BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: PARAGARD PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL DOCKET NO.: 2974 **NOTICE OF POTENTIAL TAG-ALONG ACTION**

In accordance to Rule 7.1(a) of the Rules of Procedure for the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, Plaintiff Monica Little writes to notify you of the potential tag-along action listed below and on the attached Schedule of Action:

- *Monica Little v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:26-cv-04017 , United States District Court for the District of New Jersey.

The following documents are attached as exhibits to this Notice:

- A Schedule of Actions is attached hereto as Exhibit 1;
- A Certificate of Service is attached hereto as Exhibit 2;
- The Little Docket Sheet and Complaint are attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

Dated: May 8, 2026

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

JAVERBAUM, WURGAFT, HICKS, KAHN WIKSTROM & SININS, PC

/s/ Michael A. Galpern

MICHAEL A. GALPERN, ESQUIRE
JAVERBAUM WURGAFT HICKS KAHN WIKSTROM & SININS, P.C.
1000 Haddonfield Berlin Road, Ste. 203
Voorhees, New Jersey 08043
Phone: 856-596-4100
Fax: 856-702-6640
Email: mgalpern@lawjw.com Attorney for Plaintiff Monica Little

FERRER, POIROT, WANSBROUGH, FELLER & DANIEL

/s/ Joseph Poirot

JOSEPH POIROT, ESQUIRE
CHRISTINA FELLER, ESQUIRE
FERRER POIROT WANSBROUGH FELLER & DANIEL
2603 Oak Lawn Ave. Suite 300
Dallas, TX 75219
Phone: 214-521-4412
Fax: 866-513-0115
Email: jpoirot@lawyerworks.com
cfeller@lawyerworks.com
To Be Admitted *Pro Hac Vice* Attorneys for Plaintiff Mya Laurencon

EXHIBIT 1

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: PARAGARD PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL DOCKET NO.: 2974 **SCHEDULE OF ACTIONS**

Caption	Court	Case Number	Judge
Monica Little v. TEVA Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.; TEVA Women's Health, Inc. d/b/a TEVA Women's Health, LLC; TEVA Pharmaceutical R & D, Inc.; TEVA Women's Health, LLC; The Cooper Companies, Inc. and Coopersurgical, Inc.	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey	2:26-cv-04017	Hon. Judge Esther Salas and Magistrate Judge Jessica S. Allen

JAVERBAUM, WURGAFT, HICKS, KAHN WIKSTROM & SININS, PC

/s/ Michael A. Galpern
MICHAEL A. GALPERN, ESQUIRE
JAVERBAUM WURGAFT HICKS KAHN WIKSTROM & SININS, P.C.
1000 Haddonfield Berlin Road, Ste. 203
Voorhees, New Jersey 08043
Phone: 856-596-4100
Fax: 856-702-6640
Email: mgalpern@lawjw.com Attorney for Plaintiff Monica Little

FERRER, POIROT, WANSBROUGH, FELLER & DANIEL

/s/ Joseph Poirot
JOSEPH POIROT, ESQUIRE
CHRISTINA FELLER, ESQUIRE
FERRER POIROT WANSBROUGH FELLER & DANIEL
2603 Oak Lawn Ave. Suite 300
Dallas, TX 75219
Phone: 214-521-4412
Fax: 866-513-0115
Email: jpoirot@lawyerworks.com
cfeller@lawyerworks.com
To Be Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
Attorneys for Plaintiff Mya Laurencon

EXHIBIT 2

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: PARAGARD PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL DOCKET NO.: 2974
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 8th day of May, 2026, I, Michael A. Galpern, Esquire, served the foregoing Notice of Potential Tag-Along Action of Plaintiff Monica Little, by email addressed to:

Christopher D. Morris, Esquire
Butler Snow LLP
1020 Highland Colony Parkway
Suite 1400
Ridgeland, MS 39157
chris.morris@butlersnow.com
Counsel for Defendants,
The Cooper Companies, Inc.
and Coopersurgical, Inc.

Christopher D. Morris, Esquire
Butler Snow LLP
1020 Highland Colony Parkway
Suite 1400
Ridgeland, MS 39157
chris.morris@butlersnow.com
Counsel for Defendants,
TEVA Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.;
TEVA Pharmaceutical R & D, Inc.;
TEVA Women's Health, LLC

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

JAVERBAUM, WURGAFT, HICKS, KAHN WIKSTROM & SININS, PC

/s/ Michael A. Galpern

MICHAEL A. GALPERN, ESQUIRE
JAVERBAUM WURGAFT HICKS KAHN WIKSTROM & SININS, P.C.
1000 Haddonfield Berlin Road, Ste. 203
Voorhees, New Jersey 08043
Phone: 856-596-4100
Fax: 856-702-6640
Email: mgalpern@lawjw.com Attorney for Plaintiff Monica Little

FERRER, POIROT, WANSBROUGH, FELLER & DANIEL

/s/ Joseph Poirot

JOSEPH POIROT, ESQUIRE
CHRISTINA FELLER, ESQUIRE
FERRER POIROT WANSBROUGH FELLER & DANIEL
2603 Oak Lawn Ave. Suite 300
Dallas, TX 75219
Phone: 214-521-4412
Fax: 866-513-0115
Email: jpoirot@lawyerworks.com
cfeller@lawyerworks.com
To Be Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
Attorneys for Plaintiff Mya Laurencon

EXHIBIT 3

U.S. District Court
District of New Jersey [LIVE] (Newark)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:26-cv-04017-ES-JSA

LITTLE v. TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA INC et al
Assigned to: Judge Esther Salas
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Jessica S. Allen
Cause: 28:1332 Diversity-Personal Injury

Date Filed: 04/16/2026
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 367 Personal Injury: Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability
Jurisdiction: Diversity

Plaintiff

MONICA LITTLE

represented by **MICHAEL A. GALPERN**
JAVERBAUM WURGAFT HICKS KAHN WIKSTROM &SININS
Laurel Oak Corporate Center
1000 Haddonfield-Berlin Road
Suite 203
Voorhees, NJ 08043
856.596.4100
Fax: 856.702.6640
Email: mgalpern@lawjw.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

Defendant

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA INC

Defendant

TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, INC.
doing business as
TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, LLC

Defendant

TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL R & D, INC.

Defendant

TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, LLC

Defendant

THE COOPER COMPANIES, INC.

Defendant

COOPERSURGICAL, INC.

Date Filed	#	Docket Text

04/16/2026	1	COMPLAINT against COOPERSURGICAL, INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL R & D, INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA INC, TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, INC. D/B/A TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, LLC, TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, LLC, THE COOPER COMPANIES, INC. (Filing and Admin fee $ 405 receipt number ANJDC-17315776) with JURY DEMAND, filed by MONICA LITTLE. (Attachments: # 1 Civil Cover Sheet Civil Coversheet)(GALPERN, MICHAEL) (Entered: 04/16/2026)
04/16/2026		Case assigned to Judge Esther Salas and Magistrate Judge Jessica S. Allen. (tjg,) (Entered: 04/16/2026)
04/16/2026		CLERK'S QUALITY CONTROL MESSAGE - Please be advised, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 7.1(a)(2), unless the Court orders otherwise, in any action filed or removed to this Court, in which jurisdiction is based upon diversity under 28 U.S.C. 1332(a), a party or intervenor must file a disclosure statement naming and identifying the citizenship of every individual or entity whose citizenship is attributed to that party or intervenor. A party, intervenor or proposed intervenor must file the disclosure statement with its first appearance, pleading, petition, motion, response, or other request addressed to the Court. Click here to complete the Diversity Disclosure Statement, once complete, file it using the event Diversity Disclosure Statement. (adc,) (Entered: 04/16/2026)
04/16/2026	2	SUMMONS ISSUED as to COOPERSURGICAL, INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL R & D, INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA INC, TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, INC., TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, LLC, THE COOPER COMPANIES, INC. Attached is the official court Summons, please fill out Defendant and Plaintiffs attorney information and serve. (adc,) (Entered: 04/16/2026)

PACER Service Center

Transaction Receipt

05/08/2026 16:00:32

PACER Login:	Mgalpern	**Client Code:**	Paragard
Description:	Docket Report	**Search Criteria:**	2:26-cv-04017-ES-JSA Start date: 1/1/1980 End date: 5/8/2026
Billable Pages:	2	**Cost:**	0.20

