

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

THE CITY OF PARMA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 1:17-cv-1872
)	
PURDUE PHARMA L.P.; PURDUE PHARMA)	Action Filed: August 9, 2017
INC.; THE PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY,)	Action Served: August 15, 2017
INC.; TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.;)	
CEPHALON, INC.; JOHNSON & JOHNSON;)	
JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;)	
ORTHO-MCNEIL-JANSSEN)	
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. N/K/A JANSSEN)	
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.; JANSSEN)	
PHARMACEUTICA, INC. N/K/A JANSSEN)	
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.; ENDO)	
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.; ALLERGAN PLC)	
F/K/A ACTAVIS PLC; ACTAVIS, INC. F/K/A)	
WATSON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;)	
WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.; ACTAVIS)	
LLC; ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC. F/K/A WATSON)	
PHARMA, INC.; ENDO HEALTH SOLUTIONS)	
INC.; MCKESSON CORPORATION;)	
CARDINAL HEALTH, INC.;)	
AMERISOURCEBERGEN CORPORATION;)	
RUSSELL PORTENOY; PERRY FINE;)	
SCOTT FISHMAN; and LYNN WEBSTER,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**DEFENDANTS ENDO HEALTH SOLUTIONS INC. AND
ENDO PHARMACEUTICALS INC.'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441, and 1446, defendants Endo Health Solutions Inc. and Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc. (collectively, “Endo”) hereby give notice of removal of this action, captioned *City of Parma v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al.*, bearing civil action number CV 17 884281, from the Court of Common Pleas for Cuyahoga County, Ohio, to the United States District Court

for the Northern District of Ohio. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), Endo provides the following statement of the grounds for removal:

BACKGROUND

1. On August 9, 2017, Plaintiff, the City of Parma, filed a Complaint (attached hereto, with process papers served upon Endo, as **Exhibit 1**) in the Court of Common Pleas for Cuyahoga County, Ohio, against the following defendants:

a. “Manufacturer Defendants” — Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc.; Endo Health Solutions Inc.; Purdue Pharma L.P.; Purdue Pharma Inc.; The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.; Cephalon, Inc.; Johnson & Johnson; Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. n/k/a Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc. n/k/a Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Allergan plc f/k/a Actavis plc; Actavis, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Watson Laboratories, Inc.; Actavis LLC; and Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharma, Inc.

b. “Physician Defendants” — Russell Portenoy; Perry Fine; Scott Fishman; and Lynn Webster.

c. “Distributor Defendants” — McKesson Corporation; Cardinal Health, Inc. (“Cardinal”); and AmerisourceBergen Corporation.

2. The Complaint contains allegations relating to conduct by the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants, on the one hand, and separate alleged unlawful conduct by the Distributor Defendants, on the other.

3. The thrust of the Complaint is that the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants engaged in a campaign of misrepresentations about the risks of FDA-approved opioid medications. (Compl. ¶¶ 1-51.) Plaintiff alleges that, as part of this campaign, the Manufacturer

Defendants paid physicians and others to promote the Manufacturer Defendants' opioid products. (*Id.* ¶ 13.) Plaintiff further alleges that the Physician Defendants participated in those promotional activities. (*See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 124-127, 226-232, 414-415.) Plaintiff asserts that the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants' alleged conduct has caused Plaintiff to incur "health care costs, criminal justice and victimization costs, social costs, and lost productivity costs." (*Id.* ¶ 51.) All of the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants are citizens of states other than Ohio.

4. Unlike the allegations against the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants, none of Plaintiff's allegations against the Distributor Defendants relates to purported misrepresentations about opioid medications. Instead, Plaintiff alleges that the Distributor Defendants "failed in their duty to take any action to prevent or reduce the distribution of [opioids]" or to notice and report "suspicious or alarming orders of opioid pharmaceuticals to the proper authorities and governing bodies," as required by "Ohio State Board of Pharmacy rules, codes and regulations." (*Id.* ¶¶ 96, 100, 121.) The Complaint further alleges that the Distributor Defendants failed to "prevent the flow of prescription opioids . . . into the City of Parma." (*Id.* ¶ 111.) One Distributor Defendant, Cardinal, is an Ohio citizen. The other Distributor Defendants are citizens of states other than Ohio.

