



IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF CLEVELAND COUNTY
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, *ex rel.*,
MIKE HUNTER,
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA,

Plaintiff,

STATE OF OKLAHOMA } S.S.
CLEVELAND COUNTY }

FILED

JUN 11 2018

In the office of the
Court Clerk MARILYN WILLIAMS

v.

- (1) PURDUE PHARMA L.P.;
- (2) PURDUE PHARMA, INC.;
- (3) THE PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY;
- (4) TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS
USA, INC.;
- (5) CEPHALON, INC.;
- (6) JOHNSON & JOHNSON;
- (7) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (8) ORTHO-McNEIL-JANSSEN
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., n/k/a
JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (9) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA, INC.,
n/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS,
INC.;
- (10) ALLERGAN, PLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS PLC,
f/k/a ACTAVIS, INC., f/k/a WATSON
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (11) WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.;
- (12) ACTAVIS LLC; and
- (13) ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC.,
f/k/a WATSON PHARMA, INC.,

Case No. CJ-2017-816
Honorable Thad Balkman

William C. Hetherington
Special Discovery Master

Defendants.

**DEFENDANTS TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC. AND CEPHALON INC.'S
AND NON-PARTY JODI NODINE'S OBJECTION AND MOTION
TO QUASH DEPOSITION SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM**

Pursuant to Okla. Stat. tit. 12, §§ 2004.1(C) and 3226(C), Defendants Teva
Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. and Cephalon, Inc. (collectively "the Teva Defendants"), and non-
party Jodi Nodine, by and through their undersigned counsel, object and move this Court for an
Order quashing the Deposition Subpoena Duces Tecum ("Subpoena," attached hereto as Exhibit
A) issued to Jodi Nodine by counsel for the Plaintiff the State of Oklahoma ("Plaintiff" or "the

State”). In support of this Objection and Motion, the Teva Defendants and Ms. Nodine state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff filed suit against 13 opioid manufacturers for allegedly causing a “devastating opioid epidemic in Oklahoma.” Plaintiff’s Petition centers around the Defendants’ alleged false and deceptive marketing and promotion of opioid medicines. As it specifically relates to the Teva Defendants, which include Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (“Teva”) and Cephalon, Inc., the Petition claims that “Defendant Cephalon, through its sales force and other marketing, misrepresented Actiq and Fentora as being appropriate for non-cancer pain and non-opioid-tolerant individuals, despite their labels’ contrary warnings.” Petition ¶ 53.

Jodi Nodine is a former Teva employee who left the company in 2017. She worked as a sales representative for Teva in Oklahoma for approximately six years, always in the Respiratory division. *See* Affidavit of Jodi Nodine, attached hereto as Exhibit B. She never promoted, marketed or sold any Teva opioid medicines, including Actiq and Fentora, in the state of Oklahoma or anywhere else. *Id.* Nor did she ever work in any of division of Teva that sold, promoted or marketed an opioid product, including Actiq and Fentora. *See id.* What is more, Ms. Nodine has never had any involvement with the sale or marketing of any other opioid product sold by any other company. *Id.* Accordingly, Ms. Nodine does not have any information relevant to the claims or defenses in this action.

Nevertheless, on June 2, 2018, Ms. Nodine was served with a deposition subpoena and document request by the Plaintiff.¹ The Subpoena commands her to appear in Oklahoma City on

¹ On May 23, 2018, the State notified Defendants that it was serving deposition subpoenas on 41 individual witnesses, nine of whom are current or former Cephalon or Teva employees.

July 19, 2018 to testify as a witness in a deposition in the above-captioned case. In addition, the Subpoena also contains the following request for documents:

All documents and communications in your possession, custody, or control related to your employment at Teva/Cephalon, including but not limited to all training materials, sales call notes, marketing materials, and communications to or from Teva/Cephalon during and since your employment.

As Ms. Nodine has no knowledge of facts relevant to the claims and defenses in this case, the Subpoena clearly seeks irrelevant testimony and documents – information that is outside the scope of permissible discovery. Moreover, compliance with the Subpoena would place an unnecessary and unfair burden on Ms. Nodine, a non-party to this lawsuit. For these reasons, which are explained more fully below, the Court should quash the Subpoena and not require Ms. Nodine to sit for a deposition or produce any documents.

II. ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES

Pursuant to Okla. Stat. tit. 12, § 2004.1(C)(3)(1), on timely motion, this Court has the authority to quash a subpoena if it “subjects a person to undue burden,” or it “requires production of books, papers, documents or tangible things that fall outside the scope of discovery permitted by Section 3226 of this title.” Information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party is not permissible discovery. *See id.*, § 3226.

Ms. Nodine was served with a subpoena to testify in a matter that is indisputably about Defendants’ conduct as it relates to the sale, marketing, and promotion (and any other characterization of Defendants’ conduct as alleged in the Petition) of Defendants’ *opioid medicines*. As a Teva employee, Ms. Nodine never distributed, sold, marketed, or promoted (or had any involvement whatsoever) with Teva’s opioid medicines, and she provides a sworn statement to this effect in the attached affidavit. As such, Ms. Nodine would not be able to provide any testimony that is relevant to the present action. Taking Ms. Nodine’s deposition,


which would yield absolutely nothing relevant to the claims or defenses of any party in this lawsuit, would be a clear waste of the witness's and the parties' time. Requiring Ms. Nodine to testify when she has no germane (or even marginally relevant) knowledge, would clearly place an undue and wholly unwarranted burden on Ms. Nodine. Accordingly, the Court should exercise its authority under § 2004.1(C)(3)(1), and quash the Subpoena's directive for Ms. Nodine to appear for her deposition.

Similarly, the Subpoena's document request should also be quashed as seeking irrelevant information outside the scope of permissible discovery. The request is objectionable as written as it is wildly overbroad and contains no limitation that any of the requested items pertain to opioids or any other issue relevant to the action. As already discussed, Ms. Nodine would not have any documents relevant to the claims or defenses in the action as she had no involvement whatsoever with opioid medicines. Given that the document request is improperly overbroad as drafted and Ms. Nodine would not have any materials relevant to the action, the Subpoena's document request should also be quashed.

III. CONCLUSION

Because Ms. Nodine does not have any information relevant to the claims or defenses in the action she should not be required to bear the time, expense and burden that would be required to sit for a deposition or produce any documents. The Oklahoma discovery rules set forth a clear duty: "A party or an attorney responsible for the issuance and service of a subpoena shall take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to that subpoena." Okla. Stat. tit. 12, § 2004.1(C)(1). The Subpoena at issue should be quashed because it seeks wholly irrelevant information and it would impose an undue burden on Ms. Nodine.

Dated: June 11, 2018



Robert G. McCampbell, OBA No. 10390
Nicholas ("Nick") V. Merkley, OBA No. 20284
Ashley E. Quinn, OBA No. 33251
GABLEGOTWALS
One Leadership Square, 15th Fl.
211 North Robinson
Oklahoma City, OK 73102-7255
T: +1.405.235.3314
E-mail: RMcCampbell@Gablelaw.com
E-mail: NMerkley@Gablelaw.com
E-mail: AQuinn@Gablelaw.com

OF COUNSEL:

Steven A. Reed
Harvey Bartle IV
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921
T: +1.215.963.5000
E-mail: steven.reed@morganlewis.com
E-mail: harvey.bartle@morganlewis.com

Brian M. Ercole
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
200 S. Biscayne Blvd., Suite 5300
Miami, FL 33131
T: +1.305.415.3416
E-mail: brian.ercole@morganlewis.com

Attorneys for Non-party Ashley Rice Feliciano

*Attorneys for Defendants Cephalon, Inc., Teva
Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Watson Laboratories,
Inc., Actavis LLC, and Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a
Watson Pharma, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was emailed this 11th day of June

2018, to:

***Attorneys for
Plaintiff***

Mike Hunter, Attorney General
Abby Dillsaver, General Counsel
Ethan Shaner, Dep. Gen. Counsel
**ATTORNEY GENERAL'S
OFFICE**
313 N.E. 21st Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Bradley E. Beckworth
Jeffrey J. Angelovich
Lloyd N. Duck
Lisa Baldwin
NIX, PATTERSON & ROACH
512 N. Broadway Ave., Suite 200
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Michael Burrage
Reggie Whitten
WHITTEN BURRAGE
512 N. Broadway Ave., Suite 300
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Andrew G. Pate
NIX PATTERSON & ROACH
3600 N. Capital of Texas Hwy.
Suite 350
Austin, TX 78746