JAVERBAUM, WURGAFT, HICKS, KAHN WIKSTROM & SININS, PC
Laurel Oak Corporate Center
1000 Haddonfield-Berlin Road, Suite 203
Voorhees, New Jersey 08043
(856) 596-4100
(856) 702-6640 – Telefax
Attorney for Plaintiff
By: **Michael A. Galpern, Esquire/** Attorney ID 02903-1988

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

MONICA LITTLE Plaintiff, v. TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.; TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, INC. d/b/a TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, LLC; TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL R & D, INC.; TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, LLC; THE COOPER COMPANIES, INC; and COOPERSURGICAL, INC., Defendants.	Case No.: **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

COMES NOW Plaintiff, Monica Little, by and through her counsel, file this Complaint against Defendants Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Teva Women's Health, Inc., doing business as Teva Women's Health, LLC, Teva Pharmaceutical R&D, Inc.; Teva Women's Health, LLC, The Cooper Companies, Inc., and Cooper Surgical, Inc. (collectively hereinafter "Defendants"), both jointly and severally, as the companies and/or successors in interest to the companies that designed, developed, manufactured, tested, labeled, packaged, distributed, marketed and/or sold ParaGard Intrauterine medical product that was implanted into Plaintiff, and throughout the United

States. Plaintiff incorporated by reference the complete Second Amended Master Complaint filed in MDL DOCKET NO. 2974 on or about April 19, 2021. Without waiving any claims as set forth in the Master Complaint, Plaintiff alleges and states as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is an action for damages relating to the Defendants' design, manufacture, surveillance, sale, marketing, advertising, promotion, labeling, packaging, and distribution of ParaGard Intrauterine medical product (hereinafter "ParaGard IUD").

2. ParaGard IUD is an intrauterine product, however, it is regulated as a drug. It is placed into the uterus to prevent conception.

3. ParaGard IUD has a propensity to break at the arms upon explant resulting in serious injuries.

4. Plaintiff used ParaGard IUD, and as a result suffered injuries.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

5. Plaintiff, Monica Little, ("Plaintiff"), by and through Plaintiffs' attorneys, Javerbaum Wurgaft Hicks Kahn Wikstrom & Sinins, P.C. and Law Offices of Ferrer, Poirot, Wansbrough Feller & Daniel bring this action for personal injuries suffered as a result of using the defective and dangerous ParaGard IUD.

6. ParaGard IUD is prescribed to prevent conception, and at all times relevant hereto, were manufactured, designed, tested, packaged, labeled, marketed, advertised, promoted, distributed, and sold by Defendants. On information and belief, Plaintiff used ParaGard IUD resulting in injuries.

PARTIES

7. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff, Monica Little, was an individual, citizen, and resident of Louisianna. (she now lives in AR but implant, removal and surgeries in LA)

8. Plaintiff, Monica Little, was implanted with ParaGard IUD on or about December 01, 2003 by an unknown physician at Catahoula Parish Health Unit 200 Third Street, Jonesville, LA 71343. An unsuccessful removal was attempted on or about November 18, 2014, by an unknown medical provider at Catahoula Parish Health Unit, 200 Third Street, Jonesville, LA 71343, resulting in injuries to the plaintiff. When the IUD was removed, one arm of the "T" broke off and remained in the uterus. Plaintiff responded to the Rapides Regional Medical Center Emergency Room, 211 4th Street, Alexandria, LA 71301, on or about November 18, 2014 with severe and sharp pelvic pain. A transvaginal ultrasound report provided an impression of a retained IUD in the lower uterine region. Attempts by ER physician, Elaine Kao, to remove the fragment with Serat foreceps were unsuccessful. The fragment was palpated at posterior lower uterine/cervical region. Plaintiff returned to Rapides Regional Medical Center, 211 4th Street, Alexandria, LA 71301, on or about November 19, 2014 for a hysteroscopy IUD removal by Dr. Jonahtan May. According to the pathology report the removed specimen consisted of a cylindrical piece of white plastic with jagged edge measuring 1.5 cm in length.

9. Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (hereinafter "Teva Pharmaceuticals" or "Teva USA") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Parsippany, New Jersey. At times relevant to this action, Teva USA designed, developed, manufactured, and marketed ParaGard IUD at issue. At times relevant to this action, Teva USA communicated with the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration

(hereinafter "FDA") regarding the sale, use, and safety concerns related to ParaGard IUDs, which includes managing product recalls, investigating adverse events from ParaGard IUD users, and performing mandatory reporting to FDA regarding ParaGard IUD.

10. At times relevant to this action, Teva USA was involved in regulatory communications, and medical communications, including but not limited to communications with physicians, doctors, the FDA and other medical personnel, which led to activities giving rise to failure to warn, negligence, gross negligence, common law fraud, negligent misrepresentation, breach of warranty, and a violation of consumer protection laws.

11. Defendant Teva Women's Health, Inc., is a Delaware corporation with headquarters located at 425 Privet Rd., in Horsham, Pennsylvania and is and/or was a wholly owned subsidiary of Teva USA, and/or operated as a successor-in-interest to Duramed Pharmaceuticals, Inc., a division of Barr Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and/or assumed Duramed Pharmaceuticals, Inc., a division of Barr Pharmaceuticals, Inc., in a name change after its acquisition by Teva USA. Teva Women's Health, Inc. converted into Teva Women's Health, LLC in 2017 and continues to operate as Teva Women's Health, LLC. At times relevant to this action, Teva Women's Health, Inc. designed, developed, manufactured, and marketed ParaGard IUD at issue.

12. Defendant Teva Women's Health, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company with headquarters located at 425 Privet Rd., in Horsham, Pennsylvania and is and/or was a wholly owned subsidiary of Defendants Teva USA. Teva Women's Health's sole member is Barr Pharmaceuticals, LLC, formed under Delaware law with its principal place of business in New Jersey, and the sole member of Barr Pharmaceuticals, LLC, is Teva USA. For diversity purposes, TWH, LLC, is a citizen of Delaware and New Jersey. Teva Women's Health, LLC is the product

of an entity conversion pursuant to Del. Code Ann. Tit. 8, 266. Teva Women's Health, Inc., converted into Teva Women's Health, LLC and continues to operate as a limited liability company instead of an incorporation (Teva Women's Health, LLC formerly known as Teva Women's Health, Inc. collectively hereinafter "Teva Women's Health").

13. Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals R&D, Inc. ("Teva R&D") is a parent company of Teva LLC and is a citizen of New Jersey and Delaware. Teva R&D is a Delaware Corporation with headquarters located at 41 Moore Road in Malvern, Pennsylvania. For diversity purposes, Teva R&D is a citizen of Pennsylvania and Delaware.

14. Accordingly, Duramed Pharmaceuticals, Inc., a division of Barr Pharmaceuticals, Inc., d/b/a Teva Women's Health Inc., (hereinafter "Duramed"), acquired FEI Women's Health in 2005 wherein the asset of ParaGard IUD was acquired in the deal. Duramed was acquired by Teva USA in 2008 wherein its name was changed to Teva Women's Health, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Teva USA (Defendants Teva USA and Teva Women's Health collectively hereinafter "Teva Defendants").

15. Defendant The Cooper Companies, Inc., (hereinafter "Cooper Companies") is a Delaware corporation with headquarters at 6140 Stoneridge Mall Rd., in Pleasanton, California. Cooper Companies purchased assets and global rights and business of ParaGard IUD in September 2017 for $1.1 Billion, including their manufacturing facility in Buffalo, New York. Cooper Companies is the parent company of Cooper Surgical.

16. Defendant Cooper Surgical, Inc., (hereinafter "Cooper Surgical") is a Delaware corporation with headquarters at 95 Corporate Drive in Trumbull, Connecticut, and a subsidiary of Defendant Cooper Companies (Defendants Cooper Companies and Cooper Surgical collectively hereinafter "Cooper Defendants").

17. At all times relevant hereto and alleged herein, the Defendants conducted and continues to conduct substantial business within the state of New Jersey, and within the District of New Jersey.

18. At times relevant hereto and alleged herein, the Defendants conducted and continues to regularly conduct substantial business within the State of New Jersey, which included and continues to include, the research, safety surveillance, manufacture, sale, distribution and marketing of ParaGard IUD, which is distributed through the stream of interstate commerce into the State of New Jersey, and within the District of New Jersey.

19. At all relevant times, each Defendant acted in all aspects as the agent and alter ego of each other.

20. The Cooper Defendants are liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

21. Upon reasonable belief, Duramed became Teva Women's Health, Inc., through a name change in 2008. Teva Women's Health, Inc., then became Teva Women's Health, LLC through a conversion in 2017. Teva Women's Health, LLC then sold all of its assets including ParaGard IUD to the Cooper Defendants in 2017. Teva Women's Health, LLC became a *holdings* company with no tangible assets.

