

ALLERGAN PUBLIC GLOBAL OPIOID SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

I. Definitions 2

II. Participation by States and Condition to Preliminary Agreement..... 18

III. Cessation of Litigation Activities 19

IV. Injunctive Relief 20

V. Release..... 20

VI. Monetary Relief Overview and Maximum Payments..... 25

VII. Annual Payments to Settlement Fund..... 26

VIII. Allocation and Use of Settlement Funds 38

IX. Participation by Subdivisions and Special Districts 44

X. Condition to Effectiveness of Agreement and Filing of Consent Judgment 49

XI. Potential Payment Adjustments..... 49

XII. Additional Restitution Amount..... 50

XIII. Plaintiffs’ Attorneys’ Fees and Costs 51

XIV. Enforcement and Dispute Resolution..... 51

XV. Judgment and Settlement Set-Off Related to Teva..... 57

XVI. Miscellaneous..... 58

ALLERGAN PUBLIC GLOBAL OPIOID SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Whereas, the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, Participating Special Districts, and Allergan (as those terms are defined below) share a common desire to resolve disputes between them relating to opioid medications according to the terms set out in this agreement dated as of November 22, 2022 (the “*Agreement*”);

Whereas, the Parties, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts agree and understand that upon satisfaction of the conditions set forth in Sections II and XI, this Agreement will be binding on the Settling States, Allergan, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts;

Whereas, the Parties, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts agree and understand that this Agreement will then be filed as part of Consent Judgments in the respective courts of each of the Settling States, pursuant to the terms set forth in Section III;

Whereas, the Parties, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts agree and understand that they shall at all times act in good faith to implement and execute their obligations under this Agreement and shall not act in any way to purposefully frustrate the right of any party to receive the benefits due under the Agreement;

Whereas, the Parties, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts to this Agreement now desire to avoid further expense and proceedings and to settle their disputes under the terms and conditions of this Agreement as set forth below;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED by and between the Parties, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts by and through their respective counsel, as follows:

I. Definitions

Unless otherwise specified, the following definitions apply:

1. “*Abatement Accounts Fund*” means a component of the Settlement Fund described in subsection VIII.F.
2. “*Additional Restitution Amount*” means the amount available to Settling States listed in Exhibit M of \$16,192,680.76.
3. “*Affiliated Company(ies)*” means (1) when used with respect to AbbVie Inc. (“*AbbVie*”) all of the entities listed in Exhibit J-1; (2) when used with respect to Allergan all of the entities listed in Exhibit J-2; and (3) additionally shall include other entities owned now or in the past either wholly or partially and either directly or indirectly by either AbbVie or Allergan and/or each of their respective past parents, but only to the extent those other entities played any role relating to Covered Conduct and/or Released Claims during the period when they were owned

either wholly or partially and either directly or indirectly by either AbbVie or Allergan and/or each of their respective past parents.

4. “*Agreement*” means this Allergan Public Global Opioid Settlement Agreement, inclusive of all exhibits.
5. “*Alleged Harms*” means the alleged past, present, and future financial or societal and related expenditures arising out of the alleged misuse and abuse of opioid products, non-exclusive examples of which are described in the documents listed on Exhibit A, that have allegedly arisen as a result of the physical and bodily injuries sustained by individuals suffering from opioid-related addiction, abuse, death, and other related diseases and disorders, and that have allegedly been caused by Allergan.
6. “*Allergan*” means Allergan Finance, LLC (f/k/a Actavis, Inc., which, in turn, was f/k/a/ Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.) and Allergan Limited (f/k/a Allergan plc, which, in turn, was f/k/a Actavis plc). *Allergan* does not include Teva Pharmaceuticals Industries Ltd. (“*Teva Ltd.*”), Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (“*Teva USA*”), Cephalon, Inc. (“*Cephalon*”), Actavis LLC (f/k/a Actavis Inc.) (“*Actavis LLC*”), Watson Laboratories, Inc. (“*Watson*”), Actavis Pharma, Inc. (f/k/a Watson Pharma, Inc.) (“*Actavis Pharma*”), Actavis Elizabeth LLC (“*Actavis Elizabeth*”), Actavis Kadian LLC (“*Actavis Kadian*”), Actavis Laboratories FL, Inc. (f/k/a Watson Laboratories, Inc. - Florida) (“*Actavis Labs FL*”), Actavis Laboratories UT, Inc. (f/k/a Watson Laboratories, Inc. - Utah) (“*Actavis Labs UT*”), Actavis Mid Atlantic LLC (“*Actavis Mid*”), Actavis South Atlantic LLC (“*Actavis South*”), Actavis Totowa LLC (“*Actavis Totowa*”), or Anda, Inc. (“*Anda*”).
7. “*Allocation Statute*” means a state law that governs allocation, distribution, and/or use of some or all of the Settlement Fund amounts allocated to that State and/or its Subdivisions and/or its Special Districts. In addition to modifying the allocation, as set forth in subsection VIII.E.2, an Allocation Statute may, without limitation, contain a Statutory Trust, further restrict expenditure of funds, form an advisory committee, establish oversight and reporting requirements, or address other default provisions and other matters related to the funds. An Allocation Statute is not required to address all three (3) types of funds comprising the Settlement Fund or all default provisions.
8. “*Annual Payment*” means the total amount of the Net Abatement Amount payable into the Settlement Fund by Allergan on each Payment Date (including the Initial Year Payment), as calculated by the Settlement Fund Administrator pursuant to Section VII or agreed to pursuant to Section VII.B.6, which shall not exceed the maximum payment for any given year as set forth in Exhibit M. This term does not include the Additional Restitution Amount or amounts paid pursuant to Section XIII.
9. “*Appropriate Official*” means the official defined in subsection XVI.F.43.

