IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

IN RE: YASMIN AND YAZ (DROSPIRENONE) MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	)))))	**3:09-md-02100-DRH-PMF** **MDL No. 2100**

This Document Relates to:

Nichole Clark v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-10634-DRH-PMF
Jennifer May Condra v. Bayer Corporation, et al.	No. 3:10-cv-10339-DRH-PMF
Chancey Craig v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-10575-DRH-PMF
Brynn Danyluk v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-11183-DRH-PMF
Nicole Defauw-Tucker, et al. v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:10-cv-11662-DRH-PMF
Sandra Deroche v. Bayer Corporation, et al.	No. 3:10-cv-11757-DRH-PMF
Malinda Dodson v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.[1]	No. 3:10-cv-13217-DRH-PMF
Tiffany Doucet v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:09-cv-20116-DRH-PMF
Kelly Engelking v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-12077-DRH-PMF
Christy Etzig v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:10-cv-13426-DRH-PMF
Kira Fisher v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-11837-DRH-PMF
Yvette Flores v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-10387-DRH-PMF

[1] Plaintiff a/k/a Malinda Lastinger-Zimmerman.

Rebecca Fogg v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-10364-DRH-PMF
Chelsea Follin v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-13509-DRH-PMF
Angela George v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-11078-DRH-PMF
Jaclyn Gonzalez v. Bayer Corporation, et al.	No. 3:09-cv-10107-DRH-PMF
Natasha Greenwalt-Alcala v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-12526-DRH-PMF
Ashley Hagood v. Bayer Corporation, et al.	No. 3:12-cv-10765-DRH-PMF
Chelsea Hall v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.	No. 3:11-cv-13069-DRH-PMF

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE

HERNDON, District Judge:

On November 14, 2014, Bayer filed a motion to dismiss with prejudice, pursuant to Case Management Order 60 ("CMO 60"), the above captioned plaintiffs' claims for failure to submit complete Claim Package Materials.[2]

Pursuant to the Court's local rules, the plaintiffs had 30 days to file a responsive pleading. None of the above captioned plaintiffs filed a responsive pleading. At the expiration of the responsive pleading deadline, as is required

[2] Pursuant to the "Settlement Agreement," Exhibit A to CMO 60, plaintiffs enrolled in the Gallbladder Resolution Program are required to submit to the Claims Administrator all the Claim Package Materials identified in Section 3.03(a) of the Settlement Agreement. Section 3.01 of the Settlement Agreement fixed November 18, 2013 as the deadline for submission of a complete Claims Package. The subject motion asserts that the plaintiffs have failed to comply with this requirement.

under CMO 60, the motion was considered by Special Master Stephen Saltzburg.[3] On December 22, 2014, Special Master's Saltzburg's report and recommendation relating to the above captioned cases was docketed. In each case, Special Master Saltzburg found that the subject plaintiffs failed to comply with the requirements of CMO 60 and recommended that the subject plaintiffs' claims be dismissed with prejudice in accord with the requirements of CMO 60.

The parties were given 14 days to respond or object to Special Master Saltzburg's report and recommendation. The deadline for responding or objecting to the Special Master's report has expired. None of the above captioned plaintiffs have responded or objected.

Upon consideration of Bayer's motion to dismiss, the Special Master's report, and the requirements of CMO 60, the Court finds that the above captioned

[3] Section VIII of CMO 60 "appoints Professor Stephen Saltzburg as Special Master to hear motions to dismiss claims that fail to comply with the terms of the Agreement, and to recommend to this Court rulings on such motions, as specified in the Agreement" (Doc. 2739 p. 8).

plaintiffs have failed to comply with CMO 60.

Accordingly, the claims of the above captioned plaintiffs are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

FURTHER, the Court directs the Clerk of the Court to enter judgment reflecting the same.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 8th day of January, 2015.



United States District Judge