5. The Complaint asserts five causes of action against "all Defendants" (although virtually all of the alleged conduct underlying all of those claims involves only the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants): (1) unfair consumer sales practices under chapter 1345 of the Ohio revised code; (2) deceptive trade practices under chapter 4165 of the Ohio revised code; (3) nuisance and product liability; (4) fraud; and (5) unjust enrichment. (*Id.* ¶¶ 699-736.) In addition, the Complaint asserts a negligence claim solely against the Distributor Defendants. (*Id.* ¶¶ 737-751.)

6. Counsel for Endo accepted service of the Complaint on August 15, 2017. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), a copy of all process, pleadings, and orders served on Endo is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** (Complaint and service papers) and **Exhibit 2** (orders).

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

7. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 115, 1391, 1441(a), and 1446(a) because the Court of Common Pleas for Cuyahoga County, Ohio, where the Complaint was filed, is a state court within the Northern District of Ohio.

8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) because (1) there is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and all properly joined defendants; (2) the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs; and (3) all other requirements for removal have been satisfied.

I. THERE IS COMPLETE DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP BETWEEN PLAINTIFF AND ALL PROPERLY JOINED DEFENDANTS

9. There is complete diversity of citizenship here because Plaintiff is an Ohio citizen and all of the Manufacturer Defendants and Physician Defendants are citizens of states other than Ohio, *see* Part I.A *infra*, and the citizenship of the Distributor Defendants (one of which is non-diverse) is irrelevant for purposes of determining diversity jurisdiction because they were improperly joined, *see* Part I.B *infra*. This is because the Distributor Defendants are dispensable parties subject to severance under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and are also fraudulently misjoined.¹

¹ While only one of the Distributor Defendants (Cardinal) is non-diverse, the Court should sever all of the Distributor Defendants because of the common factual allegations underlying the claims against those defendants.

A. Plaintiff Is Diverse from the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants

1. Plaintiff Is a Citizen of Ohio

10. The City of Parma is an Ohio citizen for purposes of diversity jurisdiction. *See Moor v. Alameda Cty.*, 411 U.S. 693, 717 (1973) (“[A] political subdivision of a State, unless it is simply ‘the arm or alter ego of the State,’ is a citizen of the State for diversity purposes.”) (citation omitted); *Saginaw Hous. Comm’n v. Bannum, Inc.*, 576 F.3d 620, 624 (6th Cir. 2009) (city and school district are citizens of the state in which they are situated); *Herold v. ASII, Inc.*, No. 1:11-CV-1690, 2012 WL 243303, at *1 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 23, 2012) (City of Cleveland is a citizen of Ohio).

2. None of the Manufacturer Defendants or Physician Defendants Are Citizens of Ohio

11. For purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a corporation is “a citizen of every State and foreign state by which it has been incorporated and of the State or foreign state where it has its principal place of business” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1). A partnership is a citizen of every state in which its partners are citizens. *See Americold Realty Tr. v. Conagra Foods, Inc.*, 136 S. Ct. 1012, 1015 (2016); *Hooper v. Wolfe*, 396 F.3d 744, 748 (6th Cir. 2005).

12. Applying these principles, none of the Manufacturer Defendants or Physician Defendants is a citizen of Ohio.

13. Defendant Endo Health Solutions Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business in Malvern, Pennsylvania. (Compl. ¶ 67.)

14. Defendant Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business in Malvern, Pennsylvania. (*Id.*)

15. Defendant Purdue Pharma L.P. is a limited partnership organized under the laws of Delaware, none of whose partners are residents of Ohio. (*See id.* ¶ 56.)

16. Defendant Purdue Pharma Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business in Stamford, Connecticut. (*Id.*)

17. Defendant The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business in Stamford, Connecticut. (*Id.*)

18. Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business in North Wales, Pennsylvania. (*Id.* ¶ 56.)

