

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS  
EASTERN DIVISION

TOWN OF MILLIS, MA,

Plaintiff

v.

AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG CORPORATION, CARDINAL HEALTH, INC., McKESSON CORPORATION, TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES, LTD., TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., CEPHALON, INC., JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. ORTHO-MCNEIL-JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. n/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICA INC. n/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., NORAMCO, INC., ENDO HEALTH SOLUTIONS INC., ENDO PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., PAR PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES, INC., ALLERGAN PLC f/k/a ACTAVIS PLC, ALLERGAN FINANCE LLC, f/k/a ACTAVIS INC, f/k/a WATSON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., WATSON LABORATORIES, INC., ACTAVIS LLC, ACTAVIS PHARMA, INC. f/k/a WATSON PHARMA, INC., CVS HEALTH CORPORATION, Individually and d/b/a CVS PHARMACY, INC., H. D. SMITH WHOLESALE DRUG CO., RITE AID CORPORATION, RITE AID DAYVILLE DISTRIBUTION CENTER, PJC DISTRIBUTOR COMPANY, INC., WALMART INC., WALMART STORES EAST, LP, Individually and d/b/a WAL-MART WAREHOUSE #46, WALGREEN BOOTS ALLIANCE, INC., Individually and d/b/a WALGREEN EASTERN CO. INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT**

Complaint for Public Nuisance;  
Violations of Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) 18 U.S.C. § 1961 *et seq.*; Violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1962 *et seq.*; Negligence and Negligent Misrepresentation;  
Civil Conspiracy; and Fraud and Fraudulent Misrepresentation; Violations of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 93A, Sections 2 and 11; and Aiding and Abetting

**JURY TRIAL DEMAND AND  
ENDORSED HEREON**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
JURISDICTION AND VENUE .....	7
PARTIES .....	8
I. PLAINTIFF.....	8
II. DEFENDANTS .....	9
A. Marketing Defendants.....	9
1. Actavis Entities.....	10
2. Cephalon Entities .....	11
3. Janssen Entities .....	12
4. Endo Entities.....	15
B. Distributor Defendants .....	17
1. Cardinal Health, Inc. ....	17
2. McKesson Corporation .....	18
3. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation.....	18
4. CVS Entities.....	19
5. Rite-Aid Entities .....	19
6. Walgreens Entities .....	20
7. Walmart Entities .....	21
8. H. D. Smith. ....	21
C. Agency and Authority .....	22
FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS .....	22
I. Facts Common to All Claims.....	22
A. Opioids and Their Effects .....	22
B. The Resurgence of Opioid Use in the United States.....	26
1. The Sackler Family Integrated Advertising and Medicine .....	26
2. Non-Defendant Co-Conspirator Purdue Developed and Aggressively Promoted OxyContin .....	28
3. The Marketing Defendants Leapt at the Opioid Opportunity .....	33
C. Defendants’ Conduct Created an Abatable Public Nuisance.....	36

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
D. The Marketing Defendants’ Multi-Pronged Scheme to Change Prescriber Habits and Public Perception and Increase Demand for Opioids .....	36
1. The Marketing Defendants Promoted Multiple Falsehoods About Opioids .....	38
a. Falsehood #1: The risk of addiction from chronic opioid therapy is low .....	39
i. Non-defendant co-conspirator Purdue’s misrepresentations regarding addiction risk .....	40
ii. Endo’s misrepresentations regarding addiction risk .....	46
iii. Janssen’s misrepresentations regarding addiction risk. ...	48
iv. Actavis’s misrepresentations regarding addiction risk. ...	50
v. Non-defendant co-conspirator Mallinckrodt’s misrepresentations regarding addiction risk .....	51
b. Falsehood #2: To the extent there is a risk of addiction, it can be easily identified and managed .....	53
c. Falsehood #3: Signs of addictive behavior are “pseudoaddiction,” requiring more opioids .....	56
d. Falsehood #4: Opioid withdrawal can be avoided by tapering ....	59
e. Falsehood #5: Opioid doses can be increased without limit or greater risks .....	60
f. Falsehood #6: Long-term opioid use improves functioning .....	62
g. Falsehood #7: Alternative forms of pain relief pose greater risks than opioids .....	68
h. Falsehood #8: OxyContin provides twelve hours of pain relief ..	71
i. Falsehood #9: New formulations of certain opioids successfully deter abuse .....	76
i. Non-defendant co-conspirator Purdue’s deceptive marketing of reformulated OxyContin and Hysingla ER ..	77
ii. Endo’s deceptive marketing of reformulated Opana ER ..	80
iii. Other Marketing Defendants’ misrepresentations regarding abuse deterrence .....	86
2. The Marketing Defendants Disseminated Their Misleading Messages About Opioids Through Multiple Channels .....	87

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

(continued)

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
a. The Marketing Defendants Directed Front Groups to Deceptively Promote Opioid Use.....	88
i. American Pain Foundation .....	90
ii. American Academy of Pain Medicine and the American Pain Society .....	93
iii. FSMB.....	96
iv. The Alliance for Patient Access.....	98
v. The U.S. Pain Foundation (“USPF”).....	102
vi. American Geriatrics Society (“AGS”).....	102
b. The Marketing Defendants Paid Key Opinion Leaders to Deceptively Promote Opioid Use .....	104
i. Dr. Russell Portenoy .....	106
ii. Dr. Lynn Webster.....	109
iii. Dr. Perry Fine.....	110
iv. Dr. Scott Fishman .....	113
c. The Marketing Defendants Disseminated Their Misrepresentations Through Continuing Medical Education Programs .....	115
d. The Marketing Defendants Used “Branded” Advertising to Promote Their Products to Doctors and Consumers.....	118
e. The Marketing Defendants Used “Unbranded” Advertising To Promote Opioid Use For Chronic Pain Without FDA Review.....	119
f. The Marketing Defendants Funded, Edited And Distributed Publications That Supported Their Misrepresentations.....	120
g. The Marketing Defendants Used Detailing To Directly Disseminate Their Misrepresentations To Prescribers .....	122
h. Marketing Defendants Used Speakers’ Bureaus and Programs to Spread Their Deceptive Messages .....	125
3. The Marketing Defendants Targeted Vulnerable Populations.....	126
4. Non-defendant Co-conspirator Insys Employed Fraudulent, Illegal, and Misleading Marketing Schemes to Promote Subsys.....	128
5. The Marketing Defendants’ Scheme Succeeded, Creating a Public Health Epidemic.....	133

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

(continued)

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
a. Marketing Defendants dramatically expanded opioid prescribing and use .....	133
b. Marketing Defendants' Dramatically Expanded Opioid Prescribing and Use.....	136
E. Defendants Throughout the Supply Chain Deliberately Disregarded Their Duties to Maintain Effective Controls and to Identify, Report, and Take Steps to Halt Suspicious Orders.....	137
1. All Defendants Have a Duty to Report Suspicious Orders and Not to Ship Those Orders Unless Due Diligence Disproves Their Suspicions .....	138
2. Defendants Were Aware of and Have Acknowledged Their Obligations to Prevent Diversion and to Report and Take Steps to Halt Suspicious Orders .....	144
3. Defendants Worked Together to Inflate the Quotas of Opioids They Could Distribute.....	147
4. Defendants Kept Careful Track of Prescribing Data and Knew About Suspicious Orders and Prescribers.....	155
5. Defendants Failed to Report Suspicious Orders or Otherwise Act to Prevent Diversion.....	163
6. Defendants Delayed a Response to the Opioid Crisis by Pretending to Cooperate with Law Enforcement .....	166
7. The National Retail Pharmacies Were on Notice of and Contributed to Illegal Diversion of Prescription Opioids .....	171
a. The National Retail Pharmacies Have a Duty to Prevent Diversion .....	172
b. Multiple Enforcement Actions against the National Retail Pharmacies Confirms their Compliance Failures .....	175
i. CVS.....	176
ii. Walgreens .....	179
iii. Rite Aid.....	181
F. The Opioids the Defendants Sold Migrated into Other Jurisdictions .....	183
G. Massachussets Specific Facts .....	188
1. Defendants Breached Their Duties in Massachusetts.....	188
2. The Devastating Effects of the Opioid Crisis in Massachusetts .....	194

# 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.