22. The Cooper Defendants knew or should have known that the transfer and conversion of Teva Women's Health, Inc, was intended to thwart potential creditors from having a claim against Teva Women's Heath, Inc. or Teva Women's Health, LLC. Therefore, the Cooper Defendants are liable pursuant to the Federal Consumer Protection Acts and under New Jersey

statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

23. The liability of these companies has passed on through various business instruments and now lies with both the Teva Defendants and the Cooper Defendants.

24. At times relevant and material hereto, Defendants were engaged in the business of, or were successors-in-interest to entities engaged in the business of, researching, developing, designing, formulating, licensing, manufacturing, testing, producing, processing, assembling, packaging, inspecting, distributing, selling, labeling, monitoring, marketing, promoting, advertising, and/or introducing into interstate commerce throughout the United States, and in the State of New Jersey, and within the District of New Jersey, either directly or indirectly, through third-parties, subsidiaries and/or related entities, ParaGard IUD, a device/drug used in the prevention of pregnancy, implanted in patients throughout the United States, including Plaintiff.

25. At all times alleged herein, Defendants were authorized to conduct or engage in business within the State of New Jersey and supplied ParaGard IUD within the State of New Jersey and the District of New Jersey. Defendants received financial benefit and profits as a result of designing, manufacturing, marketing, advertising, selling and distributing ParaGard IUD within the State of New Jersey, and the District of New Jersey.

26. The combined acts and/or omissions of each Defendant resulted in indivisible injuries to Plaintiff. Each of the above-named Defendants is a joint tortfeasor and/or co-conspirator and is jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for the negligent acts and omissions alleged herein. Each of the above-named Defendants directed, authorized or ratified the conduct of each and every other Defendant.

27. The amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional limits of this court.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

28. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs.

29. Jurisdiction is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 as complete diversity of citizenship exists between Plaintiff and Defendants and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of $75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.

30. In addition, venue of this case is proper in the District of New Jersey pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 as a substantial portion of the transactions or occurrences giving rise to this action occurred in New Jersey, and several Defendants are citizens of New Jersey.

31. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA Inc., is a New Jersey partnership and/or corporate entity incorporated in the state of New Jersey. TEVA Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. is the parent company of Teva Women's Health LLC and jurisdiction is appropriate in this court because many of the acts occurred in New Jersey, and several defendants are citizens of New Jersey.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

32. ParaGard IUD is an intrauterine device that can provide long term birth control, up to 10 years, without hormones.

33. ParaGard IUD is a T-shaped plastic frame made of polyethylene and barium sulfate that is inserted into the uterus. Copper wire coiled around the IUD produces an inflammatory reaction that is toxic to sperm and egg. A monofilament polyethylene thread is tied through the tip, resulting in two white threads, which aid in the detection and removal of the device.

34. ParaGard IUD has a propensity to break at the arms upon explant resulting in serious injuries.

35. At relevant times, Teva Defendants designed, researched, manufactured, labeled, packaged, promoted, marketed and/or sold ParaGard IUD at issue after receiving New Drug Application approval from FDA.

36. In 2008, Teva USA became the owner of ParaGard IUD when it acquired Duramed Pharmaceuticals, Inc., a division of Barr Pharmaceuticals, Inc., through its purchase of Barr Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

37. Upon information and belief, when Teva USA acquired Duramed, a division of Barr Pharmaceuticals, Inc., it also acquired Duramed's manufacturing facilities, sales force and responsibility for maintaining and updating the labeling for ParaGard IUD.

38. Shortly thereafter, Teva USA changed the name of Duramed Pharmaceuticals, Inc., a division of Barr Pharmaceuticals, Inc., to Teva Women's Health, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Teva USA.

39. On August 31, 2009, Duramed Pharmaceuticals, Inc., filed with the Ohio Secretary of State a Certificate of Amendment to Foreign Corporation Application for License requesting a name change. A new entity was not created, and no entities were dissolved. Duramed's license number did not change. Instead, Duramed changed its name to Teva Women's Health, Inc.

40. Upon information and belief, Teva Women's Health, Inc. is simply a new name for Duramed.

41. Upon information and belief, and for purposes of liability and interest, Teva Women's Health, Inc., is the same entity as Teva Women's Health, LLC. Teva Women's Health, Inc., converted into Teva Women's Health, LLC under the laws of Delaware. Del. Code Ann. Tit. 8, 266. Pursuant to Del. Code Ann. Tit. 8, 266, a company that converts from one entity into another is deemed to be a continuation of the preexisting company. A conversion does not equate

to a dissolution and no winding up takes place. Therefore, Teva Women's Health, Inc., did not dissolve, windup, or *cease to exist* and liability continues from the corporation to the Limited Liability Company.

42. Upon information and belief on August 11, 2017, Teva Women's Health, Inc., converted into Teva Women's Heath, LLC and sold off all of its assets.

43. On September 11, 2017, Teva Defendants sold ParaGard IUD to Cooper Defendants.

44. ParaGard IUD is currently sold only in the U.S. and had earned revenues of approximately $168 million for the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2017.

45. The Cooper Defendants still manufacture and sell ParaGard IUD in the U.S.

46. ParaGard IUD was marketed heavily by Defendants as being safe and effective, and promising fewer side effects than other birth control methods.

47. The marketing and promotional efforts of Defendants, their advertisers, and sales force served to overstate the benefits of ParaGard IUD and minimize and downplay the risks. These promotional efforts were made while Defendants fraudulently withheld important safety information from health care providers and the public.

48. Prior to Plaintiff being implanted with ParaGard IUD, Defendants knew and should have known that the device was defective and unreasonably dangerous.

49. Defendants knew or should have known that ParaGard IUD can and does cause serious harm to individuals who use it, due to the risk of ParaGard IUD's arm breaking upon removal.

50. Defendants knew of these risks from the trials they performed, their post-marketing experience and complaints, third party studies, and their own analysis of these studies, but took no

action to adequately warn or remedy the defects and instead concealed, suppressed, and failed to disclose or fix this danger.

51. The product warnings for ParaGard IUD were vague, incomplete, or otherwise wholly inadequate to alert prescribing physicians and patients to the actual risks associated with ParaGard IUD.

52. Defendants' marketing and promotion, through its own website, sought to reassure physicians and patients of Defendants' longstanding record of quality and safety assurance.

53. Based upon these representations, upon which Plaintiff and her physician relied, Plaintiff had ParaGard IUD implanted, believing it would be safe and effective, for the entire duration it was implanted and upon removal.

54. Since 2010, the FDA has received over 1600 reports of ParaGard IUD breakage, with over 700 classified as serious.

55. Defendants' failure to adequately communicate and report to the FDA the injuries associated with ParaGard IUD resulted in inadequate warnings.

56. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

PLAINTIFF'S USE OF PARAGARD IUD

57. On information and belief, on or about December 2003, Plaintiff was implanted with Defendants' ParaGard IUD by an unknown physician at Catahoula Parish Health Unit, 200 Third St., Jonesville, LA 71343.

58. Plaintiff, a young and healthy woman, wanted a ParaGard IUD because it was a reversible form of birth control that would allow her to conceive in the future.

59. On information and belief, on or about November 18, 2014, Plaintiff suffered a failed attempt to remove the ParaGard IUD by an unknown medical provider at Catahoula Parish Health Unit, 200 Third Street, Jonesville, LA 71343. The ParaGard IUD was removed but one arm of the "T" was retained.

60. On or about November 18, 2014, Plaintiff was experiencing severe and sharp pelvic pain as a result of the retained piece of the ParaGard IUD so she went to Rapides Regional Medical Center, 211 4th Street, Alexandria, LA 71301. Additional attempts to remove the retained ParaGard arm with Serat Forecepts were unsuccessful.

61. Plaintiff underwent a hysteroscopy and the fragmented piece of the ParaGard IUD was removed Dr. Jonathan May MD at Rapides Regional Medical Center, 211 4th Street, Alexandria LA 71301.

62. Plaintiff's healthcare provider attempted to remove the ParaGard IUD as instructed by Defendants, by grasping the ParaGard IUD and pulling gently. Despite following the instructions provided by Defendants, an arm of the ParaGard IUD was retained. Plaintiff's provider attempted to remove the retained arm of the ParaGard IUD without success causing her to undergo a surgical procedure to have it removed.

