

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF CLEVELAND COUNTY STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel., MIKE

HUNTER, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA

OKLAHOMA,

CLEVELAND COUNTY IS: ScJ-2017-816

Plaintiff,

FILED Honorable Thad Balkman

v.

SEP. 1/8 2018 Special Discovery Master William C. Hetherington, Jr.

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,

In the office of the Defendants. Court Clerk MARILYN WILLIAMS

PURDUE'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE

Contrary to the State's assertions, Purdue has complied and is actively complying with the Court's orders and in particular is actively engaged in producing documents pursuant to the rolling production method that the State proposed and endorsed. The State does not—and cannot—identify any discovery deadline that Purdue has exceeded or any order that it has violated. The State's motion should be denied.¹

Given the scope of the discovery at issue, Purdue moved early-on for the appointment of a Special Discovery Master, and the Court subsequently appointed Judge Hetherington to oversee the discovery process. Under the Special Discovery Master's supervision, the parties have engaged in rolling productions to expedite the collection and production of documents. The State expressly requested that the Special Discovery Master *not* incorporate deadlines as part of that

The State's motion was filed on September 11, 2018 and was not timely filed for the conference that was originally schedule for September 20, 2018. To accommodate the State's counsel's schedule, Purdue and the Defendants agreed to reschedule the conference for September 27, 2018, but that courtesy extension does not make the State's motion timely. Without waiving its objection to the untimeliness of the State's motion, to the extent that the Special Discovery Master intends to address the issues at the September 27th conference, Purdue provides its written response in this brief.

production process. T. Duck, April 19, 2018 Hearing Transcript at 19:15-16 ("[O]ur view is I think we don't want to have a strict rolling production schedule."). And as the process continued, even *after* the Court's rulings highlighted by the State in its motion, the State acknowledged that the rolling production system was progressing as intended. R. Whitten, May 17, 2018 Hearing Transcript at 58:2-4 ("[B]oth sides talked about doing rolling production. Both sides are doing it. I'm not complaining that they're rolling it out on documents.")

This has continued to be the case. Purdue has continued to steadily produce documents, and to date has produced over 18 million pages. Purdue has been working diligently to attend to the State's exceedingly broad discovery requests under the extremely compressed schedule and is producing volumes of documents as well as witnesses to testify on the State's identified corporate representative deposition topics. The State's complaint that a discrete subset of documents has not yet been produced ignores the full scope of Purdue's efforts and could easily have been resolved with a single phone call. And as the State even concedes, Purdue has already produced many of the documents that are the subject of its motion. State's Mot. at 3.

The State's contention that Purdue has stopped its rolling production of documents is demonstrably false. In fact, last week, Purdue produced 15 million pages of documents and expects to produce another 3 million pages within the next two weeks. Purdue's most recent production includes the Kentucky litigation documents referenced in the State's motion. State's Mot. at 4. Purdue's prior productions have also been substantive, including promotional materials, sales training materials, marketing documents, sales figures, Standard Operating Procedures, speaker training materials, and more. See, e.g. Exhibit A, June 4, 2018 production cover letter (identifying over 15 categories of documents produced to the State). These documents are just a part of the millions of pages of documents that the State has had access to for months. These

figures stand in stark contrast to the State's meager document production, which is largely comprised of documents that came from outside parties subpoenaed by the State. Indeed, after accounting for non-party productions, it is apparent that Oklahoma has produced only 145,000 pages of documents from its own agencies, in total.²

The State has repeatedly asserted that it is fully complying with Purdue's requests for production and does not object to them at all,³ and then simply fails to collect or produce the documents. When Purdue has moved to compel production, the State has agreed to produce the documents at issue,⁴ and then has simply failed to produce them. When Purdue filed further motions, and the Special Discovery Master again sustained the motion, the State still did not produce the documents. *See*, August 17, 2018 Purdue's Motion to Compel Production of Documents; August 31, 2018 Hearing Transcript at 50:18-19 ("Okay. I'm going to again rule that this motion to compel is sustained again.") (emphasis added). While the State has consistently represented that it is collecting documents from a wide swath of State entities, documents appear to have been collected from only ten departments, several of which appear to have made only a cursory attempt to identify relevant documents. For example:

Oklahoma Employee Group Insurance Division: 4 documents produced;

Although the State claimed to have produced "500,000 pages of documents" (T. Duck, August 31, 2018 Transcript at 47:6), that figure apparently includes "productions from third parties" (id. at 47:4).

See, e.g., B. Beckworth, April 19, 2018 Hearing Transcript at 19:23-20:14 ("Other than privilege, we're not standing on any objections. And the State is making a good faith effort to produce everything we believe is responsive to what they're asking for. [...] We are going to produce the documents. There's nothing to compel from us.").

See, e.g., April 25, 2018 Orders of Special Discovery Master, sustaining Purdue's motion to compel production of 10 separate categories of documents because "State's objection withdrawn during meet and confer."