10. “*Attorney Fee and Cost Payment*” means the total amount of the Global Settlement Attorney Fee Amount payable by Allergan on the Payment Date of each year into the (1) Attorney Fee and Cost Fund described in Exhibit R, (2) the State Cost Fund described in Exhibit T, and (3) the State Outside Counsel Fee Fund described in Exhibit S, for attorneys’ fees, expenses, and costs of the Settling States and Participating Subdivisions.
11. “*Attorney Fee and Cost Fund*” means an account consisting of \$187,115,422.10 to pay attorneys’ fees and costs of Litigating Subdivisions that become Participating Subdivisions and the MDL Expense Fund, amounts pursuant to the agreement on attorneys’ fees and costs attached as Exhibit R.
12. “*Bar*” means either (1) a ruling by the highest court of the State, or the intermediate court of appeals when not subject to further review by the highest court of the State in a State with a single intermediate court of appeals, setting forth the general principle that no Subdivisions or Special Districts in the State may maintain Released Claims against Released Entities, whether on the ground of the Agreement (or the release in it) or otherwise; (2) a law barring Subdivisions and Special Districts in the State from maintaining or asserting Released Claims against Released Entities (either through a direct bar or through a grant of authority to release claims and that authority is exercised in full); or (3) a Settlement Class Resolution in the State with full force and effect. For the avoidance of doubt, a law or ruling that is conditioned or predicated upon payment by a Released Entity (apart from payments by Allergan incurred under the Agreement) shall not constitute a Bar.
13. “*Base Payment*” means the payments made pursuant to Section VII.D.
14. “*Case-Specific Resolution*” means either (1) a law barring specified Subdivisions or Special Districts from maintaining Released Claims against Released Entities (either through a direct Bar or through a grant of authority to release claims and that authority is exercised in full) or (2) a ruling by a court of competent jurisdiction over a particular Subdivision or Special District that has the legal effect of barring the Subdivision or Special District from maintaining any Released Claims at issue against Released Entities, whether on the ground of the Agreement (or the release in it) or otherwise. For the avoidance of doubt, a law, ruling, or release that is conditioned or predicated upon a post-Effective Date payment by a Released Entity (apart from payments by Allergan incurred under the Agreement or injunctive relief obligations incurred by it) shall not constitute a Case-Specific Resolution.
15. “*Claim*” means any past, present or future cause of action, claim for relief, cross-claim or counterclaim, theory of liability, demand, derivative, claim, request, assessment, charge, covenant, damage, debt, lien, loss, fine, penalty, restitution, reimbursement, disgorgement, expenses, judgment, right, obligation, dispute, suit, contract, controversy, agreement, parens patriae claim, promise, performance, warranty, omission, or grievance of any nature whatsoever, whether legal, equitable, statutory, regulatory or administrative, whether arising under federal,

state or local common law, statute, regulation, guidance, ordinance or principles of equity, whether filed or unfiled, whether asserted or unasserted, whether known or unknown, whether accrued or unaccrued, whether foreseen, unforeseen or unforeseeable, whether discovered or undiscovered, whether suspected or unsuspected, whether fixed or contingent, and whether existing or hereafter arising, in all such cases, including but not limited to any request for declaratory, injunctive, or equitable relief, compensatory, punitive, or statutory damages, absolute liability, strict liability, restitution, subrogation, contribution, indemnity, apportionment, disgorgement, reimbursement, attorney fees, expert fees, consultant fees, fines, penalties, expenses, costs or any other legal, equitable, civil, administrative, or regulatory remedy whatsoever. Claim does not include any individuals' personal injury or wrongful death cause of action.

16. “*Claim Over*” means a Claim asserted by a Non-Released Entity against a Released Entity on the basis of contribution, indemnity, or other claim over on any theory relating to a Non-Party Covered Conduct Claim asserted by a Releasor.
17. “*Compensatory Restitution Amount*” means the aggregate amount of payments by Allergan hereunder other than amounts paid as attorneys’ fees and costs or identified pursuant to subsection VIII.C as being used to pay attorneys’ fees and investigation costs or litigation costs.
18. “*Consent Judgment*” means a state-specific consent judgment, the general terms of which shall be agreed by the Settling States and Allergan prior to the Reference Date and shall include (1) approval of this Agreement and (2) the release set forth in Section V, including the full and final resolution of any Released Claims that the Settling State has brought against Released Entities.
19. “*Court*” means the respective court for each Settling State to which the Agreement and the Consent Judgment are presented for approval and/or entry as to that Settling State, or the Northern District of Ohio for purposes of administering the Attorney Fee and Cost Fund and any related fee and cost agreements.
20. “*Covered Conduct*” means any actual or alleged act, failure to act, negligence, statement, error, omission, breach of any duty, conduct, event, transaction, agreement, service, work, misstatement, misleading statement, or other activity of any kind whatsoever from the beginning of time through the Reference Date of this Agreement (and any past, present, or future consequence of any such act, failure to act, negligence, statement, error, omission, breach of duty, conduct, event, transaction, agreement, service, work, misstatement, misleading statement, or other activity) arising from or relating in any way to (a) the availability, discovery, research, development, manufacture, packaging, repackaging, marketing, promotion, advertising, labeling, relabeling, recall, withdrawal, distribution, delivery, monitoring, reporting, supply, sale, prescribing, dispensing, physical security, warehousing, use or abuse of, or operating procedures relating to, any Product, or any system, plan, policy, procedure, or advocacy relating to any Product or class of Products, including, but not limited to, any unbranded or branded

promotion, marketing, or advertising, unbranded information, patient support or assistance, educational programs, consultancy, research, or other programs, campaigns, lobbying, or grants, sponsorships, charitable donations, or other funding relating to any Product or class of Products; (b) the characteristics, properties, risks, or benefits of any Product or class of Products; (c) the monitoring, reporting, disclosure, non-monitoring, non-reporting, or non-disclosure to federal, state, or other regulators of orders for any Product or class of Products; (d) the selective breeding, harvesting, extracting, purifying, exporting, importing, applying for quota for, procuring quota for, handling, promoting, manufacturing, processing, packaging, supplying, distributing, converting, or selling of, or otherwise engaging in any activity relating to, a precursor or component of Product, including but not limited to natural, synthetic, semi-synthetic, or chemical raw materials, starting materials, finished active pharmaceutical ingredients, drug substances, or any related intermediate of Product; and/or (e) diversion control programs or suspicious order monitoring related to any Product. The foregoing is not intended to apply to claims alleging contamination of products.

21. “*Covered Special Districts*” means a Special District that is (1) a school district with K-12 student enrollment of at least 25,000 or 0.12% of a State’s population, whichever is greater; (2) a fire district that covers a population of 25,000, or 0.20% of a State’s population if a State’s population is greater than 18 million (though, if a fire district’s population is not easily calculable from state data sources and agreed to between the State and Allergan, it is calculated by dividing the population of the county or counties a fire district serves by the number of fire districts in the county or counties); or (3) a healthcare district or hospital district with at least 125 hospital beds in one or more hospitals rendering services in that district.
22. “*Designated State*” means New York.
23. “*Divested Actavis Generic Entity(ies)*” means Actavis LLC, Watson, Actavis Pharma, Actavis Elizabeth, Actavis Kadian, Actavis Labs FL, Actavis Labs UT, Actavis Mid, Actavis South, and Actavis Totowa.
24. “*Divested Entity(ies)*” means those companies listed on Exhibit J-3, which includes the Divested Actavis Generic Entities.
25. “*Effective Date*” means the date sixty (60) days after the Reference Date.
26. “*Eligible State*” means a State that is not a Prior Settling State and is thus eligible to participate in this Agreement and become a Settling State.
27. “*Enforcement Committee*” means a committee consisting of representatives of the Settling States and of the Participating Subdivisions. Exhibit B contains the organizational bylaws of the Enforcement Committee. Notice pursuant to subsection XVI.P shall be provided when there are changes in membership or contact information.