63. Plaintiff never knew of the defect in this product until recently, and plaintiff invokes the benefit of the discovery rule.

64. Prior to her procedures, Plaintiff and her doctors were provided with no warning from the Defendants of the risk of ParaGard IUD failure and injury, nor were Plaintiff and her doctors provided with adequate warning of the risk of removal of ParaGard IUD. This information was known or knowable only to the Defendants.

65. On information and belief, Plaintiff used the ParaGard IUD manufactured, packaged, marketed, sold, and/or distributed by Defendants. The ParaGard IUD reached Plaintiff without substantial change in the device's condition.

66. On information and belief, as a direct and proximate result of using ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff developed serious and/or permanent adverse effects.

67. As a result of said injuries, Plaintiff suffered significant bodily and mental injuries, pain and suffering, mental anguish, disfigurement, embarrassment, inconvenience, loss of earnings and earning capacity, and have and will incur past and future medical expenses.

68. At all relevant times, each Defendant had knowledge that there was a significant increased risk of adverse events associated with ParaGard IUD including arm breakage, and despite this knowledge Defendants continued to manufacture, market, distribute, sell, and profit from sales of ParaGard IUD.

69. The Cooper Defendants continue to manufacture, market, distribute, sell and profit from sales of ParaGard IUD.

70. Despite such knowledge, Defendants knowingly, purposely, and deliberately failed to adequately warn Plaintiff, patients, consumers, medical providers, and the public of the increased risk of serious injury associated with using ParaGard IUD.

71. On information and belief, Plaintiff's prescribing physicians would not have prescribed ParaGard IUD to Plaintiff, would have changed the way they warned Plaintiff about the signs and symptoms of serious adverse effects of ParaGard IUD, and discussed with Plaintiff the true risks of arm breakage and resulting injuries and complications had Defendants provided said physicians with an appropriate and adequate warning regarding the risks associated with the use of ParaGard IUD.

72. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff suffered injuries, including, but not limited to, pain, suffering, and loss of reproductive health, which resulted in damages to Plaintiff in a sum in excess of the jurisdictional limits of the Court.

73. The Defendants owed a duty to Plaintiff from the time the ParaGard IUD was implanted and until it was removed.

74. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

75. As a direct result of Plaintiff's use of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff suffered from having a broken arm of the ParaGard IUD embedded in her cervix, causing her damage, including but not limited to pain, suffering, mental anguish, undergoing multiple painful medical procedures, the loss of reproductive health, loss of enjoyment of life, medical expenses and other out of pocket losses and loss of income.

DELAYED DISCOVERY

76. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the factual portion of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein and additionally, or in the alternative, if same be necessary, allege as follows:

77. Plaintiff plead that the discovery rule should be applied to toll the running of the statute of limitations until Plaintiff knew, or through the exercise of reasonable care and diligence should have known, of facts indicating that the Plaintiff had been injured, the cause of the injury and the tortious nature of the wrongdoing that caused the injury.

78. Despite diligent investigation by Plaintiff into the cause of her injuries, including consultations with Plaintiff's medical providers, the nature of Plaintiff's injuries and damages and their relation to the Plaintiff's ParaGard IUD and Defendants' wrongful conduct was not

discovered and could not have been discovered, until a date within the applicable statute of limitations for filing each of Plaintiff's claims. Therefore, under appropriate application of the discovery rule, Plaintiff's suit was filed well within the applicable statutory limitations period.

79. Any applicable statutes of limitations have been tolled by the knowing and active concealment and denial of material facts known by the Defendants when they had a duty to disclose those facts. The Defendants' purposeful and fraudulent acts of concealment have kept Plaintiff ignorant of vital information essential to the pursuit of Plaintiff's claims, without any fault or lack of diligence on Plaintiff's part, for the purpose of obtaining delay on Plaintiff's filing of their causes of action. The Defendants' fraudulent concealment did result in such delay.

80. Defendants are estopped from relying on the statute of limitations defense because Defendants failed to timely disclose, among other things, facts evidencing the defective and unreasonably dangerous nature of their ParaGard IUD.

COUNT I – NEGLIGENCE

81. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

82. At times relevant, Defendants were in the business of designing, developing, setting specifications, manufacturing, marketing, selling and/or distributing ParaGard IUD, including the one that was implanted into the Plaintiff.

83. Defendants had a duty to exercise reasonable and ordinary care in the manufacture, design, labeling, instructions, warnings, sale, marketing, safety surveillance and distribution of ParaGard IUD so as to avoid exposing others to foreseeable and unreasonable risks of harm.

84. Defendants breached their duty of care to the Plaintiff and her physicians, in the manufacture, design, labeling, warnings, instructions, sale, marketing, safety surveillance, and distribution of ParaGard IUD.

85. Defendants knew that ParaGard IUD could break upon removal and failed to warn Plaintiff of this potential injury.

86. Defendants had a duty to warn Plaintiff, Plaintiff's physician, and/or the medical community of the potential for breakage at the arm(s) upon removal.

87. The Cooper Defendants had a continuing duty to warn Plaintiff, Plaintiff's physician, and/or the medical community of the potential for breakage at the arm(s) upon removal upon its acquisition of ParaGard IUD in September of 2017.

88. Defendants knew or reasonably should have known that ParaGard IUD was dangerous or likely to be dangerous when used in its intended or reasonably foreseeable manner.

89. At the time of the manufacture and sale of ParaGard IUD, Teva Defendants knew or should have known that ParaGard IUD was designed and manufactured in such a manner so as to present an unreasonable risk of the fracture of the arm of the device upon removal.

90. At the time of the manufacturer and sale of ParaGard IUD, Teva Defendants knew or should have known that ParaGard IUD was designed and manufactured to have unreasonable and insufficient strength or structural integrity to withstand normal placement and subsequent removal.

91. At the time of the manufacture and sale of ParaGard IUD, Teva Defendants knew or should have known that using ParaGard IUD for its intended use or in a reasonably foreseeable manner created a significant risk of a patient suffering severe injuries, including but not limited

to additional surgeries and/or medical procedures in order to remove the fragmented device, even leading to hysterectomy.

92. Upon acquisition of ParaGard IUD from Teva Defendants, Cooper Defendants are charged with the same knowledge that Teva Defendants knew or should have known regarding the risks associated with ParaGard IUD at the time of manufacture and sale, and therefore, all Defendants had a continuing duty to warn Plaintiff and her physicians or the general health care community of those reasonably known risks.

93. Defendants knew or reasonably should have known that the consumers of ParaGard IUD would not realize the danger associated with using the device for its intended use and/or in a reasonably foreseeable manner.

94. Defendants breached their duty to exercise reasonable and prudent care in the development, testing, design, manufacture, inspection, marketing, labeling, promotion, distribution and sale of ParaGard IUD in, among others, the following ways:

a. Designing and distributing a product in which they knew or should have known that the likelihood and severity of potential harm from the product exceeded the burden of taking measures to reduce or avoid harm;

b. Designing and distributing a product in which they knew or should have known that the likelihood and severity of potential harm from the product exceeded the likelihood of potential harm from other devices/drugs available for the same purpose;

c. Failing to use reasonable care in manufacturing the product and producing a product that differed from their design or specifications;

d. Failing to use reasonable care to warn or instruct Plaintiff, Plaintiff's healthcare providers or the general health care community about ParaGard IUD's substantially dangerous condition or about facts making the product likely to be dangerous, including pre-and post-sale;

e. Failing to perform reasonable pre-and post-market testing of ParaGard IUD to determine whether or not the product was safe for its intended use;

f. Failing to provide adequate instructions, guidelines, and safety precautions, to those persons to whom it was reasonably foreseeable would recommend, use, implant and remove ParaGard IUD;

g. Advertising, marketing and recommending the use of ParaGard IUD, while concealing and failing to disclose or warn of the dangers known by the Defendants to be connected with and inherent in the use of ParaGard IUD;

h. Representing that ParaGard IUD was safe for its intended use when in fact, Defendants knew and should have known the product was not safe for its intended purpose;

i. Continuing manufacture and sale of ParaGard IUD with the knowledge that the IUD was dangerous and not reasonably safe, and failing to comply with the FDA good manufacturing regulations;

j. Failing to use reasonable and prudent care in the design, research, manufacture, and development of ParaGard IUD so as to avoid the risk of serious harm associated with the use of the IUD;

k. Failing to establish an adequate quality assurance program used in the manufacturing of ParaGard IUD;

l. Failing to establish and maintain an adequate post-marketing surveillance program for ParaGard IUD;

m. Failing to adequately and correctly report safety information relative to ParaGard IUD product resulting in inadequate warnings; and

n. Failing to provide adequate and continuous warnings about the inherent danger of breakage with ParaGard IUD upon removal.

