IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

IN RE: SMITH & NEPHEW BIRMINGHAM *
HIP RESURFACING (BHR) HIP
IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION

MDL No. 2775 Master Docket No. 1:17-md-2775

JUDGE CATHERINE C. BLAKE

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO THE BHR TRACK ACTIONS ONLY

ORDER

For the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

- 1. The defendant's motion to dismiss claims as time-barred (ECF No. 795) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part;
- 2. The defendant's motion is GRANTED as to the following cases: Stafford v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-18-708, Britt v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-3421, Aaron v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-3503, and Morgan v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-3377; Botkin v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-2606; Carrera v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-3544; Kinghorn et al. v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-2653; McLaughlin v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-2657; Aitcheson v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-18-252; Durdon et al. v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-2612; McCormick v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-2612; McCormick v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-2682.
- 3. The defendant's motion is **GRANTED** as to the claims raised, except the breach of warranty claims, in the following cases: *Maize v. Smith & Nephew*, CCB-17-2388; *Colon v. Smith & Nephew*, CCB-18-1080; *Cotten v. Smith & Nephew*, CCB-17-2542; *DeJohn v. Smith & Nephew*, CCB-17-2

Nephew, CCB-18-275; Leung et al. v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-2508; Parrish v. Smith & Nephew, CCB-17-2682.

- 4. The defendant's motion is **DENIED** without prejudice as to cases arising in California, and the plaintiffs are granted leave to amend;
- 5. The defendant's motion is **DENIED** as to all other cases; and

Sandary over the second of the second second second

6. The Clerk shall **SEND** a copy of this Order and the accompanying Memorandum to counsel of record.

Date

Catherine C. Blake
United States District Judge