28. “*Exhibit G Participant*” means a Participating Subdivision or Participating Special District that appears in Exhibit G at the relevant point in time. Nothing about the use of the term Exhibit G Participant changes the ability to amend the list of entities listed on Exhibit G pursuant to this Agreement.
29. “*Global Settlement Abatement Amount*” means the total abatement amount of \$2,149,873,027.00. (This figure does not reflect the application of the Prior Settlements Credit or potential offsets. It also does not include amounts paid to the Additional Restitution Amount, which may be used for abatement.)
30. “*Global Settlement Amount*” means \$2,372,972,184.12 and consists of the Global Settlement Abatement Amount, the Global Settlement Attorney Fee Amount, and the Additional Restitution Amount.
31. “*Global Settlement Attorney Fee Amount*” means \$206,906,476.36, which consists of the Attorney Fee and Cost Fund, the State Outside Counsel Fee Fund, and the State Cost Fund.
32. “*Implementation Administrator*” means the vendor agreed to by the Parties and retained by Teva and Allergan to provide notice pursuant to Section X.A and to manage the initial joinder period for Subdivisions and Special Districts, including the issuance and receipt of Settlement Participation Forms.
33. “*Implementation Costs*” means the costs for the Implementation Administrator, which shall be paid for pursuant to subsection VI.DC.
34. “*Incentive A*” means the incentive payment described in subsection VII.E.56.
35. “*Incentive B*” means the incentive payment described in subsection VII.E.67.
36. “*Incentive C*” means the incentive payment described in subsection VII.E.78.
37. “*Incentive D*” means the incentive payment described in subsection VII.E.89.
38. “*Incentive Payment*” means the payments made pursuant to Section VII.E.
39. “*Initial Participating Special District*” means a Special District that meets the requirements set forth in subsection IX.L.
40. “*Initial Participating Subdivision*” means a Subdivision that meets the requirements set forth in subsection IX.D.
41. “*Initial Participation Date*” means the date ninety (90) days after the Preliminary Agreement Date, unless it is extended by written agreement of Allergan and the Enforcement Committee.
42. “*Initial Year Payment*” means the first Annual Payment of the Net Abatement Amount payable into the Settlement Fund by Allergan on the Payment Date as

calculated by the Settlement Fund Administrator pursuant to Section VII or agreed to pursuant to Section VII.B.6, which shall not exceed the maximum payment for the Initial Year Payment as set forth in Exhibit M.

43. “*Injunctive Relief Terms*” means the terms described in Section IV and set forth in Exhibit P.
44. “*Later Litigating Special District*” means a Special District (or Special District official asserting the right of or for the Special District to recover for Alleged Harms to the Special District and/or the people thereof) that is not a Litigating Special District and that files a lawsuit bringing a Released Claim against a Released Entity, or that adds such a Claim to a pre-existing lawsuit, after the Preliminary Agreement Date. It may also include a Litigating Special District whose Claims were resolved by a Bar or Case-Specific Resolution, which is later revoked following the execution date of this Agreement, when such Litigating Special District takes any affirmative step in its lawsuit other than seeking a stay, removal or dismissal with prejudice.
45. “*Later Litigating Subdivision*” means a Subdivision (or Subdivision official asserting the right of or for the Subdivision to recover for Alleged Harms to the Subdivision and/or the people thereof) that is not a Litigating Subdivision and that files a lawsuit bringing a Released Claim against a Released Entity, or that adds such a Claim to a pre-existing lawsuit, after the Preliminary Agreement Date. It may also include a Litigating Subdivision whose Claims were resolved by a Bar or Case-Specific Resolution, which is later revoked following the execution date of this Agreement, when such Litigating Subdivision takes any affirmative step in its lawsuit other than seeking a stay, removal, or dismissal with prejudice.
46. “*Later Participating Special District*” means a Participating Special District that meets the requirements of subsection IX.M but is not an Initial Participating Special District.
47. “*Later Participating Subdivision*” means a Participating Subdivision that meets the requirements of subsection IX.E but is not an Initial Participating Subdivision.
48. “*Litigating Special District*” means a Special District (or Special District official asserting the right of or for the Special District to recover for Alleged Harms to the Special District and/or the people thereof) that brought any Released Claims against any Released Entities on or before the Preliminary Agreement Date that were not separately resolved prior to that date. Exhibit C includes an agreed list of the Litigating Special Districts. Exhibit C will be updated (including with any corrections) periodically, and a final version of Exhibit C will be attached hereto as of the Effective Date.
49. “*Litigating Subdivision*” means a Subdivision (or Subdivision official asserting the right of or for the Subdivision to recover for Alleged Harms to the Subdivision and/or the people thereof) that brought any Released Claims against any Released

Entities on or before the Preliminary Agreement Date that were not separately resolved prior to that date. A Prior Settling Subdivision shall not be considered a Litigating Subdivision. Exhibit C includes an agreed list of the Litigating Subdivisions. Exhibit C will be updated (including with any corrections) periodically, and a final version of Exhibit C will be attached hereto as of the Effective Date.

50. “*National Arbitration Panel*” means the panel described in subsection ~~XV.E.4~~XIV.G.4.
51. “*National Disputes*” means the disputes described in subsection XIV.G~~XV.E~~.
52. “*Net Abatement Amount*” means \$1,799,186,751.00, which is the Global Settlement Abatement Amount adjusted for the Prior Settlements Credit pursuant to subsection VIC.2.
53. “*Non-Litigating Covered Special District*” means a Covered Special District that is not a Litigating Special District.
54. “*Non-Litigating Special District*” means a Special District that is neither a Litigating Special District nor a Later Litigating Special District.
55. “*Non-Litigating Subdivision*” means a Subdivision that is not (1) a Litigating Subdivision, (2) a Later Litigating Subdivision, or (3) a Prior Settling Subdivision.
56. “*Non-Participating Special District*” means a Special District that is not a Participating Special District.
57. “*Non-Participating Subdivision*” means a Subdivision that is not a Participating Subdivision. For the avoidance of doubt, Non-Participating Subdivision also includes Prior Settling Subdivisions.
58. “*Non-Party Covered Conduct Claim*” means a Claim against any Non-Released Entity involving, arising out of, or related to Covered Conduct (or conduct that would be Covered Conduct if engaged in by a Released Entity).
59. “*Non-Party Settlement*” means a settlement by any Releasor that settles any Non-Party Covered Conduct Claim and includes a release of any Non-Released Entity.
60. “*Non-Released Entity*” means an entity that is not a Released Entity.
61. “*Non-Settling State*” means a State that is an Eligible State but not a Settling State.
62. “*Opioid Remediation*” means care, treatment, and other programs and expenditures (including reimbursement for past such programs or expenditures except where this Agreement restricts the use of funds solely to future Opioid Remediation) designed to (1) address the misuse and abuse of opioid products, (2) treat or mitigate opioid use or related disorders, or (3) mitigate other alleged effects of the opioid abuse

crisis, including on those injured as a result of the opioid abuse crisis. Exhibit E provides a non-exhaustive list of expenditures that qualify as being paid for Opioid Remediation. Qualifying expenditures may include reasonable related administrative expenses.