95. A reasonable manufacturer, distributor, and/or seller under the same or similar circumstances would not have engaged in the aforementioned acts and omissions.

96. As a proximate result of the Defendants' design, manufacture, marketing, sale and/or distribution of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been injured catastrophically, and sustained severe and permanent pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of reproductive health, comfort, and economic damages.

97. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as a successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues so triable as a matter of right.

COUNT II – STRICT LIABILITY DESIGN DEFECT

98. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

99. ParaGard IUD is inherently dangerous and defective, unfit and unsafe for its intended use and reasonably foreseeable uses and does not meet or perform to the expectations of patients and their health care providers.

100. ParaGard IUD was expected to, and did, reach its intended consumer without substantial change in the condition in which it was in when it left Defendants' possession.

101. The ParaGard IUD implanted in Plaintiff was defective in design because it failed to perform as safely as persons who ordinarily use the products would have expected at time of use.

102. The ParaGard IUD implanted in Plaintiff was defective in design, in that the IUD's risks of harm exceeded its claimed benefits.

103. Plaintiff and her healthcare providers used ParaGard IUD in a manner that was reasonably foreseeable to the Defendants.

104. Neither Plaintiff nor her healthcare providers could have by the exercise of reasonable care discovered the IUD's defective conditions or perceived its unreasonable dangers prior to her implantation of the device.

105. As a result of the foregoing design defects, ParaGard IUD created risks to the health and safety of its users that were far more significant and devastating than the risks posed by other products and procedures available to treat the corresponding medical conditions, and which far outweigh the utility of ParaGard IUD.

106. Defendants have intentionally and recklessly designed ParaGard IUD with wanton and willful disregard for the rights and health of the Plaintiff and others, and with malice, placing their economic interests above the health and safety of the Plaintiff and others.

107. As a proximate result of the Defendants' design of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been injured catastrophically, and sustained severe and permanent pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of care, comfort, and economic damages.

108. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues so triable as a matter of right.

COUNT III – STRICT LIABILITY MANUFACTURING DEFECT

109. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

110. Defendants designed, set specifications, manufactured, prepared, compounded, assembled, processed, marketed, labeled, performed pharmacovigilance, distributed and sold the ParaGard IUD that was implanted into the Plaintiff.

111. The ParaGard IUD implanted in Plaintiff contained a condition or conditions, which Defendants did not intend, at the time the ParaGard IUD left Defendants' control and possession.

112. Plaintiff and Plaintiffs' health care providers used the device in a manner consistent with and reasonably foreseeable to Defendants.

113. As a result of this condition or these conditions, the product failed to perform as safely as the ordinary consumer would expect, causing injury, when used in a reasonably foreseeable manner.

114. ParaGard IUD was defectively and/or improperly manufactured, rendering it defective and unreasonably dangerous and hazardous to Plaintiff.

115. As a result of the manufacturing defects, ParaGard IUD creates risks to the health and safety of the patients that are far more significant and devastating than the risks posed by other products and procedures available to treat the corresponding medical conditions, and which far outweigh the utility of ParaGard IUD.

116. Defendants have intentionally and recklessly manufactured ParaGard IUD with wanton and willful disregard for the rights and health of the Plaintiffs and others, and with malice, placing their economic interests above the health and safety of the Plaintiff and others.

117. As a proximate result of the Defendants' manufacture of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been injured catastrophically, and sustained severe and permanent pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of care, comfort, and economic damages.

118. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues so triable as a matter of right.

COUNT IV – STRICT LIABILITY FAILURE TO WARN

119. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

120. Defendants designed, set specifications, manufactured, prepared, compounded, assembled, processed, marketed, labeled, distributed, and sold ParaGard IUD, including the one implanted into Plaintiff, into the stream of commerce and in the course of same, directly advertised and marketed the device to consumers or persons responsible for consumers.

121. At the time Defendants designed set specifications, manufactured, prepared, compounded, assembled, processed, marketed, labeled, distributed, and sold ParaGard IUD into the stream of commerce, Defendants knew or should have known that the device presented an unreasonable danger to users of the product when put to its intended and reasonably anticipated use.

122. Specifically, Defendants knew or should have known that ParaGard IUD posed a significant risk that one of the arms of the device could break upon removal, resulting in significant injuries.

123. Defendants had a duty to warn of the risk of harm associated with the use of the device and to provide adequate warnings concerning the risk the device could break upon removal, even if implanted properly and even if the device remained properly in-place.

124. The Cooper Defendants had a continuing duty to warn Plaintiff, Plaintiff's physician, and/or the medical community of the potential for breakage at the arm(s) upon removal upon its acquisition of ParaGard IUD in September of 2017.

125. Defendants failed to properly and adequately warn and instruct the Plaintiff and her health care providers with regard to the inadequate research and testing of ParaGard IUD, and the complete lack of a safe, effective procedure for removal of ParaGard IUD.

126. The risks associated with ParaGard IUD are of such a nature that health care providers and users could not have recognized the potential harm.

127. ParaGard IUD was defective and unreasonably dangerous at the time of its release into the stream of commerce due to the inadequate warnings, labeling and/or instructions accompanying the product, including but not limited to, the implantation and subsequent removal of ParaGard IUD.

128. The ParaGard IUD, when implanted in Plaintiff, was in the same condition as when it was manufactured, inspected, marketed, labeled, promoted, distributed, and sold by the Defendants.

129. The Defendants intentionally, recklessly, and maliciously misrepresented the safety, risks, and benefits in order to advance their own financial interests, with wanton and willful disregard for the rights and health of the Plaintiff.

130. As a proximate result of the Defendants' design, manufacture, marketing, sale and/or distribution of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been injured catastrophically, and sustained

severe and permanent pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of reproductive health, comfort, and economic damages.

131. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues so triable as a matter of right.

COUNT V – COMMON LAW FRAUD

132. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

133. The Defendants have falsely and fraudulently represented and continue to represent to the medical and healthcare community, Plaintiff and her physicians, and/or the public that ParaGard IUD had been appropriately tested and was found to be safe and effective.

134. The representations made by the Defendants were, in fact, false. When the Defendants made their representations, they knew and/or had reason to know that those representations were false, and they willfully, wantonly, and recklessly disregarded the inaccuracies in their representations and the dangers and health risks to users of ParaGard IUD.

135. These representations were made by the Defendants with the intent of defrauding and deceiving the medical community, Plaintiff, and the public, and also inducing the medical community, Plaintiff, Plaintiff's physicians, and/or the public, to recommend, prescribe, dispense,

and purchase ParaGard IUD for use as a form of long-term birth control, all of which evidenced a callous, reckless, willful, and depraved indifference to the health, safety, and welfare of Plaintiff.

136. In representations to Plaintiff and/or to her healthcare providers, the Defendants fraudulently concealed and intentionally omitted the following material information:

a. That ParaGard IUD was not as safe as other products and procedures available to aid in the long-term prevention of pregnancy;

b. That the risk of adverse events with ParaGard IUD was higher than with other products and procedures available for birth control;

c. ParaGard IUD was not adequately tested;

d. That the limited clinical testing for ParaGard IUD revealed a higher risk of adverse events, above and beyond those associated with other products and procedures available for birth control;

e. That Defendants deliberately failed to follow up on the adverse results from clinical studies and/or formal and informal reports from physicians and/or other healthcare providers and either ignored, concealed and/or misrepresented those findings;

f. That Defendants were aware of dangers in ParaGard IUD in addition to and above and beyond those associated with other products and procedures available for birth control;

g. That ParaGard IUD was defective, and that it caused dangerous and adverse side effects, including but not limited to unacceptable incidence of breakage upon removal;

h. That when ParaGard IUD needed to be removed, the removal procedure had a very high failure rate and/or needed to be performed repeatedly;

i. That ParaGard IUD was manufactured negligently;

j. That ParaGard IUD was manufactured defectively; and

k. That ParaGard IUD was designed negligently and designed defectively.

137. The Defendants were under a duty to disclose to Plaintiff and her physicians, the defective nature of ParaGard IUD, including but not limited to, the risk of breakage prior to and upon removal, which could result in permanent injury.

138. The Defendants had sole access to material facts concerning the defective nature of the products and their propensity to cause serious and dangerous side effects and hence, cause dangerous injuries and damage to persons who used ParaGard IUD, such as Plaintiff.