Glenn Coffee
**GLENN COFFEE &
ASSOCIATES**
915 N. Robinson Ave.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

***Attorneys for
Purdue Pharma,
LP,
Purdue Pharma,
Inc. and The
Purdue Frederick
Company***

Patrick Joseph Fitzgerald
R. Ryan Stoll
**SKADDEN ARPS SLATE
MEAGHER & FLOM**
155 N. Wacker Drive
Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606


Sheila L. Birnbaum
Mark S. Cheffo
Hayden Adam Coleman
Paul LaFata
DECHERT LLP
Three Bryant Park
1095 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

Sandy Coats
Cullen Sweeney
CROWE & DUNLEVY
324 N. Robinson Ave., Suite 100
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

*Attorneys for
Johnson &
Johnson, Janssen
Pharmaceutica,
Inc., N/K/A
Janssen
Pharmaceuticals,
Inc., and Ortho-
McNeil-Janssen
Pharmaceuticals,
Inc. N/K/A Janssen
Pharmaceuticals,
Inc.*

John Sparks
Ben Odom
ODOM SPARKS & JONES
2500 McGee Drive, Suite 140
Norman, OK 73072
Stephen D. Brody
O'MELVENY & MEYERS
1625 Eye Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

Charles C. Lifland
Jennifer D. Cardelus
O'MELVENY & MEYERS
400 S. Hope Street, 18th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071



Nicholas ("Nick") V. Merkle

GREETINGS:

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED on behalf of Plaintiff in the above-captioned case, to produce true and correct copies of the documents, electronically stored information, or objects in your possession, custody or control that are identified in Exhibit "A" attached hereto. You may comply by delivering the requested materials to Whitten Burrage, 512 N Broadway Ave Suite 300, Oklahoma City, OK 73102, at 1:00 p.m. on or before June 25, 2018.

In order to allow objections to the production of documents and things to be filed, you should not produce them until the date specified in this subpoena, and if an objection is filed, until the court rules on the objection.


YOU ARE ALSO HEREBY COMMANDED to appear at Whitten Burrage, 512 N Broadway Ave Suite 300, Oklahoma City, OK 73102, on July 19, 2018, at 1 p.m., to testify as a witness in a deposition noticed by the State of Oklahoma in the above-captioned case. The deposition shall be recorded by audio/visual means.

This subpoena is authorized pursuant to 12 O.S. § 2004.1 and all parties to this case are being given notice of the issuance of this subpoena. The provisions of 12 O.S. § 2004.1(C), relating to your protection as a person subject to a subpoena, and 12 O.S. § 2004.1(D) & (E), relating to your duty to respond to this subpoena and the potential consequences of not doing so, are attached.

Please direct inquiries regarding this subpoena to Brooke Hamilton: tel: (405) 516-7800; email: bhamilton@whittenburrage.com.

HEREOF FAIL NOT, UNDER PENALTY OF LAW.

Issued this 21st day of May, 2018.



Mike Hunter, OBA No. 4503
ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR
THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA
Abby Dillsaver, OBA No. 20675
GENERAL COUNSEL TO
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
Ethan A. Shaner, OBA No. 30916
DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL
313 N.E. 21st Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
Telephone: (405) 521-3921
Facsimile: (405) 521-6246
Emails: abby.dillsaver@oag.ok.gov
ethan.shaner@oag.ok.gov

Michael Burrage, OBA No. 1350
Reggie Whitten, OBA No. 9576
WHITTEN BURRAGE
512 N. Broadway Avenue, Suite 300
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 516-7800
Facsimile: (405) 516-7859
Emails: mburrage@whittenburrage.com
rwhitten@whittenburrage.com

Bradley E. Beckworth, OBA No. 19982
Jeffrey J. Angelovich, OBA No. 19981
NIX, PATTERSON & ROACH, LLP
512 N. Broadway Avenue, Suite 200
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 516-7800
Facsimile: (405) 516-7859
Emails: bbeckworth@nixlaw.com
jangelovich@npraustin.com

