

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

**IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION
OPIATE LITIGATION**

This document relates to:

*Broward County, Florida v. Purdue Pharma
L.P., et al.*, Case No. 18-OP-45332 (N.D.
Ohio);

*Cabell County Commission, West Virginia v.
AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.*, Case
No. 17-OP-45053 (N.D. Ohio);

*City of Cleveland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug
Corp., et al.*, Case No. 18-OP-45132 (N.D.
Ohio);

*County of Monroe, Michigan v. Purdue
Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 18-OP-45158
(N.D. Ohio);

*The City of Chicago, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma
L.P.*, Case No. 17-OP-45169 (N.D. Ohio);

*The County of Cuyahoga v. Purdue Pharma
L.P., et al.*, Case No. 17-OP-45004 (N.D.
Ohio); and

*The County of Summit, Ohio., et al., v. Purdue
Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 18-OP-45090
(N.D. Ohio).

MDL No. 2804

Case No. 1:17-md-2804

Judge Dan Aaron Polster

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS’
MOTION TO STRIKE AND AMENDED
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
AMENDED COMPLAINTS UNDER SEAL**

Plaintiffs move to Strike Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to file Amended Complaints Under Seal (ECF Doc. 253) and the corresponding Order granting said Motion (ECF Doc. 257) due to a

clerical error.¹ Plaintiffs have filed an Amended Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaints Under Seal in the following seven (7) cases:

1. *Broward County, Florida v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 18-OP-45332 (N.D. Ohio);
2. *Cabell County Commission, West Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.*, Case No. 17-OP-45053 (N.D. Ohio);
3. *City of Cleveland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.*, Case No. 18-OP-45132 (N.D. Ohio);
4. *County of Monroe, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 18-OP-45158 (N.D. Ohio);
5. *The City of Chicago, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, Case No. 17-OP-45169 (N.D. Ohio);
6. *The County of Cuyahoga v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 17-OP-45004 (N.D. Ohio); and
7. *The County of Summit, Ohio., et al., v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 18-OP-45090 (N.D. Ohio).

The Motion states that filing said Amended Complaints under seal is necessary to ensure compliance with the following Orders:

1. Case Management Order One, ECF Doc. 232 (hereinafter “CMO One”);
2. Protective Order Re: DEA’s ARCOS/DADS Database, ECF Doc. 167 (hereinafter “ARCOS Protective Order”); and
3. Amended Agreed Confidentiality Order, filed in *City of Chicago v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, Case No. 14-CV-04361, ECF Doc. 487 (N.D. Ill.) (hereinafter “City of Chicago Confidentiality Order”).

The Motion states that said Amended Complaints will contain information that is subject to Protective and Confidentiality Orders. Specifically, the Amended Complaints will contain:

¹ The correct Order from the *City of Chicago v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, Case No. 14-CV-04361, (N.D. Ill.) that relates to protected information contained within the Amended Complaints is the Amended Agreed Confidentiality Order (Case No. 14-CV-04361, ECF. **Doc 487** (N.D. Ill.)), not the Agreed Qualified Protective Order For Protected Health Information (Case No. 14-CV-04361, ECF. **Doc 386** (N.D. Ill.)).

1. Information designated CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER by the ARCOS Protective Order; and
2. Excerpts from documents produced in *The City of Chicago, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, Case No. 14-CV-04361 (N.D. Ill.), which are subject to the City of Chicago Confidentiality Order, which binds Plaintiffs in MDL 2804 pursuant to CMO One.

Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike and Amended Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaints

Under Seal is hereby **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Dan Aaron Polster

DAN AARON POLSTER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: April 25, 2018