action was tried by a jury with Judge S. James Otero presiding, and the jury has rendered a verdict.

IT IS ORDERED that the plaintiff Adriann Georges recover from the defendant Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation the amount of \$2,162,000. with post-judgment interest at the applicable statutory rate and costs.

The jury's award of \$2,162,000. is comprised of the following components as found by the jury in response to specific questions addressed to them by the Court:

1. "Did Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation fail to provide an adequate

1 warning to Mrs. Georges' prescribing physician or oral and maxillofacial surgeon  
2 of the potential risk of a substantial danger that were known or knowable at the time  
3 of distribution in light of generally accepted scientific and medical knowledge?"

4 Jury: "Yes."

5 2. "Was the failure to warn a substantial factor in causing her harm?"

6 Jury: "Yes."

7 3. "Did Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation negligently fail to provide  
8 an adequate warning to Mrs. Georges' prescribing physician or oral and  
9 maxillofacial surgeon of the risks of Aredia and Zometa that Novartis knew or  
10 reasonably should have known to exist?"

11 Jury: "Yes."

12 4. "Was the negligent failure to warn a substantial factor in causing her  
13 harm?"

14 Jury: "Yes."

15 5. "Did Novartis intentionally fail to disclose an important fact that was  
16 known only to Novartis and that Mrs. Georges' prescribing physician or oral and  
17 maxillofacial surgeon could not have discovered?"

18 Jury: "Yes."

19 6. "Did Novartis intend to deceive her physicians by concealing the  
20 fact?"

21 Jury: "Yes."

22 7. "Did Mrs. Georges and her physicians reasonably rely on the  
23 deception?"

24 Jury: "Yes."

25 8. "Was the concealment by Novartis a substantial factor in causing her  
26 harm?"

27 Jury: "Yes."  
28

1 9. “What amount, if any, do you award to fully justify and fairly  
2 compensate Mrs. Georges for all of her

3 a) past economic losses resulting from defendant’s conduct?”

4 Jury: “\$250,000.”

5 b) “past [non-] (sic) economic losses resulting from defendant’s  
6 conduct?”

7 Jury: “\$951,000.”

8 c) “future economic losses resulting from defendant’s conduct?”

9 Jury: “\$200,000.”

10 d) “future non-economic losses resulting from defendant’s  
11 conduct?”

12 Jury: “\$761,000.”

13 The jury was polled following the verdict and all members of the jury  
14 affirmed the verdict as presented and read. *See* 4/24/13 Tr. Tran. at pp. 4-8.

15  
16  
17 Date: September 24, 2013

18  
19 

20  
21 

---

HONORABLE S. JAMES OTERO  
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE  
23