

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA
CENTRAL DIVISION**

APPANOOSE COUNTY, CERRO GORDO COUNTY, CHEROKEE COUNTY, CHICKASAW COUNTY, EMMET COUNTY, FREMONT COUNTY, HANCOCK COUNTY, HENRY COUNTY, IDA COUNTY, JONES COUNTY, KEOKUK COUNTY, MADISON COUNTY, MUSCATINE COUNTY, OSCEOLA COUNTY, POCAHONTAS COUNTY, POWESHIEK COUNTY, WEBSTER COUNTY, WINNEBAGO COUNTY, and WRIGHT COUNTY,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ALLERGAN PLC f/k/a ACTAVIS PLC, ALLERGAN FINANCE LLC f/k/a ACTAVIS, INC. f/k/a WATSON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., ALLERGAN SALES, LLC, ALLERGAN USA, INC., WATSON LABORATORIES, INC., WARNER CHILCOTT COMPANY, LLC, ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC. f/k/a WATSON PHARMA, INC., ACTAVIS SOUTH ATLANTIC LLC, ACTAVIS ELIZABETH LLC, ACTAVIS MID ATLANTIC LLC, ACTAVIS TOTOWA LLC, ACTAVIS LLC, ACTAVIS KADIAN LLC, ACTAVIS LABORATORIES UT, INC. f/k/a WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.-SALT LAKE CITY, ACTAVIS LABORATORIES FL, INC. f/k/a WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.-FLORIDA, TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES LTD., CEPHALON, INC., JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., NORAMCO, INC., ORTHO-MCNEIL-JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA, INC., ENDO HEALTH SOLUTIONS INC., ENDO

Case No.: _____

COMPLAINT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

**This Complaint Relates to In Re National
Prescription Opiate Litigation, MDL No. 2804**

Case No. 17-md-2804

**Judge Dan Aaron Polster
N.D. Ohio (Eastern Division)**

PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., PAR
PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., PAR
PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES, INC. f/k/a
PAR PHARMACEUTICAL HOLDINGS, INC.,
ENDO INTERNATIONAL PLC, CARDINAL
HEALTH, INC., McKESSON CORPORATION,
AMERISOURCEBERGEN CORPORATION,
ANDA, INC., CVS HEALTH CORPORATION;
CVS INDIANA L.L.C.; CVS RX SERVICES,
INC.; CVS TN DISTRIBUTION, LLC; CVS
PHARMACY, INC.; OMNICARE
DISTRIBUTION CENTER LLC; OHIO CVS
STORES, LLC; WALGREEN CO.;
WALGREENS BOOTS ALLIANCE, INC.;
WALGREEN EASTERN CO., INC.; THE
KROGER CO.; RITE AID CORP.; RITE AID
HDQTRS. CORP.; ECKERD CORPORATION
D/B/A RITE AID LIVERPOOL DISTRIBUTION
CENTER; RITE AID OF OHIO, INC.; RITE AID
OF MARYLAND, INC.; WALMART INC.
F/K/A WAL-MART STORES, INC.; WAL-
MART STORES EAST, LP; WSE
MANAGEMENT, LLC; WSE INVESTMENT
LLC; WAL- MART STORES EAST, INC.; KVK
TECH, INC.; MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS,
INC.; SANDOZ, INC.; WEST-WARD
PHARMACEUTICALS CORP.; SUPERVALU,
INC. D/B/A ADVANTAGE LOGISTICS;
DAKOTA DRUG, INC.; HY-VEE, INC.;
PHARMACY BUYING ASSOCIATION, INC.;
and SAJ DISTRIBUTORS,