19. Defendant Cephalon, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business in Frazer, Pennsylvania. (*Id.* ¶ 57.)

20. Defendant Johnson & Johnson is a corporation organized under the laws of New Jersey with its principal place of business in New Brunswick, New Jersey. (*Id.* ¶ 63.)

21. Defendant Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Pennsylvania with its principal place of business in Titusville, New Jersey. (*Id.*)

22. Defendant Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Pennsylvania with its principal place of business in Titusville, New Jersey. (*Id.*)

23. Defendant Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Pennsylvania with its principal place of business in Titusville, New Jersey. (*Id.*)

24. Defendant Allergan plc is a public limited company incorporated in Ireland with its principal place of business in Dublin, Ireland. (*Id.* ¶ 70.)

25. Defendant Actavis, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is now known as Allergan Finance LLC, a Nevada limited liability company with its principal place of business in Parsippany, New Jersey. (*See id.*)

26. Defendant Actavis LLC is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business in Parsippany, New Jersey. (*Id.*) Actavis LLC's sole member is Actavis US

Holdco LLC, a limited liability company organized under the laws of Delaware. Actavis US Holdco LLC's sole member is Watson Laboratories, Inc., a Nevada corporation with its principal place of business in Parsippany, New Jersey. (*See id.*)

27. Defendant Watson Laboratories, Inc. is a Nevada corporation with its principal place of business in Parsippany, New Jersey. (*See id.*)

28. Defendant Actavis Pharma, Inc., f/k/a Watson Pharma, Inc., is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Parsippany, New Jersey. (*Id.*)

29. Defendant Dr. Russell Portenoy is a citizen of New York. (*Id.* ¶ 124.)

30. Defendant Dr. Perry Fine is a citizen of Utah. (*Id.* ¶ 125.)

31. Defendant Dr. Scott Fishman is a citizen of California. (*Id.* ¶ 126.)

32. Defendant Dr. Lynn Webster is a citizen of Utah. (*Id.* ¶ 127.)

33. Accordingly, all of the Manufacturer Defendants and Physician Defendants are citizens of a state or foreign state other than Ohio.

B. The Citizenship of the Distributor Defendants Should Be Ignored

1. The Distributor Defendants Are Dispensable Parties Subject to Severance

34. Even where the face of a complaint shows a lack of complete diversity, removal based on diversity jurisdiction is nonetheless proper if the claims against the non-diverse defendants are severable under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 19 and 21. Under those rules, parties are severable if they are either unnecessary or dispensable.

35. This Court's decision in *Joseph v. Baxter International, Inc.*, 614 F. Supp. 2d 868 (N.D. Ohio 2009) (attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**), is instructive. There, the plaintiffs, citizens of Louisiana, brought a products liability action against Baxter, the manufacturer of the drug Heparin and a citizen of Delaware and Illinois. *Id.* at 870. Before the case was removed, the plaintiffs

amended their complaint to add as defendants various healthcare provider companies, which were citizens of Louisiana and therefore non-diverse, alleging that they engaged in “negligent acts and omissions in the administration of Heparin.” *Id.* at 871. Despite the addition of these non-diverse healthcare provider defendants, the district court denied remand.

36. Following Sixth Circuit precedent, the court explained that “it is appropriate to drop a nondiverse and dispensable party from litigation in order to achieve diversity.” *Id.* at 872 (quoting *Soberay Mach. & Equip. Co. v. MRF Ltd.*, 181 F.3d 759, 763 (6th Cir. 1999)). As the court explained, Rule 21 “permits a district court to retain diversity jurisdiction over a case by dropping a nondiverse party if that party’s presence in the action is not required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 19.” *Id.* (quoting *Safeco Ins. Co. v. City of White House*, 36 F.3d 540, 545 (6th Cir. 1994)); *see also id.* (“[U]nder Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, [courts] can retain jurisdiction by severing claims against nondiverse dispensable defendants.”). Applying these principles, the *Baxter* court concluded that the healthcare-provider defendants were dispensable parties subject to severance and thus declined to remand the entire case. *Id.* at 872-74. The court reasoned that the healthcare-provider defendants were “not necessary parties as the resolution of a claim against them would not necessarily resolve the [plaintiffs’] claim against Baxter”; the medical malpractice claims against the healthcare providers “differ from the [plaintiffs’] products liability claim” against the manufacturer. *Id.* at 872. And, the court explained, the healthcare-provider defendants were dispensable because the plaintiffs “retain an adequate remedy against the Healthcare Defendants as they can proceed with their claims in state court.” *Id.* at 873. Given the separate questions raised by plaintiffs’ medical malpractice claims against the healthcare providers, the court found that it could “sever them from the claims against