139. The Defendants' concealment and omissions of material facts concerning the safety of ParaGard IUD were made purposefully, willfully, wantonly, and/or recklessly to mislead Plaintiff, Plaintiff's physicians, surgeons and healthcare providers and to induce them to purchase, prescribe, and/or dispense ParaGard IUD; and/or to mislead them into reliance upon and cause them to use ParaGard IUD.

140. At the time these representations were made by Defendants, and at the time Plaintiff and/or her physicians, used ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff and/or her physicians were unaware of the falsehood of these representations, and reasonably believed them to be true.

141. The Defendants knew and had reason to know that ParaGard IUD could and would cause severe and grievous personal injury to the users of the product and was inherently dangerous in a manner that exceeded any purported, inaccurate, or otherwise downplayed warnings.

142. In reliance upon these false representations, Plaintiff and her physicians were induced to, and did use ParaGard IUD, thereby causing severe and permanent personal injuries and damages to Plaintiff. The Defendants knew or had reason to know that the Plaintiff and her physicians and other healthcare providers had no way to determine the truth behind the Defendants' concealment and omissions, and that these included material omissions of facts surrounding the use of ParaGard IUD, as described in detail herein.

143. Plaintiff and her physicians reasonably relied on facts provided by the Defendants which foreseeably and purposefully suppressed and concealed facts that were critical to understanding the real dangers inherent to the use of ParaGard IUD.

144. Having knowledge based on the Defendants research and testing, or lack thereof, Defendants blatantly and intentionally distributed false information, including but not limited to assurances to Plaintiff, the public, and Plaintiff's healthcare providers and physicians, that ParaGard IUD was safe for use as a means of providing long-term birth control and was as safe or safer than other product and/or procedures available and/or on the market. As a result of Defendants' research and testing, or lack thereof, these Defendants intentionally omitted, concealed and suppressed the dissemination of certain results of testing and research to healthcare professionals, Plaintiff, her physicians, and the public at large.

145. The Defendants had a duty when disseminating information to the public to disseminate truthful information; and a parallel duty not to deceive the public, Plaintiff, and/or her physicians.

146. The information distributed to the public, the medical community, Plaintiff and her physicians by the Defendants included, but was not limited to websites, information presented at medical and professional meetings, information disseminated by sales representatives to physicians and other medical care providers, professional literature, reports, press releases, advertising campaigns, television commercials, print advertisements, and/or other commercial media, and contained material representations which were false and misleading, as well as omissions and concealments of the truth about the dangers of the use of ParaGard IUD.

147. These representations, and others made by the Defendants, were false when made and/or were made with the pretense of actual knowledge when such knowledge did not actually exist and were made recklessly and without regard to the true facts.

148. The Defendants recklessly and/or intentionally falsely represented the dangerous and serious health and safety concerns inherent in the use of ParaGard IUD to Plaintiff, her physicians and the public at large, for the purpose of influencing the sales of products known to be dangerous and defective, and/or not as safe as other alternatives.

149. At the time the representations were made, Plaintiff and her healthcare providers did not know the truth about the dangers and serious health and/or safety risks inherent in the use of ParaGard IUD.

150. Plaintiff did not discover the true facts about the dangers and serious health and/or safety risks, nor did Plaintiff discover the false representations of the Defendants, nor would Plaintiff with reasonable diligence have discovered the true facts about the Defendant's misrepresentations at the time when the ParaGard IUD was surgically implanted into her.

151. Had Plaintiff known the true facts about the dangers and serious health and/or safety risks of ParaGard IUD, neither Plaintiff nor her physician would not have purchased, used, or relied on Defendants' representations and omissions concerning ParaGard IUD.

152. As a proximate result of the Defendants' design, manufacture, marketing, sale and/or distribution of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been seriously injured, and sustained severe and permanent injury, pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of reproductive health, comfort, and economic damages.

153. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues as triable as a matter of right.

COUNT VI – NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

154. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

155. At relevant times, Defendants negligently provided Plaintiff, her healthcare providers, and the general medical community with false or incorrect information or omitted or failed to disclose material information concerning ParaGard IUD, including, but not limited to, misrepresentations regarding the safety of ParaGard IUD.

156. The information distributed by the Defendants to the public, the medical community, the Plaintiff, and her healthcare providers, including advertising campaigns, labeling materials, print advertisements, commercial media, was false and misleading and contained omissions and concealment of truth about the dangers of ParaGard IUD.

157. Defendants' intent and purpose in making these misrepresentations was to deceive and defraud the public and the medical community, including Plaintiff and Plaintiffs' health care providers; to falsely assure them of the quality of ParaGard IUD and the induce the public and medical community, including Plaintiff and her healthcare provider to request, recommend, prescribe, implant, purchase and continue to use ParaGard IUD.

158. The Defendants had a duty to accurately and truthfully represent to the medical and healthcare community, medical drug manufacturers, Plaintiff, her healthcare providers and the public, that ParaGard IUD had been tested and found to be safe and effective for long term birth control.

159. The representations made by the Defendants were, in fact, false. ParaGard IUD was not safe for human use in its intended and reasonably foreseeable manner. Use of ParaGard IUD is dangerous as there is a risk that it may fracture upon removal and cause significant injury.

160. In reliance upon the false and negligent misrepresentations and omissions made by the Defendants, Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers were induced to, and did use ParaGard IUD, thereby causing Plaintiff to endure severe and permanent injuries.

161. Defendants knew and had reason to know that the Plaintiff, Plaintiff's healthcare providers, and the general medical community did not have the ability to determine the true facts which were intentionally and/or negligently concealed and misrepresented by the Defendants.

162. Plaintiff and her healthcare providers would not have recommended, and implanted ParaGard IUD had the true facts not been concealed by the Defendants.

163. Defendants had sole access to the material facts concerning the defective nature of ParaGard IUD and its propensity to cause serious and dangerous side injuries.

164. At the time Defendants failed to disclose and misrepresented the foregoing facts, and at the time Plaintiff was implanted with ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff and her healthcare providers were unaware of Defendants' negligent misrepresentations and omissions.

165. The Defendants failed to exercise ordinary care in making representations concerning ParaGard IUD while they were involved in their manufacture, sale, testing, quality assurance, quality control, and distribution in interstate commerce, because the Defendants

negligently misrepresented ParaGard IUD's high risk of unreasonable and dangerous adverse side effects.

166. The Defendants breached their duty to Plaintiff, her physicians, and the medical and healthcare community, by representing that ParaGard IUD has no serious side effects different from older generations of similar products or procedures.

167. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers reasonably relied upon the misrepresentations and omissions made by the Defendants, where they concealed and misrepresented facts that were critical to understanding the true dangers inherent in the use of ParaGard IUD.

168. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers' reliance on the foregoing misrepresentations and omissions was the direct and proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries.

169. The Defendants knew, and had reason to know, that ParaGard IUD had been insufficiently tested, or had not been tested at all, that the products lacked adequate and accurate warnings, that they created a high risk, and/or higher than acceptable risk, and/or higher than reported risk that they represented a risk of adverse side effects, including, pain and suffering, surgery to remove the product, and other severe and personal injuries, which are permanent and lasting in nature.

170. As a proximate result of the Defendants' design, manufacture, marketing, sale and/or distribution of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been injured catastrophically, and sustained severe and permanent pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of reproductive health, comfort, and economic damages.

171. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues as triable as a matter of right.

COUNT VII – BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY

172. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

173. At relevant times, Defendants intended that ParaGard IUD be used in the manner that Plaintiff used it and Defendants expressly warranted that each product was safe and fit for use by consumers, that it was of merchantable quality, that its side effects were minimal and comparable to other treatments for long-term birth control, and that they were adequately tested and fit for their intended use.

174. At relevant times, Defendants were aware that consumers, including Plaintiff, would use ParaGard IUD; which is to say that Plaintiff was a foreseeable user of ParaGard IUD.

175. Plaintiff and/or her implanting physicians were, at all relevant times, in privity with the Defendants.

176. ParaGard IUD was expected to reach and did in fact reach its ultimate consumer, including Plaintiff and her implanting physicians, without substantial change in the condition in which it was manufactured and sold by the Defendants.

