1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	* * *	
9	JOYCE COPELAND,	Case No. 2:13-cv-01066-MMD-CWH
10	Plaintiff,	
11	v.	ORDER
12	STRYKER ORTHOPEDICS, INC., et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	Plaintiff Joyce Copeland filed this action on April 8, 2013, and an Amended	
16	Complaint on May 15, 2013, in the Eighth Judicial District Court in Clark County,	
17	Nevada. Plaintiff alleges that the total knee arthroplasty surgery she had on July 27,	
18	2009, failed because of faulty Triathlon Knee components, which she asserts were	
19	designed, researched, tested, manufactured, labeled, and distributed by Defendants	
20	Stryker Corporation, Stryker Orthopedics, Inc., and Stryker Howmedica Osteonics	
21	Corporation. Plaintiff had a revision surgery in 2011 during which Plaintiff alleges her	
22	surgeon discovered that the Triathlon Knee components inserted during her original	
23	surgery had come loose in three different places related to the tibial components of the	
24	device. Plaintiff brings twelve claims for relief. Defendants removed the action on the	
25	basis of 28 U.S.C. § 1332. (See dkt. no. 1.)	
26	On June 20, 2013, the Court ordered Defendants to show cause as to why this	

26 On June 20, 2013, the Court ordered Defendants to show cause as to why this
27 case should not be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Dkt. no. 4.)
28 Defendants responded on June 25, 2013. (Dkt. no. 8.) In their response, Defendants

1	met their burden to demonstrate that the amount-in-controversy exceeds \$75,000 and	
2	that their Petition for Removal was timely filed. Accordingly, the Court is now assured of	
3	its jurisdiction to preside over this case.	
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
5	DATED THIS 16 <sup>th</sup> day of July 2013.	
6	all	
7	MIRANDA M. Du UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16 17		
17 18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	
	ζ.	