



## Supreme Court Extends *PLIVA* to Preempt Certain Design Defect Claims Against Generic Manufacturers

In *Mutual Pharm. Co., Inc. v. Bartlett*, No. 12-142 (U.S. June 24, 2013), the Supreme Court, in a 5–4 decision building on *PLIVA, Inc. v. Mensing*, 564 U. S. \_\_\_\_ (2011), held that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act preempted a state law design defect action against a generic drug manufacturer that turned on the adequacy of warnings.

The case involved the application of New Hampshire state law to a generic version of Clinoril, a popular non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), known as sulindac, manufactured by Mutual. In a very small number of patients, NSAIDs—including both sulindac and popular NSAIDs such as ibuprofen, naproxen and Cox2-inhibitors—have the serious side effect of causing two hypersensitivity skin reactions characterized by necrosis of the skin. At the time the plaintiff was prescribed sulindac, the drug’s label did not specifically refer to toxic epidermal necrolysis, but did warn that the drug could cause “severe skin reactions” and “[f]atalities.” Only the package insert indicated that one of those reactions is necrosis of the skin.

Soon after taking the drug, the plaintiff developed an acute case of toxic epidermal necrosis, causing about 65 percent of the surface of her body to burn off or turn into open wounds. She filed suit against Mutual, alleging that the drug was defectively designed. A defective warning claim was not in the cards because her prescribing physician admitted that he did not read the black box label or the package insert. A jury returned a \$21 million verdict in her favor.

New Hampshire requires manufacturers to ensure that the products they design, manufacture and sell are not “unreasonably dangerous.” The New Hampshire Supreme Court has recognized that this duty can be satisfied either by changing a drug’s design or its labeling. Mutual could not change the design, because a generic drug of the type at issue, by definition, is one that uses the same active ingredient as the branded product. Nor could Mutual change its labeling because, under federal law (the FDCA and *PLIVA*), Mutual’s labeling had to comport with the labeling of the branded product. The court of appeals

held, and plaintiff had argued, that Mutual had a third viable option, namely it could cease selling the drug.

The Supreme Court disagreed. Since it was impossible for Mutual and other similarly situated manufacturers to comply with both state and federal law, “New Hampshire’s warning-based design-defect cause of action is pre-empted with respect to FDA-approved drugs sold in interstate commerce.” The Court also brushed aside the court of appeal’s suggestion that Mutual could stop selling sulindac “as incompatible with our pre-emption jurisprudence. Our pre-emption cases presume that an actor seeking to satisfy both his federal- and state-law obligations is not required to cease acting altogether in order to avoid liability. Indeed, if the option of ceasing to act defeated a claim of impossibility, impossibility pre-emption would be ‘all but meaningless.’” The Court noted that “sympathy for respondent does not relieve us of the responsibility of following the law.”

Justice Alito wrote the majority opinion. Justices Breyer, Kagan, Sotomayor and Ginsburg dissented.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by **Robert P. Charrow**. Questions about this information can be directed to:

- > [Robert P. Charrow](mailto:charrowr@gtlaw.com) | 202.533.2396 | [charrowr@gtlaw.com](mailto:charrowr@gtlaw.com)
- > Or your [Greenberg Traurig](#) attorney

<b>Albany</b> 518.689.1400	<b>Denver</b> 303.572.6500	<b>New York</b> 212.801.9200	<b>Silicon Valley</b> 650.328.8500
<b>Amsterdam</b> + 31 20 301 7300	<b>Fort Lauderdale</b> 954.765.0500	<b>Orange County</b> 949.732.6500	<b>Tallahassee</b> 850.222.6891
<b>Atlanta</b> 678.553.2100	<b>Houston</b> 713.374.3500	<b>Orlando</b> 407.420.1000	<b>Tampa</b> 813.318.5700
<b>Austin</b> 512.320.7200	<b>Las Vegas</b> 702.792.3773	<b>Philadelphia</b> 215.988.7800	<b>Tel Aviv<sup>^</sup></b> +03.636.6000
<b>Boca Raton</b> 561.955.7600	<b>London*</b> +44 (0)203 349 8700	<b>Phoenix</b> 602.445.8000	<b>Tysons Corner</b> 703.749.1300
<b>Boston</b> 617.310.6000	<b>Los Angeles</b> 310.586.7700	<b>Sacramento</b> 916.442.1111	<b>Warsaw<sup>~</sup></b> +48 22 690 6100
<b>Chicago</b> 312.456.8400	<b>Mexico City+</b> +52 55 5029.0000	<b>San Francisco</b> 415.655.1300	<b>Washington, D.C.</b> 202.331.3100
<b>Dallas</b> 214.665.3600	<b>Miami</b> 305.579.0500	<b>Seoul<sup>∞</sup></b> 82-2-369-1000	<b>West Palm Beach</b> 561.650.7900
<b>Delaware</b> 302.661.7000	<b>New Jersey</b> 973.360.7900	<b>Shanghai</b> +86 21 6391 6633	<b>White Plains</b> 914.286.2900

*This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. \*Operates as Greenberg Traurig Maher LLP. \*\*Greenberg Traurig is not responsible for any legal or other services rendered by attorneys employed by the strategic alliance firms. +Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ∞Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. ^Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. ~Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2013 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*