Glenn Coffee, OBA No. 14563
GLENN COFFEE & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
915 N. Robinson Ave.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 601-1616
Email: gcoffee@glenncoffee.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

Oklahoma Session Law, 2010 O.S.L. 50, 2004.1 (c), (d), (e)

SECTION 2. AMENDATORY 12 O.S. 2001, Section 2004.1, as last amended by Section 5, Chapter 12, O.S.L. 2007 (12 O.S. Supp. 2009, Section 2004.1), is amended to read as follows:

Section 2004.1.

C. PROTECTION OF PERSONS SUBJECT TO SUBPOENAS.

1. A party or an attorney responsible for the issuance and service of a subpoena shall take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to that subpoena. The court on behalf of which the subpoena was issued shall enforce this duty and impose upon the party or attorney, or both, in breach of this duty an appropriate sanction, which may include, but is not limited to, lost earnings and a reasonable attorney fee.

2. a. A person commanded to produce and permit inspection, copying, testing or sampling of designated books, papers, documents, electronically stored information or tangible things, or inspection of premises need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless commanded to appear for deposition, hearing or trial.

b. Subject to paragraph 2 of subsection D of this section, a person commanded to produce and permit inspection, copying, testing or sampling or any party may, within fourteen (14) days after service of the subpoena or before the time specified for compliance if such time is less than fourteen (14) days after service, serve written objection to inspection, copying, testing or sampling of any or all of the designated materials or of the premises, or to producing electronically stored information in the form or forms requested. An objection that all or a portion of the requested material will or should be withheld on a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial preparation materials shall be made within this time period and in accordance with subsection D of this section. If the objection is made by the witness, the witness shall serve the objection on all parties; if objection is made by a party, the party shall serve the objection on the witness and all other parties. If objection is made, the party serving the subpoena shall not be entitled to inspect, copy, test or sample the materials or inspect the premises except pursuant to an order of the court by which the subpoena was issued. For failure to object in a timely fashion, the court may assess reasonable costs and attorney fees or take any other action it deems proper; however, a privilege or the protection for trial preparation materials shall not be waived solely for a failure to timely object under this section. If objection has been made, the party serving the subpoena may, upon notice to the person commanded to produce, move at any time for an order to compel the production. Such an order to compel production shall protect any person who is not a party or an officer of a party from significant expense resulting from the inspection and copying commanded.

3. a. On timely motion, the court by which a subpoena was issued shall quash or modify the subpoena if it:

- (1) fails to allow reasonable time for compliance,
- (2) requires a person to travel to a place beyond the limits allowed under paragraph 3 of subsection A of this section,
- (3) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter and no exception or waiver applies,
- (4) subjects a person to undue burden, or
- (5) requires production of books, papers, documents or tangible things that fall outside the scope of discovery permitted by Section 3226 of this title.

b. If a subpoena:

- (1) requires disclosure of a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information, or
- (2) requires disclosure of an unretained expert's opinion or information not describing specific events or occurrences in dispute and resulting from the expert's study made not at the request of any party,

the court may, to protect a person subject to or affected by the subpoena, quash or modify the subpoena. However, if the party in whose behalf the subpoena is issued shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship and assures that the person to whom the subpoena is addressed will be reasonably compensated, the court may order appearance or production only upon specified conditions.

D. DUTIES IN RESPONDING TO SUBPOENA.

1. a. A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents shall produce them as they are kept in the usual course of business or shall organize and label them to correspond with the categories in the demand.

b. If a subpoena does not specify the form or forms for producing electronically stored information, a person responding to a subpoena shall produce the information in a form or forms in which the person ordinarily maintains it or in a form or forms that are reasonably usable.

c. A person responding to a subpoena is not required to produce the same electronically stored information in more than one form.

d. A person responding to a subpoena is not required to provide discovery of electronically stored information from sources that the person identifies as not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. If such showing is made, the court may order discovery from such sources if the requesting party shows good cause, considering the limitations of subparagraph c of

paragraph 2 of subsection B of Section 3226 of this title. The court may specify conditions for the discovery.