63. “*Participating Special District*” means a Special District that signs the Settlement Participation Form annexed hereto as Exhibit K and meets the requirements for becoming a Participating Special District under Section IX. Participating Special Districts include both Initial Participating Special Districts and Later Participating Special Districts.
64. “*Participating Subdivision*” means a Subdivision that signs a Settlement Participation Form annexed hereto as Exhibit K and meets requirements for becoming a Participating Subdivision under Section IX. Participating Subdivisions include both Initial Participating Subdivisions and Later Participating Subdivisions.
65. “*Parties*” means Allergan and the Settling States (each, a “*Party*”).
66. “*Payment Date*” means the date on which Allergan makes its Annual Payments (including its Initial Year Payment), Additional Restitution Payments, and Attorney Fee and Cost Payments, pursuant to Section VII and XIII and Exhibits M-1 and M-2. The first Payment Date is thirty (30) days after the Effective Date. The second Payment Date is July 15, 2024, the third Payment Date is July 15, 2025, the fourth Payment Date is July 15, 2026, the fifth Payment Date is July 15, 2027, ~~and~~ the sixth Payment Date is July 15, 2028, and the seventh Payment Date is July 15, 2029.
67. “*Payment Year*” means the calendar year during which the applicable Annual Payment is due pursuant to subsection VII.B. Payment Year 1 is 2023, Payment Year 2 is 2024, and so forth. References to payment “for a Payment Year” mean the Annual Payment due that year. References to eligibility “for a Payment Year” mean eligibility in connection with the Annual Payment due during that year.
68. “*Preliminary Agreement Date*” means the date on which Allergan gives notice to the Settling States and MDL Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee of its determination that a sufficient number of States have agreed to be Settling States to proceed with notice pursuant to Section IX.A. This date shall be no more than fourteen (14) days after the end of the notice period to States (as set forth in Section II.A) unless it is extended by written agreement of Allergan and the Enforcement Committee.
69. “*Primary Subdivision*” means a Subdivision that has a population of 30,000 or more. A list of Primary Subdivisions in each State is provided in Exhibit I, and such list shall be updated if any Primary Subdivision is inadvertently missed or included.
70. “*Prior Settlements Credit*” means the credit of \$350,686,276.00, reflecting that the allocations for Prior Settling States and Prior Settling Subdivisions for Claims related to the Covered Conduct against Allergan and/or other Released Entities were or will be separately settled. The credit is applied pursuant to subsection VI.A.1.

71. “*Prior Settling State(s)*” means Florida, Louisiana, New York, Rhode Island, and West Virginia and all Subdivisions and Special Districts within those States whose Claims were released as part of those States’ settlements.
72. “*Prior Settling Subdivision(s)*” means the City and County of San Francisco, California, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, and Summit County, Ohio.
73. “*Product*” means any chemical substance, whether used for medicinal or non-medicinal purposes, and whether natural, synthetic, or semi-synthetic, or any finished pharmaceutical product made from or with such substance, that is an opioid or opiate, as well as any product containing any such substance. It also includes: 1) the following when used in combination with opioids or opiates: benzodiazepine, carisoprodol, zolpidem, gabapentin, diazepam, estazolam, quazepam, alprazolam, clonazepam, oxazepam, flurazepam, triazolam, temazepam, midazolam; and 2) a combination or “cocktail” of any stimulant or other chemical substance prescribed, sold, bought, or dispensed to be used together that includes opioids or opiates. For the avoidance of doubt, “*Product*” does not include benzodiazepine, carisoprodol, zolpidem, or gabapentin when not used in combination with opioids or opiates. “*Product*” includes but is not limited to any substance consisting of or containing buprenorphine, codeine, fentanyl, hydrocodone, hydromorphone, meperidine, methadone, morphine, naloxone, naltrexone, oxycodone, oxymorphone, pentazocine, propoxyphene, tapentadol, tramadol, opium, heroin, carfentanil, any variant of these substances, or any similar substance. “*Product*” also includes any natural, synthetic, semi-synthetic or chemical raw materials, starting materials, finished active pharmaceutical ingredients, drug substances, and any related intermediate products used or created in the manufacturing process for any of the substances described in the preceding sentence. Further, “*Product(s)*” includes, but is not limited to, the following: (a) Anexsia, Bancap HC, Combunox, Dilaudid, Dilaudid HP, Duradyne, Esgic with Codeine, Fiorinal with Codeine, Fioricet with Codeine, Kadian, Lorcet, Lorcet Plus, Maxidone, MoxDuo, Norco, Procet, Reprexain, Vicodin, Vicodin ES, Vicodin HP, and Vicoprofen, and any type, version, strength, or dosage of the foregoing; and (b) Aspirin + butalbital + caffeine + codeine phosphate, Fentanyl citrate injection, Fentanyl citrate tablet, Fentanyl transdermal, Homatropine methylbromide + hydrocodone bitartrate, Hydrocodone + acetaminophen, Hydrocodone + ibuprofen, Hydromorphone tablet, Meperidine hydrochloride injection, Meperidine hydrochloride tablet, Morphine sulfate capsule, Morphine sulfate injection, Morphine sulfate tablet, Oxycodone, Oxycodone + acetaminophen, Oxycodone + aspirin, Oxycodone + hydrochloride, Oxycodone + ibuprofen, Oxymorphone tablet, Tramadol hydrochloride, and any type, version, strength, or dosage of the foregoing.
74. “*Reference Date*” means the date on which Allergan is to inform the Settling States and MDL Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee of its determination whether there is sufficient resolution of Claims and potential Claims at the Subdivision level to go forward with the settlement. The Reference Date shall be no later than thirty (30) days after the Initial Participation Date, unless it is extended by written agreement of Allergan and the Enforcement Committee.

