IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 DONALD BATES, et al., No. C 09-4150 CW 5 Plaintiffs, ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO SHOW 6 CAUSE, DISMISSING CASE AND DIRECTING ASTRAZENECA, LP, et al., COUNSEL TO FILE A LIST OF CURRENT 8 Defendants. PLAINTIFFS 9 CAROLYN HARRISON, et al., No. C 09-4151 CW 11 Plaintiffs, 12 v. 13 ASTRAZENECA, LP, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 TODD BOGGIS, et al., No. C 09-4159 CW 17 Plaintiffs, 18 v. 19 ASTRAZENECA, LP, et al., 20 Defendants. 21 22 PAUL TRIM, et al., No. C 09-4160 CW 23 Plaintiffs, 24 v. 25 ASTRAZENECA, LP, et al., 26 Defendants. 27 28

27

```
ANTONIO BURTON, et al.,
                                                   No. C 09-4162 CW
 2
              Plaintiffs,
 3
         v.
   ASTRAZENECA, LP, et al.,
 5
              Defendants.
 6
   GLORIA MILLER, et al.,
                                                   No. C 09-4163 CW
 8
              Plaintiffs,
9
         v.
   ASTRAZENECA, LP, et al.,
11
              Defendants.
12
13
   BONG NGYUEN, et al.,
                                                   No. C 09-4166 CW
14
              Plaintiffs,
15
         v.
   ASTRAZENECA, LP, et al.,
17
              Defendants.
18
19
   DAVID MARTIN, et al.,
                                                  No. C 09-4164 CW
20
              Plaintiffs,
21
         v.
22
   ASTRAZENECA, LP, et al.,
23
              Defendants.
24
25
         On May 18, 2012, in response to a motion made by Plaintiffs'
26
   counsel, the Court issued an order requiring the Plaintiffs listed
```

in Exhibit A to counsel's motion to show cause why their cases

should not be dismissed with prejudice, have new counsel appear

before this Court on their behalf, or communicate with counsel regarding their agreement to the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA). The Court warned Plaintiffs that if they failed to comply with that order, their claims would be dismissed with prejudice. The Court further directed Plaintiffs' counsel to file a declaration addressing whether these Plaintiffs have since communicated with counsel regarding their agreement to the MSA.

On June 8, 2012, Plaintiffs' counsel filed a declaration, stating that six Plaintiffs, Cox, Hendrix, King, Miklich, Natale and [Sant] Agante contacted counsel to indicate their assent to the MSA, and that counsel is in the process of completing their settlements. Counsel further indicated that four Plaintiffs, Davis, French, Picard and Prestenbeck, have previously resolved their claims. Counsel also states that he learned that two other Plaintiffs, Bipin and Dean, are represented by other counsel, and that he is working with the other counsel to resolve their claims. The Court therefore DISCHARGES its Order to Show Cause as to these twelve Plaintiffs. Counsel shall continue to work diligently toward resolving all Plaintiffs' claims and shall promptly file stipulations of dismissal as appropriate.

Plaintiffs' counsel further attests that he provided notice of the Court's order to the other Plaintiffs listed in Exhibit 1 of his declaration, and that counsel has not been contacted by these Plaintiffs. The Court notes that these Plaintiffs have also not contacted the Court separately or had new counsel appear before this Court on their behalf. Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES the claims of these Plaintiffs with prejudice.

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

Within seven days of the date of this Order, Plaintiffs'
counsel shall file a list of Plaintiffs that remain in each of the
cases captioned above.
IT IS SO ORDERED.
Dated: 6/20/2012 CLAUDIA WILKEN United States District Judge