[the manufacturer], and in doing so, perfect diversity jurisdiction over [the manufacturer].” *Id.* at 874.

37. The *Baxter* court cited numerous other decisions that followed the same approach to retain diversity jurisdiction over diverse defendants after a motion to remand. *See id.* at 873-74 (citing *Phillips v. Knoll Pharm. Co.*, No. 03-8044 (N.D. Ohio Sept. 4, 2003); *Williams v. Knoll Pharm. Co.*, No. 03-8030 (N.D. Ohio July 11, 2003); *Lucas v. Springhill Hosps., Inc.*, No. 1:09HC60016, 2009 WL 1652155, at *2 (N.D. Ohio June 11, 2009); *Jolly v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, No. 9:09-cv-00038 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 16, 2009)).

38. The same outcome is warranted here because the Distributor Defendants are both unnecessary and dispensable. As no more than alleged joint tortfeasors, the Distributor Defendants are unnecessary parties as a matter of settled law. *Boggs v. Landmark 4 LLC*, No. 1:12 CV 614, 2012 WL 3485288, at *3 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 13, 2012) (“[T]he Supreme Court has held that, as a matter of law, joint tortfeasors are not necessary parties under Rule 19.” (citing *Temple v. Synthes Corp.*, 498 U.S. 5, 7-8 (1990)).

39. Moreover, just like the claims against the manufacturer and the non-diverse healthcare provider defendants in *Baxter*, Plaintiff’s claims and factual allegations against the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants are sufficiently distinct from those against the Distributor Defendants to merit severance. The claims against the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants involve alleged misrepresentations regarding the risks of opioid medications. (Compl. ¶¶ 6-18.) By contrast, Plaintiff’s claims against the Distributor Defendants focus exclusively on allegations that the Distributor Defendants negligently distributed opioid medications. (*Id.* ¶¶ 89-123.) Severance is thus particularly appropriate because “the claims ‘involve different legal standards and different factual allegations.’” *Kelly v. Aultman Physician Ctr.*, No. 5:13CV0994, 2013 WL

2358583, at *3 (N.D. Ohio May 29, 2013) (citing *DeGidio v. Centocor, Inc.*, No. 3:09CV721, 2009 WL 1867676, at *2 (N.D. Ohio July 8, 2009)).

40. Beyond Rule 19, the claims against the Distributor Defendants are also misjoined because they do not “aris[e] out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences” as the claims against the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants. Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(1)(A). In these circumstances, these two sets of claims cannot properly be joined together.

41. *Aramouni v. Cook Medical*, No. 1:15 CV 1116, 2015 WL 5661040 (N.D. Ohio Sept. 24, 2015), is readily distinguishable. There, the court found severance unnecessary in part because all claims arose from “the same basic operative facts” and severance would not promote “judicial and economic efficiency” absent the ability to consolidate with other federal lawsuits. *Id.* at *3. This case is entirely different. As described above, Plaintiff’s claims against the Distributor Defendants involve different operative facts, and severance could promote efficiency here, given that there is already one other similar suit pending in this District and another pending in the Southern District of Ohio. *See City of Lorain v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al.*, No. 1:17-cv-01639-DAP (N.D. Ohio) (motion to remand pending); *City of Dayton v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al.*, No. 3:17-cv-00229-TMR (S.D. Ohio) (same).