75. “*Released Claims*” means any and all Claims that directly or indirectly are based on, arise out of, or in any way relate to or concern the Covered Conduct occurring prior to the Reference Date. Without limiting the foregoing, “Released Claims” include any Claims that have been asserted against the Released Entities by any Settling State or any of its Litigating Subdivisions or Litigating Special Districts in any federal, state, or local action or proceeding (whether judicial, arbitral, or administrative) based on, relating to, in whole or in part, the Covered Conduct, or any such Claims that could be or could have been asserted now or in the future in those actions or in any comparable action or proceeding brought by a State or any of its Subdivisions or Special Districts or any Releasors (whether or not such State, Subdivision, Special District, or Releasor has brought such action or proceeding). Released Claims also include all Claims against Released Entities asserted in any proceeding to be dismissed pursuant to the Agreement, whether or not such claims relate to Covered Conduct. “Released Claims” shall be interpreted broadly. This Agreement does not release Claims by private individuals. Claims by private individuals shall be treated in accordance with applicable law. Released Claims is also used herein to describe Claims brought by a Later Litigating Subdivision, Later Litigating Special District, or other non-party Subdivision or Special District that would have been Released Claims if they had been brought by a Releasor against a Released Entity before the Effective Date.
76. “*Released Entities*” means Allergan and (1) all of Allergan’s past and present direct or indirect parents, subsidiaries, divisions, joint ventures, predecessors, successors, affiliates, business units, assigns, agents (all of the foregoing solely in their capacity as such with respect to the Released Claims), and insurers (solely in their role as insurers, if any, with respect to the Released Claims), including, but not limited to, (a) AbbVie and (b) Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities (and their respective past and current parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates, including but not limited to Teva Ltd., Teva USA, and their subsidiaries and affiliates) but solely as to the branded opioid drugs that are Products distributed and/or sold before August 2, 2016 by Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities and the operation of the Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities related to those branded opioid drugs that are Products before August 2, 2016; (2) any person or entity to the extent, and only to the extent, that such person or entity may have a Claim based on such person or entity having a business relationship with Allergan or AbbVie and/or any of Allergan or AbbVie’s Affiliated Companies, including, but not limited to, for contractual indemnity, equitable or implied indemnity, contribution, comparative fault, reimbursement, or apportionment (including, but not limited to, the respective past and present direct or indirect parents, subsidiaries, divisions, joint ventures, predecessors, successors, affiliates, business units, assigns, partners, manufacturers, contractors, agents, and insurers (all of the foregoing solely in their capacity as such with respect to the Released Claims) of any of the foregoing in (1), including Abbott Laboratories and Abbott Laboratories Inc. (“Abbott”), provided that, for avoidance of doubt, Abbott is not a Released Entity for purposes of Claims related to OxyContin, Purdue Pharma, or Purdue Pharma Inc.; and (ii) Halo Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Shionogi Inc., Mikart, LLC, PDI, Inc., TMS Health, LLC, National Health Information Network,

Inc., Ventiv Commercial Services, LLC, inVentiv Commercial Services, LLC, UPS Supply Chain Solutions, Inc., and King Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and their respective past and current parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates) against Allergan or AbbVie and/or any of Allergan or AbbVie's Affiliated Companies relating to any Covered Conduct, Products, class of Products, and/or Released Claims arising from such business relationship; and (3) the respective past and present employees, officers, directors, members, shareholders, partners, trustees, contractors, consultants, and agents (all of the foregoing solely in their capacity as such with respect to the Released Claims) of any of the foregoing in (1) and (2). Notwithstanding the foregoing (and subject to certain provisions, including, but not limited to, the Non-Party Settlement at Section V.B.2 and the Set-Off at Section XV below), Released Entities shall exclude Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities (and their respective past and current parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates, including but not limited to Teva Ltd., Teva USA, and their subsidiaries and affiliates, but not Allergan and other Released Entities), but solely as to: (i) their generic opioid drugs that are Products, and/or (ii) the operation of Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities related to those generic opioid drugs that are Products for which Releasors have also sought to hold Allergan (and/or other Released Entities) liable. For the avoidance of doubt, any entity acquired, or joint venture entered into by Allergan after the Reference date is not a Released Entity.

77. “*Releasors*” means (1) each Settling State; (2) each Participating Subdivision; (3) each Participating Special District; and (4) without limitation and to the maximum extent of the power of each Settling State’s Attorney General and/or Participating Subdivision and Participating Special District to release Claims, (a) the Settling State’s, Participating Subdivision’s, and Participating Special District’s departments, agencies, divisions, boards, commissions, Subdivisions, districts, instrumentalities of any kind and attorneys, including its Attorney General, and any person in their official capacity whether elected or appointed to serve any of the foregoing and any agency, person, or other entity claiming by or through any of the foregoing, (b) any public entities, public instrumentalities, public educational institutions, unincorporated districts, fire districts, irrigation districts, water districts, emergency services districts, school districts, healthcare districts, hospital districts, Sheriffs and law enforcement districts, library districts, coroner’s offices, and public transportation authorities, and other Special Districts in a Settling State, including those with the regulatory authority to enforce state and federal controlled substances acts or the authority to bring Claims related to Covered Conduct seeking money (including abatement (or remediation and/or restitution)) or revoke a pharmaceutical distribution license, and (c) any person or entity acting in a *parens patriae*, sovereign, quasi-sovereign, private attorney general, *qui tam*, taxpayer, or other capacity seeking relief, including but not limited to, fines, penalties, or punitive damages, on behalf of or generally applicable to the general public with respect to a Settling State or a Subdivision or Special District in a Settling State, whether or not any of them participate in the Agreement. “*Releasors*” does not include persons acting in an individual capacity, regardless of the type of relief sought. In addition to being a Releasor as provided herein, Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts shall also provide a Settlement

Participation Form, which is attached as Exhibit K. Each Settling State’s Attorney General represents that he or she has or has obtained (or will obtain no later than the Effective Date) the authority set forth in the Representation and Warranty subsection of Section V.

78. “*Revocation Event*” means with respect to a Bar, Settlement Class Resolution, or Case-Specific Resolution, a legislative amendment or a revocation, rescission, reversal, overruling, or interpretation that in any way limits the effect of such Bar, Settlement Class Resolution, or Case-Specific Resolution on Released Claims or any other action or event that otherwise deprives the Bar, Settlement Class Resolution or Case-Specific Resolution of force or effect in any material respect.
79. “*Settlement Class Resolution*” means a class action resolution in a court of competent jurisdiction in a Settling State with respect to a class of Subdivisions and Special Districts in that State that (1) conforms with that Settling State’s statutes, case law, and/or rules of procedure regarding class actions; (2) is approved and entered as an order of a court of competent jurisdiction in that State and has become final as defined in “State-Specific Finality”; (3) is binding on all Non-Participating Subdivisions and Non-Participating Special Districts in that State (other than opt outs as permitted under the next sentence); (4) provides that all such Non-Participating Subdivisions or Non-Participating Special Districts may not bring Released Claims against Released Entities, whether on the ground of the Agreement (or the releases herein) or otherwise; and (5) does not impose any costs or obligations on Allergan other than those provided for in the Agreement, or contain any provision inconsistent with any provision of the Agreement. If applicable state law requires that opt-out rights be afforded to members of the class, a class action resolution otherwise meeting the foregoing requirements shall qualify as a Settlement Class Resolution unless Subdivisions collectively representing more than 1% of the total population of all of that State’s Subdivisions listed in Exhibit G opt out. In seeking certification of any Settlement Class, the applicable State and Participating Subdivisions shall make clear that certification is sought solely for settlement purposes and shall have no applicability beyond approval of the settlement for which certification is sought. Nothing in this Agreement constitutes an admission by any Party that class certification would be appropriate for litigation purposes in any case.
80. “*Settlement Fund*” means the interest-bearing fund established under the Agreement into which Annual Payments by Allergan are made pursuant to subsection VII. The Settlement Fund comprises the Abatement Accounts Fund, State Fund, and Subdivision Fund.
81. “*Settlement Fund Administrator*” means the entity that determines the Annual Payments (including calculating Incentive Payments pursuant to Section VII) and any amounts subject to offset pursuant to Sections VII.C and XI), and administers and distributes amounts into the Settlement Fund. It shall also administer and distribute the Additional Restitution Amount pursuant to Section XII. The duties of the Settlement Fund Administrator shall be governed by this Agreement. Prior to