 Oklahoma Department of Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services: 3 documents produced;

• Oklahoma Health Care Authority: 3 documents produced;

Oklahoma Department of Human Services: 47 documents produced;

Oklahoma State Department of Health: 86 documents produced; and

University of Oklahoma College of Pharmacy: 5 6 documents produced.

These figures are troubling. As but one example, the Oklahoma Employees Group Insurance Division oversees administration of healthcare benefits for every Oklahoma employee, inmate, and recipient of state-sponsored Medicaid. It is beyond belief that it has only four documents that are discoverable.

The discovery in this case has been largely one-sided. Purdue has diligently collected and produced documents in a rolling fashion, and will continue to do so. The State should do the same.

Purdue has not failed to comply with any order of the Court. Purdue's latest production of 15 million pages includes specific documents demanded by the State, and a substantial number of additional documents will be produced in the coming days. Purdue will continue to produce responsive documents as they are available, and the motion to show cause should therefore be denied.

Date: September 18, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

Sanford C. Coats, OBA No. 18268 Joshua D. Burns, OBA No. 32967

CROWE & DUNLEVY, P.C.

Braniff Building

324 N. Robinson Ave., Ste. 100

Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Tel: (405) 235-7700

The University of Oklahoma College of Pharmacy has a professional services contract with the Oklahoma Healthcare Authority to administer pharmacy benefits to Oklahoma Medicaid recipients.

Fax: (405) 272-5269 sandy.coats@crowedunlevy.com joshua.burns@crowedunlevy.com

Of Counsel:

Sheila Birnbaum Mark S. Cheffo Hayden A. Coleman Paul A. LaFata Jonathan S. Tam DECHERT, LLP Three Bryant Park 1095 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036 Tel: (212) 698-3500 Fax: (212) 698-3599 sheila.birnbaum@dechert.com mark.cheffo@dechert.com hayden.coleman@dechert.com paul.lafata@dechert.com jonathan.tam@dechert.com

Counsel for Purdue Pharma L.P., Purdue Pharma Inc., and The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 18th day of September 2018, I caused a true and correct copy of the following:

PURDUE'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE

to be served via email upon the counsel of record listed on the attached Service List.

SERVICE LIST

WHITTEN BURRAGE
Michael Burrage
Reggie Whitten
512 N. Broadway Avenue, Suite 300
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
mburrage@whittenburragelaw.com
rwhitten@whittenburragelaw.com
Counsel for Plaintiff the State of Oklahoma

NIX, PATTERSON & ROACH, LLP
Bradley E. Beckworth
Jeffrey J. Angelovich
Lloyd "Trey" Nolan Duck, III
Andrew Pate
Lisa Baldwin
512 N. Broadway Ave., Suite 200
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
bbeckworth@nixlaw.com
jangelovich@npraustin.com
tduck@nixlaw.com
dpate@nixlaw.com
lbaldwin@nixlaw.com
Counsel for Plaintiff the State of Oklahoma

ODOM, SPARKS & JONES PLLC
Benjamin H. Odom
John H. Sparks
HiPoint Office Building
2500 McGee Drive Ste. 140
Oklahoma City, OK 73072
odomb@odomsparks.com
sparksj@odomsparks.com
Counsel for Defendants Janssen Pharmaceuticals,
Inc., Johnson & Johnson, Janssen Pharmaceutica,
Inc. n/k/a/ Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and
Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
n/k/a/ Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

OKLAHOMA OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL Mike Hunter Abby Dillsaver Ethan A. Shaner 313 NE 21st St Oklahoma City, OK 73105 abby.dillsaver@oag.ok.gov ethan.shaner@oag.ok.gov Counsel for Plaintiff the State of Oklahoma

GLENN COFFEE & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
Glenn Coffee
915 N. Robinson Ave.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
gcoffee@glenncoffee.com
Counsel for Plaintiff the State of
Oklahoma

DECHERT, LLP Sheila Birnbaum Mark S. Cheffo Hayden A. Coleman Paul A. LaFata Jonathan S. Tam Three Bryant Park 1095 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036 sheila.birnbaum@dechert.com mark.cheffo@dechert.com hayden.coleman@dechert.com paul.lafata@dechert.com jonathan.tam@dechert.com Counsel for Purdue Pharma L.P., Purdue Pharma Inc., and The Purdue Frederick Company Inc.

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

Charles C. Lifland
Jennifer D. Cardelús
David K. Roberts
400 S. Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
clifland@omm.com
jcardelus@omm.com
droberts2@omm.com
Counsel for Defendants

Counsel for Defendants Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Johnson & Johnson, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc. n/k/a/ Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. n/k/a/ Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

GABLEGOTWALS

Robert G. McCampbell
Nicholas V. Merkley
One Leadership Square, 15th Fl.
211 North Robinson
Oklahoma City, OK 73102-7255
RMcCampbell@Gablelaw.com
NMerkley@Gablelaw.com
Attorneys for Defendants Cephalon, Inc., Teva
Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Watson Laboratories,
Inc., Actavis LLC, and Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a/
Watson Pharma, Inc.