42. That Plaintiff asserts some causes of action against “all Defendants” changes nothing. Because the factual basis for Plaintiff’s claims against the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants (alleged misrepresentations), on the one hand, is separate and distinct from the factual basis giving rise to Plaintiff’s claims against the Distributor Defendants (alleged failure to prevent or reduce the distribution of opioid products or to report suspicious orders), severance is appropriate. *See Nelson v. Aim Advisors, Inc.*, No. 01-CV-0282-MJR, 2002 WL 442189, at *3 (S.D. Ill. Mar. 8, 2002) (“Although Plaintiffs’ claims against all Defendants are pled under the

same legal theory, it is only in this abstract sense that Plaintiffs' claims share anything in common . . . [and] does not mean that there are common issues of law and fact sufficient to satisfy Rule 20(a)."); *Smith v. Hendricks*, 140 F. Supp. 3d 66, 75-76 (D.D.C. 2015) (severing non-diverse healthcare-provider defendants even though the plaintiff asserted some of the same causes of action against both those defendants and the diverse manufacturer defendant because the "factual basis" for the claims against the manufacturer and the healthcare providers were distinct and arose out of different occurrences). And, as in *Baxter*, if Plaintiff truly wants to pursue claims against the Distributor Defendants, Plaintiff has an "adequate remedy . . . in state court." 614 F. Supp. 2d at 872.

2. The Distributor Defendants Are Also Fraudulently Misjoined

43. The citizenship of the Distributor Defendants alternatively should be ignored because the claims against them are fraudulently misjoined in this action. "Fraudulent misjoinder occurs when a plaintiff attempts to defeat removal by misjoining the unrelated claims of non-diverse party plaintiffs against a defendant, or . . . by misjoining the unrelated claims of a plaintiff against non-diverse party defendants." *Baxter*, 614 F. Supp. 2d at 874 (quoting *Tapscott v. MS Dealer Serv. Corp.*, 77 F.3d 1353, 1360 (11th Cir. 1996), abrogated on another ground in *Cohen v. Office Depot, Inc.*, 204 F.3d 1069 (11th Cir. 2000)). As explained above, Plaintiff's claims against the Manufacturer and Physician Defendants are separate and distinct from Plaintiff's claims against the Distributor Defendants, including Cardinal. There is no plausible basis for their inclusion in this lawsuit other than to defeat diversity.

44. Indeed, in opioid-related cases like this one, federal district courts recently relied on the fraudulent misjoinder doctrine to ignore the citizenship of non-diverse defendants and deny remand based on diversity jurisdiction. *See Cty. Comm'n of McDowell Cty. v. McKesson Corp.*,

No. 1:17-00946, 2017 WL 2843614, at *5 (S.D. W. Va. July 3, 2017) (attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**); *City of Huntington v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp.*, No. 3:17-01362, 2017 WL 3317300, at *4-5 (S.D. W. Va. Aug. 3, 2017) (attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**). In *McKesson Corp.*, the plaintiff filed suit in state court against diverse distributors of opioid products for allegedly “flood[ing] McDowell County with opioids well beyond what was necessary to address pain and other [legitimate] reasons,” and also against a non-diverse doctor for allegedly “provid[ing] written opioid prescriptions for patients, knowing that the drugs were likely to be abused, diverted or misused.” 2017 WL 2843614, at *1. The court found that these claims were fraudulently misjoined and accordingly denied remand because “plaintiff’s claims against the [distributors] and the claims against [the doctor]” lacked “common questions of law or fact” and were “separate and distinct.” *Id.* at *5. In *AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation*, the court reached the same conclusion for substantially the same reasons. 2017 WL 3317300, at *5 (claims against diverse and non-diverse defendants were “separate and distinct”).

45. To be sure, as the court in *Baxter* noted, the Sixth Circuit has not yet adopted the fraudulent misjoinder doctrine, and certain judges in the Northern District of Ohio have declined to apply the doctrine. *Baxter*, 614 F. Supp. 2d at 874; *Geffen v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 575 F. Supp. 2d 865, 871 (N.D. Ohio 2008); *Rodriguez v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP*, No. 1:08 GD 50327, 2008 WL 4683294, at *2 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 21, 2008).