2. a. When information subject to a subpoena is withheld on a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial preparation materials, the claim shall be made expressly and shall be supported by a description of the nature of the documents, communications, or things not produced that is sufficient to enable the demanding party to contest the claim.

b. If information is produced in response to a subpoena that is subject to a claim or privilege or of protection as trial preparation material, the person making the claim may notify any party that received the information of the claim and the basis for such claim. After being notified, a party shall promptly return, sequester, or destroy the specified information and any copies the party has and may not use or disclose the information until the claim is resolved. A receiving party may promptly present the information to the court under seal for a determination of the claim. If the receiving party disclosed the information before being notified, such shall take reasonable steps to retrieve the information. The person who produced the information shall preserve the information until the claim is resolved. This mechanism is procedural only and does not alter the standards governing whether the information is privileged or subject to protection as trial preparation material or whether such privilege or protection has been waived.

E. CONTEMPT.

Failure by any person without adequate excuse to obey a subpoena served upon him or her may be deemed a contempt of the court from which the subpoena issued.

EXHIBIT "A"

DEFINITIONS

1. "Teva/Cephalon" means Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. and Cephalon, Inc. and any and all predecessors, merged entities, subsidiaries and affiliates, whether individuals, corporations, LLC's or partnerships. The term "affiliate" shall include any entity owned in whole or in part by Teva/Cephalon or any entity which owns Teva/Cephalon in whole or in part. The term "Teva/Cephalon," where appropriate, shall also include entities and individuals, such as officers, directors, sales representatives, medical liaisons, etc., who are employed by Teva/Cephalon or who provide services on behalf of Teva/Cephalon.
2. "Communication" means the transmission, exchange, or transfer of information in any form between two or more persons, including by telephone, facsimile, telegraph, telex, text message, letter, email, mobile messaging application, or other medium.
3. "Document" includes, but is not limited to, any electronic, written, printed, handwritten, graphic matter of any kind, or other medium upon which intelligence or information can be recorded or retrieved.

DOCUMENTS TO BE PRODUCED

1. All documents and communications in your possession, custody, or control related to your employment at Teva/Cephalon, including but not limited to all training materials, sales call notes, marketing materials, and communications to or from Teva/Cephalon during and since your employment.

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF CLEVELAND COUNTY
STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel.,
MIKE HUNTER,
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

- (1) PURDUE PHARMA L.P.;
- (2) PURDUE PHARMA, INC.;
- (3) THE PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY;
- (4) TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS
USA, INC.;
- (5) CEPHALON, INC.;
- (6) JOHNSON & JOHNSON;
- (7) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (8) ORTHO-McNEIL-JANSSEN
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., n/k/a
JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (9) JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA, INC.,
n/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS,
INC.;
- (10) ALLERGAN, PLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS PLC,
f/k/a ACTAVIS, INC., f/k/a WATSON
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.;
- (11) WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.;
- (12) ACTAVIS LLC; and
- (13) ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC.,
f/k/a WATSON PHARMA, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. CJ-2017-816
Honorable Thad Balkman

William C. Hetherington
Special Discovery Master


AFFIDAVIT

I, Jodi Nodine of lawful age, being first duly sworn, upon oath state as follows:

1. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein.
2. I am not presently an employee of Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. ("Teva"). I left Teva in 2017 after working there for approximately six years.
3. On June 2, 2018, I received a Deposition Subpoena Duces Tecum commanding me to testify as a witness and to produce documents in the above-captioned case.




4. I have never had any involvement with the sale or marketing of any opioid product, including Actiq and Fentora, while employed at Teva. During the entire time I worked for Teva, I was employed in a sales role within the Respiratory division. I never worked in any division of Teva that sold, promoted or marketed opioids, including Actiq and Fentora, in Oklahoma or anywhere else.
5. I have never had any involvement with the sale or marketing of any other opioid product sold by any other company in Oklahoma or anywhere else.



Jodi Nodine

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of June, 2018.



Notary Public

My Commission expires: 05/17/2020
My Commission Number: 12004722

RONALD J. STAMPS
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF OKLAHOMA
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MAY 17, 2020
COMMISSION # 12004722