177. The Defendants breached various express warranties with respect to ParaGard IUD including the following particulars:

a. The Defendants represented to Plaintiff and her physicians and healthcare providers through their labeling, advertising, marketing materials, detail persons, seminar presentations, publications, notice letters, and regulatory submissions that ParaGard IUD was safe, and fraudulently withheld and concealed information about the substantial risks of serious injury associated with using ParaGard IUD;

b. The Defendants represented to Plaintiff and her physicians and healthcare providers that ParaGard IUD was as safe, and/or safer than other alternative procedures, devices, and drugs and fraudulently concealed information, which demonstrated that ParaGard IUD was not safer than alternatives available on the market; and

c. The Defendants represented to Plaintiff and her physicians and healthcare providers that ParaGard IUD was more efficacious than other alternatives and fraudulently concealed information regarding the true efficacy of the products.

178. In reliance upon the Defendants' express warranties, Plaintiff was implanted with ParaGard IUD as prescribed and directed, and therefore, in the foreseeable manner normally intended, recommended, promoted, and marketed by the Defendants.

179. At the time of making such express warranties, the Defendants knew or should have known that ParaGard IUD does not conform to these express representations because ParaGard IUD was not safe and had numerous side effects, many of which the Defendants did not accurately warn about, thus making ParaGard IUD unreasonably unsafe for its intended purpose.

180. Members of the medical community, including physicians and other healthcare professionals, as well as Plaintiff and her physicians, relied upon the representations and warranties of the Defendants in connection with use, recommendation, description, and/or dispensing of ParaGard IUD.

181. The Defendants breached their express warranties to Plaintiff in that ParaGard IUD was not of merchantable quality, safe and/or fit for its intended uses, nor was it adequately tested.

182. As a proximate result of the Defendants' design, manufacture, marketing, sale and/or distribution of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been injured catastrophically, and sustained severe and permanent pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of reproductive health, comfort, and economic damages.

183. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues as triable as a matter of right.

COUNT VIII – BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY

184. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

185. At relevant and material times, Defendants manufactured, distributed, advertised, promoted, and sold ParaGard IUD.

186. At relevant times, Defendants intended that ParaGard IUD be implanted for the purposes, and in the manner, that Plaintiff or her physicians or surgeons used it and the Defendants impliedly warranted each ParaGard IUD to be of merchantable quality, safe and fit for such use, and to have been adequately tested.

187. Defendants were aware that consumers, including Plaintiff or her physicians or surgeons would implant ParaGard IUD in the manner described by the instructions for use and that Plaintiff was the foreseeable user of ParaGard IUD.

188. Plaintiff and/or her physicians and surgeons were at all relevant times in privity with Defendants.

189. The Defendants' ParaGard IUD was expected to reach and did in fact reach consumers, including Plaintiff and/or her physicians and surgeons, without substantial change in the condition in which they manufactured and sold by Defendants.

190. Defendants breached various implied warranties with respect to ParaGard IUD, including the following particulars:

a. Defendants represented through their labeling, advertising, marketing materials, detail persons, seminar presentations, publications, notice letters, medical literature, and regulatory submissions that ParaGard IUD was safe and fraudulently withheld and concealed information about the substantial risks of serious injury associated with using ParaGard IUD;

b. Defendants represented that ParaGard IUD was safe, and/or safer than other alternative drugs, devices, or procedures and fraudulently concealed information, which demonstrated that ParaGard IUD was not as safe or safer than alternatives available on the market; and

c. Defendants represented that ParaGard IUD was more efficacious than other alternative treatments and fraudulently concealed information, regarding the true efficacy of ParaGard IUD.

191. In reliance upon Defendants' implied warranties, Plaintiff and/or her implanting physicians and surgeons used ParaGard IUD as prescribed in the foreseeable manner normally intended, recommended, promoted, and marketed by Defendants.

192. Defendants breached their implied warranties to Plaintiff and/or her implanting physicians and surgeons in that ParaGard IUD was not of merchantable quality, safe and fit for its intended use, or adequately tested, in violation of common law principles.

193. As a proximate result of the Defendants' design, manufacture, marketing, sale and/or distribution of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been injured catastrophically, and sustained

severe and permanent pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of reproductive health, comfort, and economic damages.

194. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues as triable as a matter of right.

COUNT IX – VIOLATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS

195. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

196. Plaintiff purchased and used ParaGard IUD primarily for personal use thereby suffering ascertainable losses, as a result of the Defendants' actions in violation of the consumer protection laws.

197. Had the Defendants not engaged in the deceptive conduct described herein, Plaintiff and her physicians would not have purchased and/or paid for ParaGard IUD and would not have incurred related medical costs and injury.

198. The Defendants engaged in wrongful conduct while at the same time obtaining, under false pretenses, moneys from Plaintiff for ParaGard IUD, that was implanted into her, and that would not have been paid for had the Defendants not engaged in unfair and deceptive conduct.

199. Unfair methods of competition of deceptive acts or practices that were proscribed by law, including the following:

a. Representing that goods or services have characteristics, ingredients, uses benefits or quantities that they do not have;

b. Advertising goods or services with the intent not to sell them as advertised; and

c. Engaging in fraudulent or deceptive conduct that creates a likelihood of confusion and/or misunderstanding.

200. Plaintiff was injured by the cumulative and indivisible nature of the Defendants' conduct. The cumulative effect of the Defendants' conduct directed at patients, physicians and consumers, including the Plaintiff and her physicians, was to create demand for and promote the sale of ParaGard IUD. Each aspect of the Defendants' conduct combined to artificially create sales of ParaGard IUD.

201. The Defendants have a statutory duty to refrain from unfair or deceptive acts or trade practices in the design, labeling, development, manufacture, promotion, and sale of ParaGard IUD.

202. Had the Defendants not engaged in the deceptive conduct described above, Plaintiff would not have purchased and/or paid for ParaGard IUD and would not have incurred related medical costs.

203. The Defendants' deceptive, unconscionable, or fraudulent representations and material omissions to patients, physicians and consumers, including Plaintiff and her physicians, constituted unfair and deceptive acts and trade practices in violation of the state and Federal consumer protection statutes.

204. The Defendants' actions, as complained of herein, constitute unfair competition or unfair, unconscionable, deceptive or fraudulent acts, or trade practices in violation of state and Federal consumer protection statutes.

205. The Defendants have engaged in unfair competition or unfair or deceptive acts or trade practices or have made false representations in violation under the statute listed above to protect consumers against unfair, deceptive, fraudulent and unconscionable trade and business practices and false advertising, the Defendants are the suppliers, manufacturers, advertisers, and sellers, who are subject to liability under such legislation for unfair, deceptive, fraudulent and unconscionable consumer sales practices.

206. The Defendants engaged in fraudulent behavior regarding the transfer and/or sale of assets to Cooper Defendants in 2017. Cooper Defendants knew or should have reasonably known that the transfer of assets was done in a manner consistent with and in an effort to, deceive potential creditors.

207. Pursuant to the terms of the asset purchase agreement, Teva Women's Health, Inc., claims to maintain liability for all ParaGard IUD placed prior to the execution of the asset purchase agreement in September of 2017. However, Teva Women's Health, Inc., converted to Teva Women's Health, LLC and sold off all of its assets.

208. Cooper Defendants knew or reasonably should have known that Teva Defendants converted Teva Women's Health, Inc., into Teva Women's Health, LLC after selling off or moving all assets from Teva Women's Health, Inc.

209. Therefore, Cooper Defendants knew or reasonably should have known that Teva Defendants shuffling of assets and subsequent conversions were done to thwart potential creditors in violation of state and Federal consumer protection laws.

210. The Defendants violated the statutes that were enacted to protect consumers against unfair, deceptive, fraudulent and unconscionable trade and business practices and false advertising, by knowingly and falsely representing that ParaGard IUD was fit to be used for the purpose for

which it was intended, when in fact it was defective and dangerous, and by other acts alleged herein. These representations were made in uniform promotional materials and product labeling.

211. The actions and omissions of the Defendants alleged herein are uncured or incurable deceptive acts under the statutes enacted in the states to protect consumers against unfair, deceptive, fraudulent and unconscionable trade and business practices and false advertising.

212. The Defendants had actual knowledge of the defective and dangerous condition of ParaGard IUD and failed to take any action to cure such defective and dangerous conditions.

213. Plaintiff and her implanting physicians and surgeons relied upon the Defendants' misrepresentations and omissions in determining which product and/or procedure to undergo and/or perform.

214. The Defendants' deceptive, unconscionable, or fraudulent representations and material omissions to patients, physicians and consumers, constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices.

215. By reason of the unlawful acts engaged in by the Defendants, and as a direct and proximate result thereof, Plaintiff has suffered ascertainable losses and damages.