Defendants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	3
JURISDICTION AND VENUE	9
PARTIES	9
I. PLAINTIFFS	9
II. DEFENDANTS	11
A. Marketing Defendants.....	11
1. Actavis Entities	11
2. Cephalon Entities	17
3. Janssen Entities	18
4. Endo Entities	20
5. Allegations Against Additional Manufacturing Defendants.....	22
B. Distributor & Dispenser Defendants.....	25
1. Cardinal Health, Inc.	26
2. McKesson Corporation	26
3. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation.....	27
4. Anda, Inc.	27
5. CVS	27
6. Walgreens	28
7. Rite-Aid.....	30
8. Walmart.....	32
9. The Kroger Co.	32
10. H.D. Smith	33
11. Allegations Against Additional Distributor Defendants.....	33
C. Agency and Authority.....	36
FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS	37
I. Facts Common to All Claims.....	37
A. Opioids and Their Effects	37
B. The Resurgence of Opioid Use in the United States.....	41
1. The Sackler Family Integrated Advertising and Medicine	41
2. Purdue and the Development of OxyContin.....	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
3. Other Marketing Defendants Leapt at the Opioid Opportunity	47
C. Defendants' Conduct Created an Abatable Public Nuisance.....	50
D. The Marketing Defendants' Multi-Pronged Scheme to Change Prescriber Habits and Public Perception and Increase Demand for Opioids.....	51
1. The Marketing Defendants Promoted Multiple Falsehoods About Opioids.....	52
a. Falsehood #1: The risk of addiction from chronic opioid therapy is low	53
i. Purdue's misrepresentations regarding addiction risk.....	54
ii. Endo's misrepresentations regarding addiction risk.....	59
iii. Janssen's misrepresentations regarding addiction risk.....	61
iv. Cephalon's misrepresentations regarding addiction risk.....	62
v. Actavis's misrepresentations regarding addiction risk.....	63
vi. Mallinckrodt's misrepresentations regarding addiction risk.....	63
b. Falsehood #2: To the extent there is a risk of addiction, it can be easily identified and managed	65
c. Falsehood #3: Signs of addictive behavior are "pseudoaddiction," requiring more opioids	67
d. Falsehood #4: Opioid withdrawal can be avoided by tapering	70
e. Falsehood #5: Opioid doses can be increased without limit or greater risks.....	71
f. Falsehood #6: Long-term opioid use improves functioning.....	73
g. Falsehood #7: Alternative forms of pain relief pose greater risks than opioids	78
h. Falsehood #8: OxyContin provides twelve hours of pain relief.....	82
i. Falsehood #9: New formulations of certain opioids successfully deter abuse.....	87

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
i. Purdue’s deceptive marketing of reformulated OxyContin and Hysingla ER	88
ii. Endo’s deceptive marketing of reformulated Opana ER	91
iii. Other Marketing Defendants’ misrepresentations regarding abuse deterrence	96
2. The Marketing Defendants Disseminated Their Misleading Messages About Opioids Through Multiple Channels	97
a. The Marketing Defendants Directed Front Groups to Deceptively Promote Opioid Use	98
i. American Pain Foundation	100
ii. American Academy of Pain Medicine and the American Pain Society.....	103
iii. FSMB.....	106
iv. The Alliance for Patient Access.....	107
v. The U.S. Pain Foundation (“USPF”).....	111
vi. American Geriatrics Society (“AGS”).....	112
b. The Marketing Defendants Paid Key Opinion Leaders to Deceptively Promote Opioid Use	113
i. Dr. Russell Portenoy	115
ii. Dr. Lynn Webster.....	118
iii. Dr. Perry Fine.....	120
iv. Dr. Scott Fishman	123
c. The Marketing Defendants Disseminated Their Misrepresentations Through Continuing Medical Education Programs	124
d. The Marketing Defendants Used “Branded” Advertising to Promote their Products to Doctors and Consumers	127
e. The Marketing Defendants Used “Unbranded” Advertising To Promote Opioid Use For Chronic Pain Without FDA Review	128
f. The Marketing Defendants Funded, Edited And Distributed Publications That Supported Their Misrepresentations	129

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.