

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

ALASKA NATIVE TRIBAL HEALTH
CONSORTIUM;
ALEUTIAN PRIBILOF ISLANDS
ASSOCIATION, INC.;
BRISTOL BAY AREA HEALTH
CORPORATION;
KODIAK AREA NATIVE ASSOCIATION;
NORTON SOUND HEALTH
CORPORATION;
SOUTHEAST ALASKA REGIONAL
HEALTH CONSORTIUM,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MCKINSEY & COMPANY, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. _____

COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE	2
III. PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff Tribal Organizations	3
B. Defendant	17
IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS	17
A. The Corporate Integrity Agreement	17
B. McKinsey's Role Following the Corporate Integrity Agreement	18
1. The Sacklers seek to divert money to themselves.	18
2. McKinsey supplied Purdue with Granular Sales and Marketing Strategies and Remained Intimately Involved in Implementation.	19
C. Project Turbocharge	20
D. McKinsey Knew About the Dangers of Opioids and Acted to Maximize OxyContin Prescriptions Anyway	22
E. Purdue's 2020 Guilty Plea and McKinsey's Recent Statement	23
F. The Impact of the Opioid Crisis in Alaska	24
G. The Impact of Opioid Abuse, Addiction, and Diversion on American Indians and Alaska Natives	25
H. The Impact of McKinsey's Work with Opioid Manufacturers on Plaintiffs	28
I. Tolling of Statutes of Limitations	30
1. Equitable Estoppel and Fraudulent Concealment	30
2. McKinsey and Purdue Persisted in The Fraudulent Scheme Despite a Guilty Plea and Large Fine.	32
V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS PERTAINING TO CLAIMS UNDER THE RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS (RICO) ACT: THE OPIOID MARKETING ENTERPRISE	33
A. The Common Purpose and Scheme of the Opioid Marketing Enterprise	33
B. The Conduct of the Opioid Marketing Enterprise Violated Civil RICO	36
C. Pattern of Racketeering Activity	37
VI. CAUSES OF ACTION	41
A. Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), 18 U.S.C. § 1961, et. seq.	41

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
B. Negligence under Alaska Law	50
C. Public Nuisance under Alaska Law	52
D. Fraud under Alaska Law	55
E. Unfair Competition (Alaska Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Act AS § 45.50.471, et seq.).....	56
F. Civil Conspiracy under Alaska Law	58
G. Unjust Enrichment under Alaska Law	59
VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF	61
VIII. JURY DEMAND	62

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This case arises from the worst man-made epidemic in modern medical history—the misuse, abuse, and over-prescription of opioids. This crisis arose from the opioid manufacturers’ deliberately deceptive marketing strategy to expand opioid use.

2. McKinsey and Company, Inc. (“McKinsey” or “Defendant”), played an integral role in creating and deepening the opioid crisis.

3. In the years following Purdue Pharma L.P.’s (“Purdue”) 2007 guilty plea for misleadingly marketing OxyContin, McKinsey worked closely with Purdue to dramatically increase OxyContin sales to the benefit of McKinsey, Purdue, and the Sackler family, the wealthy family that has owned and controlled Purdue for decades. McKinsey specifically sought to maximize OxyContin sales by working around the requirements of the Corporate Integrity Agreement that Purdue entered as part of its guilty plea. McKinsey also performed related work for other manufacturers of opioids, including Johnson & Johnson. Through the conduct described in this Complaint, McKinsey participated in and helped orchestrate a broad scheme to deceptively market opioids.

4. McKinsey knew of the dangers of opioids and of Purdue’s prior misconduct, but nonetheless advised Purdue to improperly market and sell OxyContin, supplying granular sales and marketing strategies and remaining intimately involved throughout implementation of those strategies. McKinsey’s actions resulted in a surge in sales of OxyContin and other opioids that fueled and prolonged the opioid crisis.

5. As reported in the media, in a series of agreements, McKinsey recently settled opioid-related claims with 49 states, the District of Columbia, and five U.S. territories.

6. Plaintiffs are inter-tribal consortia and Tribal Organizations (“Plaintiffs”) responsible for providing healthcare services to the citizens of their constituent tribes in Alaska.

Native Americans have disproportionately borne the toll of the opioid crisis. Plaintiffs bring suit to hold McKinsey responsible for its role in that crisis, which has posed an existential threat to tribes and tribal communities.

7. Plaintiffs bring this action in their proprietary capacity and pursuant to their interests to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of their constituent tribes to stop the opioid epidemic in Alaska and to recover damages and seek other redress from harm caused by McKinsey's improper marketing practices and other unlawful conduct related to prescription opioids.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action because the Plaintiffs bring a federal cause of action that raises a federal question pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. The Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over the Plaintiffs' state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 because the state law claims are part of the same case or controversy.

9. This Court independently has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(2) because the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000 and the Defendant is not a citizen of the same state as the Plaintiffs.

10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over McKinsey because at all relevant times, McKinsey purposely availed itself of the privilege of doing business in the State of Ohio and in this District, including by engaging in the business of researching, designing, and implementing marketing and promoting strategies for various opioid manufacturers, including Purdue, in support of their sales and marketing of opioids in Ohio.

11. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(g) and 18 U.S.C. § 1965, and pursuant to paragraph 6(a) of Case Management Order 1, issued by this Court on April 11, 2018 in case number 1:17-CV-2804.

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.