46. Nevertheless, at least one other court within the Sixth Circuit has applied the doctrine. *Asher v. Minn. Mining & Mfg. Co.*, No. 04-CV-522, 2005 WL 1593941, at *7 (E.D. Ky. June 30, 2005) (adopting fraudulent misjoinder doctrine and articulating a standard that requires no “reasonable basis for finding the Plaintiff’s claims were properly joined”). Even if the Court

finds that the Distributor Defendants are not dispensable parties subject to severance, it should find the claims against them misjoined under the procedural misjoinder doctrine.

47. In sum, because Plaintiff is an Ohio citizen, and because none of the properly joined defendants are Ohio citizens, there is complete diversity of citizenship. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).

II. THE AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY EXCEEDS \$75,000

48. “[A] defendant’s notice of removal need include only a plausible allegation that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold.” *Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co., LLC v. Owens*, 135 S. Ct. 547, 554 (2014). “[W]hen a defendant seeks federal-court adjudication, the defendant’s amount-in-controversy allegation should be accepted when not contested by the plaintiff or questioned by the court.” *Id.* at 553. In determining whether the amount in controversy is satisfied, the Court may consider compensatory and statutory damages, as well as punitive damages. *Hayes v. Equitable Energy Res. Co.*, 266 F.3d 560, 572-73 (6th Cir. 2001).

49. Here, Plaintiff asserts that it has suffered “millions of dollars” in losses “[a]s a direct and foreseeable consequence of [Manufacturer] Defendants’ wrongful conduct.” (Compl. ¶ 51.) Plaintiff seeks “[c]ompensatory damages in an amount sufficient to . . . completely compensate Plaintiff for all damages” as well as treble damages and punitive damages. (*Id.* Prayer for Relief ¶¶ i–iii.) It is thus clear that the alleged amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

III. ALL OTHER REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS ARE SATISFIED

A. This Notice of Removal Is Timely

50. This Notice of Removal is timely filed. Endo accepted service of the Complaint on August 15, 2017. The last day to file the Notice of Removal is September 14, 2017.

28 U.S.C. § 1446(b)(1). Because Endo filed the Notice of Removal on September 6, 2017, removal is timely.

B. All Properly Joined And Served Defendants Consent to Removal

51. For purposes of removal based on diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), all defendants who have been properly joined and served must consent to removal.

52. The following properly joined and served Defendants consent to removal, as indicated by their signing below: Purdue Pharma L.P.; Purdue Pharma Inc.; The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc.; Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.; Cephalon, Inc.; Johnson & Johnson; Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. N/K/A Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc. N/K/A Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Watson Laboratories, Inc.; Actavis LLC; Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharma, Inc.; Dr. Russell Portenoy; Dr. Perry Fine; Dr. Scott Fishman; and Dr. Lynn Webster. *See City of Cleveland v. Ameriquest Mort. Sec., Inc.*, 615 F.3d 496, 501 (6th Cir. 2010) (co-defendants may consent to removal by filing a written consent).

53. The following properly joined Defendants have not been properly served, and thus their consent to removal is not required: Allergan plc f/k/a Actavis plc; and Allergan Finance LLC f/k/a Actavis, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. *See id.*

54. By filing this Notice of Removal, neither Endo nor any other defendant waives any defense that may be available to them and reserve all such defenses. If any question arises as to the propriety of the removal to this Court, Endo and the remaining properly joined defendants request the opportunity to present a brief and oral argument in support of their position that this case has been properly removed.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Endo hereby removes this action from the Court of Common Pleas, Cuyahoga County, to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

DATED: September 6, 2017

/s/ Tera N. Coleman

Carole S. Rendon (0070345)
Tera N. Coleman (0090544)
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
Key Tower
127 Public Square, Suite 2000
Cleveland, OH 44114-1214
(216) 696-0740
crendon@bakerlaw.com
tcoleman@bakerlaw.com

Ingo W. Sprie, Jr.*
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
250 West 55th Street
New York, NY 10019-9710
(212) 836-8000
Ingo.Sprie@apks.com

Sean Morris*
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
777 S. Figueroa Street
44th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 243-4000
Sean.Morris@apks.com

