

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAULA ACKERMAN, et al.,

No. C 13-3049 MMC

Plaintiffs,

v.

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT  
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM  
CORPORATION'S MOTION TO STAY;  
VACATING AUGUST 16, 2013 HEARING**

MCKESSON CORPORATION and  
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Before the Court is defendant Smithkline Beecham Corporation's ("defendant") Motion, filed July 10, 2013, to Stay All Proceedings Pending Transfer by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to MDL 1871 (E.D.PA). Plaintiffs have filed opposition, to which defendants have replied. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion, the Court deems the matter suitable for decision on the parties' respective written submissions, VACATES the hearing scheduled for August 16, 2013, and rules as follows.

The instant complaint "involves claims of death, personal injury, economic damages, punitive damages, and other claims of damage arising from the use of [Avianda]<sup>1</sup>"

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> "Avianda" is one of several trade names for the pharmaceutical compound Rosiglitazone. (See Compl. ¶ 1.)

1 (see Compl. ¶ 1) brought on behalf of eighty-eight named plaintiffs. A number of  
2 complaints raising similar claims are pending in a coordinated proceeding in the Eastern  
3 District of Pennsylvania, titled In re: Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products  
4 Liability Litigation, MDL No. 1871. (See Mot. Exs. A & B.) On July 9, 2013, the Judicial  
5 Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”) conditionally transferred the instant action to the  
6 Eastern District of Pennsylvania. See In re: Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices and  
7 Products Liability Litigation, MDL No. 1871, Doc. No. 1022. On July 25, 2013, plaintiffs  
8 filed their motion to vacate the conditional transfer order, see id., Doc. No. 1093;  
9 defendant’s response thereto is due no later than August 19, 2013, see id., Doc. No. 1040.  
10 Defendant asks the Court to stay proceedings in the instant action pending the JPML’s  
11 determination as to whether the instant action will be transferred.

12 Other than defendant’s motion to stay, the only matter pending before the Court is  
13 plaintiffs’ motion to remand, also noticed for hearing August 16, 2013. Accordingly, the  
14 issue now presented is, in effect, whether the Court should consider the merits of plaintiffs’  
15 motion to remand, or, instead, stay the instant action, with the understanding that, in the  
16 event of transfer, the motion will be heard by the transferee court.

17 Because a decision as to whether the instant action will be transferred will, in all  
18 likelihood, be made shortly by the JPML, the stay sought by defendant likely will be of  
19 limited duration. In light of the anticipated brevity of the stay, and no significant prejudice  
20 resulting from such stay having been identified by plaintiffs, the Court, in the interests of  
21 conserving judicial resources and promoting consistency in the determination of common  
22 issues,<sup>2</sup> finds a stay of the proceedings is appropriate. See Rivers v. Walt Disney Co., 980

---

23  
24 <sup>2</sup> The issues presented by plaintiffs’ motion to remand are whether McKesson  
25 Corporation is fraudulently joined as a defendant and whether the case is removable as a  
26 collective action. The same issues have been raised in motions to remand filed in a  
27 number of other actions that are currently pending in this district and have been stayed  
28 pending a decision by the JPML as to transfer to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. See,  
e.g., Flores v. McKesson Corp., C. 13-3153 (Doc. No. 18); Tarango v. McKesson Corp., C.  
13-3070 (Doc. No. 17); Harrison v. McKesson Corp., 13-3045, (Doc. No. 13); Myers v.  
McKesson Corp., C. 13-3096, (Doc. No. 11); Allender v. McKesson Corp., C. 13-3068  
(Doc. No. 18); Allen v. McKesson Corp., C. 13-3110 JSW (Doc. No. 20); Hargrove v.


1 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal 1997) (identifying factors for court to consider when  
2 determining whether to stay action pending decision by JPML).

3 Accordingly, defendant's motion for a stay is hereby GRANTED.

4 In light of the stay, the August 16, 2013 hearing on plaintiffs' motion to remand is  
5 hereby VACATED.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 Dated: August 12, 2013

8   
9 MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
10 United States District Judge

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 

---

McKesson Corp., C. 13-3114 (Doc. No. 20); Poff v. McKesson Corp., C. 13-3115 (Doc. No.  
27 21); Adams v. McKesson Corp., C 13-3102 (Doc. No. 19); and Alvarez v. McKesson Corp.,  
28 C. 13-3112 (Doc. No. 18).