UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: C.R. BARD, INC., PELVIC REPAIR SYSTEM PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Cherylene E. Grimsley v. Ernest C. Wynne, III, M.D., et al., D. Maryland, C.A. No. 8:13-00405)

MDL No. 2187

TRANSFER ORDER

Before the Panel: Pursuant to Panel Rule 7.1, plaintiff moves to vacate our order conditionally transferring this action (*Grimsley*) to MDL No. 2187. Defendant C.R. Bard, Inc. (Bard) opposes the motion to vacate.

After considering all argument of counsel, we find this action involves common questions of fact with the actions previously transferred to MDL No. 2187, and that transfer will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. Moreover, transfer is warranted for reasons set out in our order directing centralization. In that order, we held that the Southern District of West Virginia was an appropriate Section 1407 forum for actions sharing factual questions arising from alleged injuries from pelvic surgical mesh products manufactured by Bard and related entities. *See In re: Avaulta Pelvic Supports Sys. Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 746 F. Supp. 2d 1362 (J.P.M.L. 2010); Order Renaming Litigation, MDL No. 2187 (J.P.M.L. Feb. 13, 2012). This action involves injuries from implantation of a Bard pelvic surgical mesh product, and clearly falls within the MDL's ambit.

In support of the motion to vacate, plaintiff argues that *Grimsley* was improperly removed and plaintiff's motion to remand to state court is pending. The Panel often has held that jurisdictional issues do not present an impediment to transfer.¹ *See, e.g., In re: Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litig.*, 170 F. Supp. 2d 1346, 1347-48 (J.P.M.L. 2001).

¹ Moreover, under Panel Rule 2.1(d), the pendency of a conditional transfer order does not limit the pretrial jurisdiction of the court in which the subject action is pending. Between the date a remand or other motion is filed and the date the Panel finalizes transfer of the action to the MDL, a court wishing to rule upon that motion generally has adequate time to do so.

Case MDL No. 2187 Document 714 Filed 06/11/13 Page 2 of 2

-2-

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, this action is transferred to the Southern District of West Virginia and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Joseph R. Goodwin for inclusion in the coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

4 10h John G. Heyburn II Chairman

Kathryn H. Vratil Paul J. Barbadoro Charles R. Breyer W. Royal Furgeson, Jr. Marjorie O. Rendell Lewis A. Kaplan