Attorneys for Defendants
ENDO HEALTH SOLUTIONS INC. and ENDO
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

** denotes national counsel who will seek pro hac
vice admission*

**WRITTEN CONSENT OF OTHER
PROPERLY JOINED DEFENDANTS**

Consent to removal on behalf of PURDUE
PHARMA L.P., PURDUE PHARMA INC., and
THE PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY, INC.:

/s/ Daniel J. Buckley

Daniel J. Buckley (3772)
VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR and PEASE LLP
301 East Fourth Street
Suite 3500, Great American Tower
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 723-4002
djbuckley@vorys.com

Patrick J. Fitzgerald*

R. Ryan Stoll*
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER &
FLOM LLP
4 Times Square
New York, NY 10036
(212) 735-3000
patrick.fitzgerald@skadden.com
ryan.stoll@skadden.com

-and-

155 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 407-0700

** denotes national counsel who will seek pro hac
vice admission*

Consent to removal on behalf of Defendants
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,
CEPHALON, INC., WATSON
LABORATORIES, INC., ACTAVIS LLC, and
ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC. F/K/A WATSON
PHARMA, INC.
(Appearance by local counsel pending):

/s/ Tinos Diamantatos

Tinos Diamantatos*
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
77 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601-5094
(312) 324-1145
tdiamantatos@morganlewis.com
** denotes national counsel who will seek pro hac vice admission*

J. Gordon Cooney, Jr.*
Steven A. Reed*
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 963-5000
gordon.cooney@morganlewis.com
steven.reed@morganlewis.com
** denotes national counsel who will seek pro hac vice admission*

Brian M. Ercole
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
200 S. Biscayne Blvd., Suite 5300
Miami, FL 33131-2339
brian.ercole@morganlewis.com
** denotes national counsel who will seek pro hac vice admission*

Consent to removal on behalf of Defendants
JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JANSSEN
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
ORTHO-MCNEIL-JANSSEN
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. N/K/A JANSSEN
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., and JANSSEN
PHARMACEUTICA, INC. N/K/A JANSSEN
PHARMACEUTICALS, Inc.
(Appearance by local counsel pending):

/s/ Charles C. Lifland
Charles C. Lifland*
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 S. Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 430-6000
clifland@omm.com
ckubota@omm.com
** denotes national counsel who will seek pro hac vice admission*

Consent to removal on behalf of Defendant
RUSSELL PORTENOY:

/s/ Jordan D. Rauch

O. Judson Scheaf, III (0040285)
Jordan D. Rauch (0093389)
HAHN LOESER & PARKS LLP
65 East State Street, Suite 1400
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 233-5190
JScheaf@hahnlaw.com
JRauch@hahnlaw.com

Consent to removal on behalf of Defendants
PERRY FINE, SCOTT FISHMAN, and LYNN
WEBSTER:

/s/ Gregory D. Brunton

Gregory D. Brunton (61722)
GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI
41 South High Street, Suite 240
Columbus, OH 43215
(614) 427-1845
gbrunton@grsm.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing is being served upon the following by regular United States mail, postage prepaid:

John R. Climaco
David M. Cuppage
Margaret M. Metzinger
CLIMACO, WILCOX, PECA, & GAROFOLI, C.O., L.P.A.
55 Public Square, Suite 1950
Cleveland, Ohio 44113
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Paul J. Napoli
Joseph L. Ciaccio
Salvatore C. Badala
NAPOLI SHKOLNIK, PLLC
400 Broadhollow Road — Suite 350
Melville, New York 11747
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Vincent I. Holzhall
STEPTOE & JOHNSON PLLC
41 South High St, Ste 2200
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Attorney for Defendant McKesson Corporation

Joseph F Murray
MURRAY MURPHY MOUL BASIL LLP
1114 Dublin Road
Columbus, OH 43215
Attorney for Defendant Cardinal Health, Inc.

AmerisourceBergen Corporation
1300 East Ninth St
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Dated: September 6, 2017

/s/ Tera N. Coleman
Attorney for Defendants