the Initial Participation Date, the Parties shall agree to selection and removal processes for and a detailed description of the Settlement Fund Administrator's duties all of which shall be appended to the Agreement as Exhibit L.

82. "*Settlement Fund Administrator Costs*" means any costs and fees associated with or arising out of the duties of the Settlement Fund Administrator with regard to Teva and Allergan's payments to the Settlement Fund as described in Exhibit L and elsewhere in this Agreement, including those arising from the use of a bank or other financial institution to receive and disburse payments.
83. "*Settlement Fund Escrow*" means the interest-bearing escrow fund established pursuant to this Agreement to hold disputed payments made under this Agreement.
84. "*Settlement Participation Form*" means the form attached as Exhibit K that Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts must execute and provide to Allergan and the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator, and which shall (1) make such Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts signatories to this Agreement, (2) include a full and complete release of any and all of such Participating Subdivisions' and Participating Special Districts' Claims and (3) require prompt cessation of litigation activity as set forth in Section III, and request for dismissal with prejudice of any Released Claims that have been filed against Released Entities by any such Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts within fourteen (14) business days after the Reference Date.
85. "*Settlement Payment Schedule*" means the schedule of payments attached to this Agreement as Exhibit M. Actual payment amounts are subject to adjustments consistent with this Agreement.
86. "*Settling State*" means any Eligible State that has entered into this Agreement.
87. "*Special District*" means (1) formal and legally recognized sub-entities of a State recognized by the U.S. Census Bureau¹ and those listed on Exhibit C; and (2) any person, official, or entity thereof acting in an official capacity on behalf of the Special District. Special Districts do not include sub-entities of a State that provide general governance for a defined area that would qualify as a Subdivision. Entities that include any of the following words or phrases in its name shall not be considered a Special District: mosquito, pest, insect, spray, vector, animal, air quality, air pollution, clean air, coastal water, tuberculosis, and sanitary.
88. "*State*" means any state of the United States of America, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Additionally, the use of non-capitalized "state" to describe

¹ All such entities are found on the "Special District," "School District," and "DEP School District" tabs of the Census Bureau's 2017 Government Units Listing spreadsheet available at https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/gus/datasets/2017/govt_units_2017.ZIP.

something (e.g., “state court”) shall also be read to include parallel entities in commonwealths, territories, and the District of Columbia (e.g., “territorial court”).

89. “*State Allocation Percentage*” means the allocation percentages for Eligible States as set forth in Exhibit F-2, which have been adjusted from the State Global Allocation Percentages to account for the Prior Settlements Credit.
90. “*State Cost Fund*” means the fund totaling \$3,598,373.50 and described in Exhibit T.
91. “*State Global Allocation Percentage*” means the allocation percentages for all States as set forth in Exhibit F-1, which represents allocations before the Prior Settlements Credit is applied.
92. “*State Fund*” means a component of the Settlement Fund described in subsection VIII.D.
93. “*State Outside Counsel Fee Fund*” means the fund totaling \$16,192,680.76 described in Exhibit S.
94. “*State-Specific Finality*” means, with respect to the Settling State in question:
 - a. the Agreement and the Consent Judgment have been approved and entered by the Court as to Allergan, including the release of all Released Claims against Released Entities as provided in this Agreement;
 - b. for all lawsuits brought by the Settling State against Released Entities for Released Claims, either previously filed or filed as part of the entry of the Consent Judgment, the Court has stated in the Consent Judgment or otherwise entered an order finding that all Released Claims against Released Entities asserted in the lawsuit have been resolved by agreement; and
 - c. (1) the time for appeal or to seek review of or permission to appeal from the approval and entry as described in subsection (a) hereof and entry of such order described in subsection (b) hereof has expired; or (2) in the event of an appeal, the appeal has been dismissed or denied, or the approval and entry described in (a) hereof and the order described in subsection (b) hereof have been affirmed in all material respects (to the extent challenged in the appeal) by the court of last resort to which such appeal has been taken and such dismissal or affirmance has become no longer subject to further appeal (including, without limitation, review by the United States Supreme Court).
95. “*State-Subdivision Agreement*” means an agreement that a Settling State reaches with the Subdivisions in that State regarding the allocation, distribution, and/or use of funds allocated to that State and to Exhibit G Participants in that State. A State-Subdivision Agreement shall be effective if approved pursuant to the provisions of Exhibit O or if adopted by statute. Preexisting agreements addressing funds other

than those allocated pursuant to this Agreement shall qualify if the approval requirements of Exhibit O are met. A State and its Subdivisions may revise, supplement, or refine a State-Subdivision Agreement if approved pursuant to the provisions of Exhibit O or if adopted by statute.