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP Brian M. Ercole 200 S. Biscayne Blvd., Suite 5300 Miami, FL 33131 brian.ercole@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Defendants Cephalon, Inc., Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Watson Laboratories, Inc., Actavis LLC, and Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a/ Watson Pharma, Inc. O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
Stephen D. Brody
1625 Eye Street NW
Washington, DC 20006
sbrody@omm.com
Counsel for Defendants Janssen
Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Johnson &
Johnson, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc.
n/k/a/ Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
and Ortho-McNeil-Janssen
Pharmaceuticals, Inc. n/k/a/ Janssen
Pharmaceuticals, Inc. n/k/a/ Janssen

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Steven A. Reed
Harvey Bartle IV
Rebecca Hillyer
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921
steven.reed@morganlewis.com
harvey.bartle@morganlewis.com
rebecca.hillyer@morganlewis.com
Attorneys for Defendants Cephalon, Inc.,
Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.,
Watson Laboratories, Inc., Actavis LLC,
and Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a/ Watson
Pharma. Inc.



Joshua D. Burns Direct Tel: (405) 239-6681 Direct Fax: (405) 272-5274

joshua.burns@crowedunlevy.com

June 4, 2018

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Reggie Whitten Michael Burrage Whitten Burrage 512 North Broadway Avenue, Suite 300 Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Re: State of Oklahoma, ex rel., Mike Hunter, Attorney General of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.; District Court of Cleveland County, Oklahoma, Case No. CJ-2017-816

Dear Counsel:

On behalf of Defendants Purdue Pharma L.P., Purdue Pharma Inc., and The Purdue Frederick Company Inc. (together, "Purdue"), please find enclosed two secure hard drives containing documents responsive to Plaintiff's discovery demands as part of Purdue's rolling production of documents. The documents included in this production are Bates-numbered PPLP003274913 through PPLP003464167 and include the following:

- a. branded promotional materials;
- b. unbranded educational materials;
- c. sales bulletins provided to Purdue's former sales representatives;
- d. press releases from Purdue's Public Affairs Department dated between January 2006 and November 2016 concerning OxyContin®, Butrans®, and Hysingla ER®, or opioids generally;
- e. Contracts identified in Purdue's contract databases as reflecting an engagement of a health care professional to serve as a Purdue advisory board member, other consultant, or promotional speaker;
- f. agreements (including contracts and statements of work) with the key print and digital marketing agencies, market research agencies, marketing consultants, and medical writers identified by Purdue as having been used

EXHIBIT A

R PROFICE CORPOSATION

OKLAHOMA CITY · Braniff Building · 324 N. Robinson Ave., Ste. 100 · Öklahoma City, ÖK 73102 · T: 405.235.7700 · F: 405.239.6651 TULSA · 500 Kennedy Building · 321 S. Boston Ave. · Tulsa, OK 74103 · T: 918.592.9800 · F: 918.592.9801 DALLAS · Spaces McKinney Avenue · 1919 McKinney Ave., Ste. 100 · Dallas, TX 75201 · T: 214.603.5922 · F: 214.692.2801 croweduitlevy.com

- by Purdue in connection with its opioid medications during the period from 2006 through 2016;
- g. available annual, national IMS sales data reflecting the units and sales of Purdue and non-Purdue opioids for the time period since 1992;
- h. available IMS data since 1998 reflecting information available to Purdue regarding the number and strength of prescriptions of Purdue's opioid medications by prescribers in each State;
- i. information concerning all third-party payments between January 1, 2006, and November 7, 2016 attributable to various marketing-related cost centers at Purdue;
- j. information concerning grant payments;
- k. Standard Operating Procedures relating to Purdue's Abuse & Diversion Detection Program;
- files containing documentation of advisory boards related to opioids conducted by Purdue since 2008. These files include agendas for advisory boards, materials presented at advisory boards, and documents reflecting information learned from advisory boards;
- m. market research reports dated between January 1, 2006 and November 17, 2016;
- n. marketing plans, marketing strategy plans, and Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats ("SWOT") analyses dated between January 1, 2006 and November 17, 2016;
- o. Standard Operating Procedures for Purdue's Sales Force; and
- p. speaker program training materials related to OxyContin®, Butrans®, or Hysingla®, dated between January 1, 2010, and November 7, 2016.

Some of the documents in this production have been labeled Confidential or Highly Confidential.

Plaintiff's Counsel June 4, 2018 Page 3

Sincerely,

Joshua D. Burns For the Firm

JDB:sg

Enclosures

cc: VIA E-MAIL WITHOUT ENCL.

Abby Dillsaver, abby.dillsaver@oag.ok.gov
Ethan A. Shaner, ethan.shaner@oag.ok.gov
Bradley E. Beckworth, bbeckworth@nixlaw.com
Jeffrey J. Angelovich, jangelovich@nixlaw.com
Lloyd "Trey" Nolan Duck, III, tduck@nixlaw.com
Glenn Coffee, gcoffee@glenncoffee.com