

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

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------|
| I.C., a Minor, by MARIA PINO and | : | CIVIL ACTION |
| THOMAS CINTAO, Guardians, | : | |
| and MARIA PINO and THOMAS | : | NO. 13-3681 |
| CINTAO, Individually | : | |
| Plaintiffs, | : | |
| | : | |
| v. | : | |
| | : | |
| SMITHKLINE BEECHAM | : | |
| CORPORATION d/b/a | : | |
| GLAXOSMITHKLINE, | : | |
| Defendant | : | |

FILED
AUG 7 2013
MICHAEL E. KUNZ, Clerk
By _____ Dep. Clerk

MEMORANDUM

Before the court is Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand. As Plaintiffs' counsel has pointed out, there are nine cases having "the same exact remand issue." They are:

1. *Kenney v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3675 (Judge Mitchell S. Goldberg)
2. *Moore v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3676 (Judge Mitchell S. Goldberg)
3. *Cammarota v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3677 (Judge John R. Padova)
4. *Cintao v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3681 (Judge Ronald L. Buckwalter)
5. *Staley v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3684 (Judge Mary A. McLaughlin)
6. *Powell v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3693 (Judge Michael M. Baylson)
7. *Rader v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3694 (Judge C. Darnell Jones II)
8. *Nieman v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3695 (Judge Ronald L. Buckwalter)
9. *Guddeck v. GSK*, Civil Action No. 13-3696 (Judge Harvey Bartle III)

Recently, two judges of this court (Bartle and McLaughlin) have denied Plaintiffs' Motion by opinions and orders dated July 24, 2013 and July 26, 2013. Having reviewed those opinions as well as the briefs filed in this case, I too will deny the Motion to Remand.

AND NOW, this 7th day of August, 2013, upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Defendant's Response thereto, it is hereby **ORDERED** that said Motion (Docket No. 4) is **DENIED**.

BY THE COURT:



RONALD L. BUCKWALTER, S. J.