

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

In re: FLONASE ANTITRUST LITIGATION,	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
	:	NO. 08-CV-3301
	:	
	:	
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	:	
Indirect Purchaser Actions	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this __26th__ day of September 2011, in considering Defendant’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 180), it is **ORDERED**:

- Defendant’s motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters’ monopolization and unjust enrichment claims under Arizona law is **DENIED**.
- Defendant’s motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters’ monopolization and unjust enrichment claims under Wisconsin law is **DENIED**.
- Defendant’s motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiffs AFL and IBEW’s unfair and deceptive trade practices claim under Florida law is **DENIED**.
- Defendant’s motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff IABORI’s monopolization and unfair and deceptive trade practices claims under North Carolina law is **GRANTED**.
- Defendant’s motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters’

monopolization and unjust enrichment claims under Iowa law is

GRANTED.

- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters' unfair and deceptive trade practices claim under Florida law is

GRANTED.

- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters' unfair and deceptive trade practices claim under Arizona law is

GRANTED.

s/Anita B. Brody

ANITA B. BRODY, J.

Copies **VIA ECF** on _____ to:

Copies **MAILED** on _____ to:

O