96. “*Statewide Payment Amount*” means the amount from an Annual Payment to be paid to a Settling State, its separate types of funds (if applicable), and its Exhibit G Participants.
97. “*Statutory Trust*” means a trust fund established by state law to receive funds allocated to a State’s Abatement Accounts Fund and restrict their expenditure to Opioid Remediation purposes subject to reasonable administrative expenses. A State may give a Statutory Trust authority to allocate one or more of the three Settlement Funds, but this is not required.
98. “*Subdivision*” means (1) a formal and legally recognized sub-entity of a State that provide general governance for a defined area, such as a municipality, county, parish, city, town, incorporated township, village, borough, or any other entities that provide municipal-type government within a State, and (2) any person, official, or entity thereof acting in an official capacity on behalf of the Subdivision (including, without limitation, district attorneys, county attorneys, city attorneys, Sheriffs, and any other official, employee, or representative). Unless otherwise specified, “Subdivision” includes all functional counties and parishes and other functional levels of sub-entities of a State that provide general governance for a defined area. Historic, non-functioning sub-entities of a State (such as Connecticut counties) are not Subdivisions, unless the entity has filed a lawsuit that includes a Released Claim against a Released Entity in a direct, parens patriae, or any other capacity. For purposes of this Agreement, the term Subdivision does not include Special Districts.
99. “*Subdivision and Special District Allocation Percentage*” means for Subdivisions and Special Districts in a Settling State that are eligible to receive an allocation from the Subdivision Fund pursuant to subsection VIII.D or subsection VIII.E, the percentage as set forth in Exhibit G. The aggregate Subdivision and Special District Allocation Percentage of all Subdivisions and Special Districts receiving a Subdivision and Special District Allocation Percentage in each State shall equal 100%. Immediately upon the effectiveness of any State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution allowed by subsection VIII.E.3 (or upon the effectiveness of an amendment to any State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution allowed by subsection VIII.E.3) that addresses allocation from the Subdivision Fund, whether before or after the Initial Participation Date, Exhibit G will automatically be amended to reflect the allocation from the Subdivision Fund pursuant to the State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution allowed by Section VIII.E.3. The Subdivision and Special District Allocation Percentages contained in Exhibit G may not change once notice is distributed pursuant to subsection X.A, except upon the effectiveness

of any State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution allowed by subsection VIII.E.3 (or upon the effectiveness of an amendment to any State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution allowed by subsection VIII.E.3) that addresses allocation from the Subdivision Fund. For the avoidance of doubt, no Subdivision or Special District not listed on Exhibit G shall receive an allocation from the Subdivision Fund and no provision of this Agreement shall be interpreted to create such an entitlement.

100. “*Subdivision Fund*” means a component of the Settlement Fund described in subsection VIII.A.
101. “*Teva*” means (i) Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. and, (ii) all of its respective past and present direct or indirect parents, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, joint ventures, predecessors, successors, assigns, including but not limited to the Divested Actavis Generic Entities and Anda Inc.
102. “*Teva Global Opioid Settlement Agreement*” means the settlement agreement between and among the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, Participating Special Districts, and Teva to resolve opioid-related Claims against Teva and the other Released Entities (as defined therein).
103. “*Threshold Motion*” means a motion to dismiss or equivalent dispositive motion made at the outset of litigation under applicable procedure. A Threshold Motion must include as potential grounds for dismissal, any applicable Bar or the relevant release by a Settling State, Participating Subdivision, or Participating Special District provided under this Agreement and, where appropriate under applicable law, any applicable limitations defense.

II. Participation by States and Condition to Preliminary Agreement

- A. *Notice to States.* On November 22, 2022 this Agreement shall be distributed to all Eligible States. The Eligible States’ Attorneys General shall then have a period of thirty (30) days to decide whether to become Settling States. Eligible States will decide whether to become Settling States for both this Agreement and the Teva Global Opioid Settlement Agreement, or decline participation in both settlements. However, if Teva enters bankruptcy prior to the Effective Date, Eligible States can choose to only join this Agreement. If a State is only an Eligible State with respect to one of the Agreements, the State need only decide whether to become a Settling State with respect to the Agreement for which it is an Eligible State. States that determine to become Settling States shall so notify the Enforcement Committee and Allergan within thirty (30) days after November 22, 2022 and shall further commit to obtaining any necessary additional State releases prior to the Effective Date. This notice

period for States may be extended by written agreement of Allergan and the Enforcement Committee.

- B.** *Ineligible States.* Non-Settling States and Prior Settling States shall not be eligible for any payments or have any rights in connection with this Agreement.
- C.** *Condition to Preliminary Agreement.* Following the notice period to Eligible States set forth in subsection II.A above, Allergan shall determine on or before the Preliminary Agreement Date whether, in its sole discretion enough States have agreed to become Settling States to proceed with notice to Subdivisions as set forth in Section X below. The determination to proceed shall be in the sole discretion of Allergan and may be based on any criteria or factors deemed relevant by Allergan. If Allergan determines that this condition has been satisfied, and that notice to the Subdivisions should proceed, it will so notify the Settling States by providing notice to the Enforcement Committee on the Preliminary Agreement Date. If Allergan determines that this condition has not been satisfied, it will so notify the Settling States by providing notice to the Enforcement Committee, and this Agreement will have no further effect and all releases and other commitments or obligations contained herein will be void, other than Allergan's funding of Implementation Costs to date. The Preliminary Agreement Date may be extended by written agreement of Allergan and the Enforcement Committee.
- D.** *Later Joinder by States.* After the Preliminary Agreement Date, an Eligible State may only become a Settling State with the consent of Allergan, in its sole discretion. If a State becomes a Settling State more than thirty (30) days after the Preliminary Agreement Date, the Subdivisions and Special Districts in that State that become Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts within ninety (90) days of the State becoming a Settling State shall be considered Initial Participating Subdivisions or Initial Participating Special Districts.

III. Cessation of Litigation Activities

- A.** Following the Preliminary Agreement Date, if Allergan has determined to proceed with notice pursuant to Section II, all Litigating States that intend to become Settling States and that are engaged in or have engaged in discovery and/or substantive motion practice ("*Active Litigation*") against a Released Entity shall make reasonable efforts to immediately cease litigation activity (e.g., written and document discovery, depositions, expert disclosures, and motion practice) against Allergan where feasible, or to minimize litigation activity by means of agreed deadline extensions and agreed postponement of depositions, document productions, and motion practice. Allergan shall cooperate in such efforts. The obligations under this subsection do not extend past the Reference Date if Allergan determines it is not going forward with the Agreement. This paragraph III.A does not apply to Litigating States with a trial date within six (6) months of the Preliminary Agreement Date, though such Litigating States and Allergan shall engage in good faith discussions regarding the potential cessation of litigation activity.
- B.** Following the execution of the Settlement Participation Form, attached as Exhibit K, a Litigating Subdivision or Litigating Special District that is engaged in active litigation

against a Released Entity shall make all reasonable efforts to immediately cease all litigation activity (e.g., written and document discovery, depositions, expert disclosures, and motion practice) against Allergan, where feasible, or to minimize litigation activity by means of agreed deadline extensions and agreed postponement of litigation activity by means of agreed deadline extensions and agreed postponement of depositions, document productions, and motion practices. Allergan shall cooperate in such efforts. The obligations under this subsection do not extend past the Reference Date if Allergan determines it is not going forward with the settlement. This paragraph III.B does not apply to Litigating Subdivisions or Litigating Special Districts with a trial date within six (6) months of the Preliminary Agreement Date, though such Litigating Subdivisions or Litigating Special Districts and Allergan shall engage in good faith discussions regarding the potential cessation of litigation activity. Notwithstanding this provision no Litigating Subdivision is required to cease its litigation if it determines such action would be detrimental to its litigation.

