

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

X

**IN RE YASMIN AND YAZ (DROSPIRENONE)
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

**3:09-md-02100-DRH-PMF
MDL No. 2100**

This Document Relates to:

Judge David R. Herndon

Tara Montoya v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No.
3:10-cv-13482-DRH-PMF

Deborah Kirby v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No.
3:11-cv-12032-DRH-PMF

Tamia Baker v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No.
3:11-cv-12689-DRH-PMF

*Sara Cusick v. Bayer HealthCare
Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.* No. 3:11-cv-12817-
DRH-PMF

*Mary A. Mack v. Bayer HealthCare
Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.* No. 3:11-cv-13052-
DRH-PMF

Centrel Carter v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No.
3:11-cv-13075-DRH-PMF

*Kelley Pinkerton v. Bayer HealthCare
Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.* No. 3:11-cv-13116-
DRH-PMF

*Brianna Christine Lyles v. Bayer Corporation,
et al.* No. 3:11-cv-20007-DRH-PMF

*Phil Gallo, et al. v. Bayer HealthCare
Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.* No. 3:11-cv-20176-
DRH-PMF

Maria Calderon v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No. 3:12-cv-10294-DRH-PMF

Gay Hunt v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No. 3:12-cv-11024-DRH-PMF

Lauren Jessica Taylor v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No. 3:12-cv-11483-DRH-PMF

Jennifer Hamilton Anderson v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No. 3:12-cv-11570-DRH-PMF

Addie Chadwell v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No. 3:13-cv-10045-DRH-PMF

Delfina Collier v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No. 3:13-cv-10630-DRH-PMF

Felicia Rosa v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al. 3:13-cv-10706-DRH-PMF

Latika Threatt v. Bayer Corporation, et al. No. 3:13-cv-10791-DRH-PMF

Candyce Meeks v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al. No. 3:13-cv-10815-DRH-PMF

ORDER GRANTING DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE

HERNDON, District Judge:

This matter is before the Court on the Bayer Defendants' motions for an order dismissing the above captioned plaintiffs' claims without prejudice for failure to file an appearance as required by this Court's Order and Local Rule 83.1(g)(2).

In each of the above captioned cases, the Court granted a motion to withdraw filed by counsel. The orders granting leave to withdraw expressly provided that if the subject plaintiff (or her new counsel) failed to file a timely supplementary entry of appearance, the action would be subject to dismissal without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute or to comply with the orders of this Court. To date, and in violation of this Court's orders and Local Rule 83.1(g), the above captioned plaintiffs have not filed a supplementary appearance. In addition, none of the above captioned plaintiffs have responded to the instant motion to dismiss.

The plaintiffs must comply with the Local Rules and this Court's orders. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Accordingly, for the reasons stated herein, the claims of the above captioned plaintiffs are hereby dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 3rd day of March, 2015.

Digitally signed by
David R. Herndon
Date: 2015.03.03
09:50:13 -06'00'



United States District Court