## UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 1871

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

## **CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO-104)**

On October 16, 2007, the Panel transferred 2 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407. See 528 F.Supp.2d 1339 (J.P.M.L. 2007). Since that time, 1,619 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M Rufe.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and assigned to Judge Rufe.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the <u>Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation</u>, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. §1407 to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the reasons stated in the order of October 16, 2007, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M Rufe.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7–day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

FOR THE PANEL:

Jeffery N. Lüthi Clerk of the Panel

Inasmuch as no objection is pending at this time, the stay is lifted.

Jul 19, 2011

CLERK'S OFFICE
UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 1871

## SCHEDULE CTO-104 - TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

<u>DIST</u>	DIV.	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	CASE CAPTION
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
DC	1	11-01111	FASULO v. GLAXOSMITHKLINE LLC
FLORIDA NORTHERN			
FLN	4	10-00551	HENDERSON v. SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION
FLORIDA SOUTHERN			
FLS	9	10-81581	Lawrimore et al v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation
ILLINOIS SOUTHERN			
<del>ILS</del>	3	11-00471	Adcock et al vs. GlaxoSmithKline LLC
KENTUCKY WESTERN			
KYW	3	10-00721	Plappert v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation et al
LOUISIANA MIDDLE			
LAM	3	11-00439	Hebert et al v. GlaxoSmithKline
MINNESOTA			
MN MN MN MN MN MN	0 0 0 0 0 0	11-01569 11-01570 11-01571 11-01734 11-01738 11-01741 11-01742	Wang v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation Hawhee v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation McKinney v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation Schoenheide v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation Cataldi v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation Stephan v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation Kennedy v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation et al

**NEVADA** 

## Case MDL No. 1871 Document 667 Filed 07/19/11 Page 3 of 3

NV 2 11–01093 Lacombe v. Smithkline Beecham Corporation dba Glaxosmithkline