216. As a proximate result of the Defendants' design, manufacture, marketing, sale and/or distribution of ParaGard IUD, Plaintiff has been injured catastrophically, and sustained severe and permanent pain, suffering, disability, and impairment, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of reproductive health, comfort, and economic damages.

217. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues as triable as a matter of right.

COUNT X – GROSS NEGLIGENCE

218. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference every allegation of this Complaint as if each were set forth fully and completely herein.

219. The wrongs done by the Defendants were aggravated by the kind of malice, fraud, and grossly negligent disregard for the rights of others, the public, and Plaintiff , for which the law would allow, and which Plaintiff will seek at the appropriate time under governing law for the imposition of exemplary damages, in that Defendants' conduct was specifically intended to cause substantial injury to Plaintiff; or when viewed objectively from Defendants' standpoint at the time of the conduct, involved an extreme degree of risk, considering the probability and magnitude of the potential harm to others, and Defendants were actually, subjectively aware of the risk involved, but nevertheless proceeded with conscious indifference to the rights, safety, or welfare of others; or included material representations that were false, with Defendants, knowing that they were false or with reckless disregard as to the truth and as a positive assertion, with the intent that the representation is acted on by Plaintiff.

220. Plaintiff and her physicians relied on the representations of Defendants and suffered injury as a proximate result of this reliance.

221. Plaintiff therefore will seek to assert claims for exemplary damages at the appropriate time under governing law in an amount within the jurisdictional limits of the Court.

222. Plaintiff also alleges that the acts and omissions of Defendants, whether taken singularly or in combination with others, constitute gross negligence that proximately caused the injuries to Plaintiff. In that regard, Plaintiff will seek exemplary damages in an amount that would punish Defendants for their conduct, and which would deter other manufacturers from engaging in such misconduct in the future.

223. The Cooper Defendants are also liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues as triable as a matter of right.

COUNT XI – PUNITIVE DAMAGES

224. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

225. At times material hereto, Defendants knew or should have known that their ParaGard IUD, as designed, manufactured, assembled, sold and/or distributed was inherently dangerous.

226. At times material hereto, Defendants attempted to misrepresent and did misrepresent facts concerning the safety of their ParaGard IUD.

227. Defendants' misrepresentations included knowingly withholding material information from the public and consumers alike, including Plaintiff, concerning the safety of ParaGard IUD.

228. At times material hereto, Defendants knew and recklessly disregarded the fact that their ParaGard IUD could cause serious, disabling, and permanent injuries to individuals such as Plaintiff.

229. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Defendants continued to aggressively market and promote their ParaGard IUD, without disclosing the risks.

230. As a proximate result of Defendants' willful, wanton, careless, reckless, conscious, and deliberate disregard for the rights and safety of their consumers, Plaintiff suffered severe and permanent physical and emotional injuries, endured pain and suffering, and has suffered economic loss, including incurring significant expenses for medical care and treatment, and will continue to incur such expenses in the future.

231. Defendants' aforesaid conduct was committed with knowing, conscious, careless, reckless, willful, wanton, and deliberate disregard for the rights and safety of consumers, including Plaintiff, thereby entitling Plaintiff to punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish Defendants and deter them from similar conduct in the future.

232. The Cooper Defendants are liable as successors-in-interest under New Jersey statutes and/or regulations; and/or any other state or federal successor in interest acts or statutes; and the Federal Consumer Protection Act pursuant to a fraudulent conveyance or transfer of assets.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory damages, for punitive damages and for costs, in an as yet unliquidated sum in excess of $75,000.00, and such other relief as this Court deems just and for a trial by jury on all issues as triable as a matter of right.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

So far as the law and this Court allows, Plaintiff demands judgment against each Defendant on each count as follows:

a. All available compensatory damages for the described losses with respect to each cause of action;

b. Past and future medical expenses, as well as the cost associated with past and future life care;

c. Past and future lost wages and loss of earning capacity;

d. Past and future emotional distress;

e. Consequential damages;

f. All available noneconomic damages, including without limitation pain, suffering, and loss of enjoyment of life;

g. Punitive damages with respect to each cause of action;

h. Reasonable attorneys' fees where recoverable;

i. Costs of this action;

j. Pre-judgment and all other interest recoverable; and

k. Such other additional, further, and general relief as Plaintiff may be entitled to in law or in equity as justice so requires.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury as to all issues.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.

Respectfully submitted,

JAVERBAUM, WURGAFT, HICKS, KAHN WIKSTROM & SININS, PC

FERRER, POIROT, WANSBROUGH, FELLER & DANIEL

s/*Michael A. Galpern*
MICHAEL A. GALPERN, ESQUIRE
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: April 15, 2026

s/ Joseph Poirot
JOSEPH POIROT, ESQUIRE
CHRISTINA FELLER, ESQUIRE
To Be Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

JS 44 (Rev. 04/21)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Monica Little

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff State of Arkansas
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys *(Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)*
Michael A. Galpern, Esq /Javerbaum Wurgaft/ 1000 Haddonfield-Berlin Rd Voorhees, NJ 856-596-4100

DEFENDANTS

TEVA Pharmaceuticals USA, INC., et. al.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Morris
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)
NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys *(If Known)*
Christopher D. Morris Butler Snow LLP
1200 Highland Parkway Suite 1400
Ridgeland, MS 39157

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☐ 3 Federal Question *(U.S. Government Not a Party)*
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☒ 4 Diversity *(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)*

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES *(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)*
(For Diversity Cases Only)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	☐ 1	☐ 1	Incorporated *or* Principal Place of Business In This State	☐ 4	☐ 4
Citizen of Another State	☒ 2	☐ 2	Incorporated *and* Principal Place of Business In Another State	☐ 5	☐ 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

CONTRACT
- ☐ 110 Insurance
- ☐ 120 Marine
- ☐ 130 Miller Act
- ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument
- ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment
- ☐ 151 Medicare Act
- ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)
- ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits
- ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits
- ☐ 190 Other Contract
- ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability
- ☐ 196 Franchise

REAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 210 Land Condemnation
- ☐ 220 Foreclosure
- ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment
- ☐ 240 Torts to Land
- ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability
- ☐ 290 All Other Real Property

TORTS

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 310 Airplane
- ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability
- ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander
- ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability
- ☐ 340 Marine
- ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability
- ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle
- ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability
- ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury
- ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability
- ☒ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability
- ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability

PERSONAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 370 Other Fraud
- ☐ 371 Truth in Lending
- ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage
- ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability

CIVIL RIGHTS
- ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights
- ☐ 441 Voting
- ☐ 442 Employment
- ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations
- ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment
- ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other
- ☐ 448 Education

PRISONER PETITIONS

Habeas Corpus:
- ☐ 463 Alien Detainee
- ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence
- ☐ 530 General
- ☐ 535 Death Penalty

Other:
- ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other
- ☐ 550 Civil Rights
- ☐ 555 Prison Condition
- ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement

FORFEITURE/PENALTY
- ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881
- ☐ 690 Other

LABOR
- ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act
- ☐ 720 Labor/Management Relations
- ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act
- ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act
- ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation
- ☐ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act

IMMIGRATION
- ☐ 462 Naturalization Application
- ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions

BANKRUPTCY
- ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158
- ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS
- ☐ 820 Copyrights
- ☐ 830 Patent
- ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application
- ☐ 840 Trademark
- ☐ 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016

SOCIAL SECURITY
- ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)
- ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)
- ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))
- ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI
- ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))

FEDERAL TAX SUITS
- ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)
- ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609

OTHER STATUTES
- ☐ 375 False Claims Act
- ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
- ☐ 400 State Reapportionment
- ☐ 410 Antitrust
- ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
- ☐ 450 Commerce
- ☐ 460 Deportation
- ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
- ☐ 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692)
- ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act
- ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
- ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
- ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
- ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
- ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
- ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act
- ☐ 896 Arbitration
- ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
- ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District *(specify)* ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing *(Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity)*:
28 USC 1332, 28 USC 1391

Brief description of cause:
Personal Injury suffered as a result of using the defective and dangerous ParaGard IUD

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A **CLASS ACTION** UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND $ greater than $75,000

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE Leigh Martin May DOCKET NUMBER 1:20-md-02974-LMM

DATE April 15, 2026

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD Michael A. Galpern, Esquire

Michael A. Galpern, Esq.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

I.(a) **Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) **County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) **Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. **Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

III. **Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

IV. **Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

V. **Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.
Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.

VI. **Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.

VII. **Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. **Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.