

United States District Court For the Northern District of California 3 before entertaining any stay of these proceedings. 4 Our court of appeals has not yet addressed whether courts must first decide the merits of a motion to remand before determining whether to stay the proceedings. Generally speaking, 5 6 a stay is warranted if this would serve judicial economy. See, e.g., In re Iphone Application 7

1

2

8

9

10

11

Litig., No. 10-5878, 2011 WL 2149102, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. May 31, 2011) (Judge Lucy Koh). In the NuvaRing litigation, some judges in this district have granted a stay pending transfer to the MDL. Tucker v. Organon, No. 13-728, 2013 WL 2255884 (N.D. Cal. May 22, 2013) (Judge Sandra Armstrong); Burton v. Organon, No. 13-1535, 2013 WL 1963954 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2013) (Judge Phyllis Hamilton); and Clarke v. Organon, No. 13-2290, 2013 WL 12 3475948 (N.D. Cal. July 10, 2013) (Judge Claudia Wilken).

in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. Plaintiffs then filed a

motion to remand, arguing that this Court should first consider the merits of its remand motion

13 Plaintiffs nonetheless contend that a stay should be denied. They rely mainly on Marble, 14 a prior decision by the undersigned judge in which an action involving NuvaRing was remanded 15 and stay was denied. Marble v. Organon USA, Inc., No. 12-2213, 2012 WL 2237271 (N.D. Cal. 16 June 15, 2012). Marble, however, was the first NuvaRing case in which McKesson was a 17 defendant. It held that "[b]ecause no other case in the MDL thus far has presented the 18 McKesson issue, there is no economy in sending this action to MDL for resolution." *Marble*, 19 2012 WL 2237271 at \*3.

Circumstances have since changed. Numerous actions involving NuvaRing in which 20 21 McKesson was a named defendant have now been transferred to the MDL. The question of 22 whether McKesson is a proper defendant is being considered by the MDL. Decisions 23 concerning that question by other courts could lead to inconsistency in judicial rulings. 24 This order therefore finds that judicial economy and consistency would be served by a stay 25 pending transfer to the MDL.

26 Plaintiffs will not be greatly prejudiced by this brief stay pending the determination to 27 transfer by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. If transferred, the MDL can efficiently 28 deal with jurisdictional issues such as fraudulent joinder; if not, then this Court can.

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

For these reasons, defendants' motion is **GRANTED**. The present action and plaintiffs' motion to remand are stayed pending the JPML's decision on transferring the case. The hearing on September 12, 2013, is VACATED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Ahr Dated: August 14, 2013. WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE