



Alabama Update

Thursday, November 03, 2011

Back in April, we put up a <u>post</u> complaining about <u>Weeks v. Wyeth</u>, 2011 WL 1216501 (M.D. Ala. March 31, 2011), one of the few courts anywhere not to dismiss a <u>Conte</u>-type non-manufacturer liability claim for failure to state a claim. Instead, contrary to five prior Alabama decisions (and literally scores of cases nationwide, <u>see</u> our branded in generic case <u>scorecard</u>), <u>Weeks</u> allowed a plaintiff who solely used a generic product (and only paid generic prices) to proceed with a pure foreseeability/fraud claim against the "brand name" manufacturer of a drug that the plaintiff never used.

Anyway, after restating all our gripes about <u>Conte-style non-manufacturer liability</u>, we closed that post with:

"We can only hope that appropriate appellate supervision - preferably by the Alabama Supreme Court - isn't long in coming."

We're pleased to tell you that this wish, at least, has come true. The defendant in <u>Weeks</u> (we're involved, so we can't say much) sought certification, and at the end of July the district court judge in <u>Weeks</u> granted the request to certify the question. Here's a <u>copy of that order</u>.

More importantly, On October 17, 2011, the Alabama Supreme Court accepted the certification. Here's a copy of the <u>high court's order</u>. Also, here's the language of the certified question, as the court accepted it:

"Under Alabama law, may a drug company be held liable for fraud or misrepresentation (by misstatement or omission), based on statements it made in connection with the manufacture or distribution of a brand-name drug, by a plaintiff claiming physical injury from a generic drug manufactured and distributed by a different company?"

As our <u>scorecard</u> indicates, while three federal appellate courts (<u>Foster</u> (4th), <u>Mensing</u> (8th - the part that the Supreme Court did not reverse), and <u>Smith</u> (6th)) have rejected expanding brand name liability along the lines that the plaintiffs seek in <u>Weeks</u> – no state high court has ever addressed this type of liability theory. <u>Weeks</u> will be the first.

We'll be rooting for a big D win, and we'll let you know if and when that happens.