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

PLUMBERS' LOCAL UNION NO. 690 HEALTH PLAN,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	No. 16-665
v.	:	
	:	
APOTEX CORP., et al.,	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 24th day of July, 2017, it is **ORDERED** that the Jurisdiction Defendant's motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction are resolved as follows:

Selling Defendants (who are not also Registration Defendants)

1. Defendant Apotex Corp.'s Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 193) is **GRANTED** as to Counts II and III (the "Non-Pennsylvania Claims") and **DENIED** as to Counts I, IV, V, VI, and VII (the "Pennsylvania Claims").

2. Defendant Actavis Elizabeth LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 194) is **GRANTED** as to Counts II and III (the "Non-Pennsylvania Claims") and **DENIED** as to Counts I, IV, V, VI, and VII (the "Pennsylvania Claims").

3. Defendant Actavis Totowa, LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 195) is **GRANTED** as to Counts II and III (the "Non-Pennsylvania Claims") and **DENIED** as to Counts I, IV, V, VI, and VII (the "Pennsylvania Claims").

4. Defendant Forest Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 196) is **GRANTED** as to Counts II and III (the "Non-Pennsylvania Claims") and **DENIED** as to Counts I, IV, V, VI, and VII (the "Pennsylvania Claims").

5. Defendant Actavis Kadian, LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 197) is **GRANTED** as to Counts II and III (the "Non-Pennsylvania Claims") and **DENIED** as to Counts I, IV, V, VI, and VII (the "Pennsylvania Claims").

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

6. Defendant Actavis Mid-Atlantic, LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 198) is **GRANTED** as to Counts II and III (the "Non-Pennsylvania Claims") and **DENIED** as to Counts I, IV, V, VI, and VII (the "Pennsylvania Claims").

7. Defendant Actavis South-Atlantic, LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 200) is **GRANTED** as to Counts II and III (the "Non-Pennsylvania Claims") and **DENIED** as to Counts I, IV, V, VI, and VII (the "Pennsylvania Claims").

8. Defendant Inwood Laboratories, Inc.'s Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 208) is **GRANTED** as to Counts II and III (the "Non-Pennsylvania Claims") and **DENIED** as to Counts I, IV, V, VI, and VII (the "Pennsylvania Claims").

Registration Defendants

9. Defendant Actavis Pharma, Inc.'s Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 202) is **DENIED**.[1]

10. Defendant Forest Laboratories LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 206) is **DENIED**.[2]

11. Defendant Watson Laboratories, Inc.'s Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 205) is **DENIED**.

Non-Selling Defendants

12. Defendant Andrx LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 209) is **GRANTED**.[3]

13. Defendant Allergan Finance LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 210) is **GRANTED**.[4]

---

[1] Actavis Pharma, Inc. was formerly known as Watson Pharma, Inc. Plaintiff named Watson Pharma, Inc. in the Amended Complaint instead of Actavis Pharma, Inc.

[2] Forest Laboratories, LLC was formerly known as Forest Laboratories, Inc. Plaintiff named Forest Laboratories, Inc. in the Amended Complaint instead of Forest Laboratories, LLC.

[3] Andrx LLC was formerly known as Andrx Corporation. Decl. Andrew S. Boyer ¶ 2, Ex. 2, ECF No. 209-2. Plaintiff mistakenly named Andrx Corporation in the Amended Complaint. Accordingly, Andrx Corporation is dismissed from the action because I have granted Andrx LLC's motion to dismiss.

[4] Allergan Finance LLC was formerly known as Actavis, Inc., which was formerly known as Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Decl. Martin Shindler ¶¶ 2, 3, ECF No. 232. Plaintiff mistakenly named Actavis, Inc. and Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. in the Amended Complaint. Accordingly, Actavis, Inc. and

14. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.'s Individual Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (ECF No. 211) is **GRANTED**.[5]

15. Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Limited's Individual Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (ECF No. 227) is **GRANTED**.[6]

It is further **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Jurisdictional Discovery (ECF No. 276) and Jurisdiction Defendants' Motion for Fees and Costs (ECF No. 281) are **DENIED**.

s/Anita B. Brody

_____

ANITA B. BRODY, J.

Copies **VIA ECF** on _____ to:

Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. are dismissed from the action because I have granted Allergan Finance LLC's motion to dismiss.

[5] Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and insufficient service of process. On May 23, 2017, I entered an Order that denied the portion of the motion to dismiss based on insufficient service of process, and reserved decision on the portion of the motion to dismiss based on lack of personal jurisdiction. ECF No. 286. I now grant dismissal based on the reserved portion of the motion.

[6] Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Limited filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and insufficient service of process. On May 23, 2017, I entered an Order that denied the portion of the motion to dismiss based on insufficient service of process, and reserved decision on the portion of the motion to dismiss based on lack of personal jurisdiction. ECF No. 286. I now grant dismissal based on the reserved portion of the motion.