- C. Following the Reference Date, the Settling States shall endeavor to file Consent Judgments (the contents of which must be agreed upon with Allergan) within thirty (30) days of the Reference Date. Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts, as applicable, shall request dismissal of their actions with prejudice within fourteen (14) days of the Reference Date. The Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts shall use best efforts to get Consent Judgments or orders of dismissal with prejudice, as applicable, entered promptly after filing.

IV. Injunctive Relief

- A. *Entry of Injunctive Relief.* As part of the Consent Judgment, the Parties agree to the Injunctive Relief Terms attached as Exhibit P.

V. Release

- A. *Scope.* As of the Effective Date, the Released Entities will be released and forever discharged from all of the Releasors' Released Claims. Each Settling State (for itself and its Releasors) and Participating Subdivision (for itself and its Releasors), and Participating Special District (for itself and its Releasors) will, on or before the Effective Date, absolutely, unconditionally, and irrevocably covenant not to bring, file, or claim, or to cause, assist in bringing, or permit to be brought, filed, or claimed, or to otherwise seek to establish liability for any Released Claims against any Released Entity in any forum whatsoever. The releases provided for in the Agreement are intended to be broad and shall be interpreted so as to give the Released Entities the broadest possible bar against any liability relating in any way to Released Claims and extend to the full extent of the power of each Settling State, its Attorney General, each Participating Subdivision, and each Participating Special District to release Claims. The release shall be a complete bar to any Released Claim of all Releasors. Nothing in this Agreement shall release or impair any Claims against Teva Ltd., Teva USA, Cephalon, or Anda, except to the extent expressly set forth in this Agreement.

B. *Claim Over and Non-Party Settlement.*

1. *Statement of Intent.* It is the intent of the Parties that:
 - a. Released Entities should not seek contribution or indemnification (other than pursuant to an insurance contract) from other parties for their payment obligations under this Agreement;
 - b. the payments made under this Agreement shall be the sole payments made by the Released Entities to the Releasers involving, arising out of, or related to Covered Conduct (or conduct that would be Covered Conduct if engaged in by a Released Entity);
 - c. Claims by Releasers against non-Parties should not result in additional payments by Released Entities, whether through contribution, indemnification or any other means; and
 - d. the Settlement meets the requirements of the Uniform Contribution Among Joint Tortfeasors Act and any similar state law or doctrine that reduces or discharges a released party's liability to any other parties.
 - e. The provisions of this subsection V.B are intended to be implemented consistent with these principles. This Agreement and the releases and dismissals provided for herein are made in good faith.
2. *Contribution/Indemnity Prohibited.* No Released Entity shall seek to recover for amounts paid under this Agreement based on indemnification, contribution, or any other theory from a manufacturer, pharmacy, hospital, pharmacy benefit manager, health insurer, third-party vendor, trade association, distributor, or health care practitioner, provided that a Released Entity shall be relieved of this prohibition with respect to any entity that asserts a Claim Over against it. However, and notwithstanding the foregoing, this provision shall not preclude any Released Entity from seeking indemnification, contribution, or any other theory from and against Teva Ltd., Divested Entities, Pfizer Inc., King Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Alpharma Inc., and/or each of their respective past and current parents, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing herein shall prohibit a Released Entity from recovering amounts owed pursuant to insurance contracts.
3. *Non-Party Settlement.* To the extent that, on or after the Reference Date, any Releaser enters into a Non-Party Settlement, including in any bankruptcy case or through any plan of reorganization (whether individually or as a class of creditors), the Releaser will include (or in the case of a Non-Party Settlement made in connection with a bankruptcy case, will cause the debtor to include), unless prohibited from doing so under applicable law, in the Non-Party Settlement a prohibition on contribution or indemnity of any kind substantially equivalent to that required from Allergan in subsection V.B.2, or a release from such Non-Released Entity in favor of the Released Entities (in a form equivalent to the releases

contained in this Agreement) of any Claim Over. The obligation to obtain the prohibition and/or release required by this subsection is a material term of this Agreement. The sole remedy for a Releasor's failure to include such a provision in a Non-Party Settlement shall be the application of Section V.B.4 below. Non-Released Entities include, but are not limited to, Teva Ltd., Teva USA, Divested Actavis Generic Entities or other Divested Entities, and Anda.

4. *Claim Over.* In the event that any Releasor obtains a judgment with respect to Non-Party Covered Conduct against a Non-Released Entity that does not contain a prohibition like that in subsection V.B.3, or any Releasor files a Non-Party Covered Conduct Claim against a Non-Released Entity in bankruptcy or a Releasor is prevented for any reason from obtaining a prohibition/release in a Non-Party Settlement as provided in subsection V.B.3, and such Non-Released Entity asserts a Claim Over against a Released Entity, then Releasor and Allergan shall take the following actions to ensure that the Released Entities do not pay more with respect to Covered Conduct to Releasors or to Non-Released Entities than the amounts owed under this Agreement by Allergan:
 - a. Allergan shall notify that Releasor of the Claim Over within sixty (60) days of the assertion of the Claim Over or sixty (60) days of the Effective Date of this Agreement, whichever is later;
 - b. Allergan and that Releasor shall meet and confer concerning the means to hold Released Entities harmless and ensure that it is not required to pay more with respect to Covered Conduct than the amounts owed by Allergan under this Agreement;
 - c. That Releasor and Allergan shall take steps sufficient and permissible under the law of the State of the Releasor to hold Released Entities harmless from the Claim Over and ensure Released Entities are not required to pay more with respect to Covered Conduct than the amounts owed by Allergan under this Agreement. Such steps may include, where permissible:
 - (i) Filing of motions to dismiss or such other appropriate motion by Allergan or Released Entities, and supported by Releasors, in response to any Claim filed in litigation or arbitration;
 - (ii) Reduction of that Releasor's Claim and any judgment it has obtained or may obtain against such Non-Released Entity by whatever amount or percentage is necessary to extinguish such Claim Over under applicable law, up to the amount that Releasor has obtained, may obtain, or has authority to control from such Non-Released Entity;
 - (iii) Placement into escrow of funds paid by the Non-Released Entities such that those funds are available to satisfy the Claim Over;

- (iv) Return of monies paid by Allergan to that Releasor under this Agreement to permit satisfaction of a judgment against or settlement with the Non-Released Entity to satisfy the Claim Over;
 - (v) Payment of monies to Allergan by that Releasor to ensure it is held harmless from such Claim Over, up to the amount that Releasor has obtained, may obtain, or has authority to control from such Non-Released Entity;
 - (vi) Credit to Allergan under this Agreement to reduce the overall amounts to be paid under the Agreement such that it is held harmless from the Claim Over; and
 - (vii) Such other actions as that Releasor and Allergan may devise to hold Allergan harmless from the Claim Over.
 - d. The actions of that Releasor and Allergan taken pursuant to paragraph (c) must, in combination, ensure Allergan is not required to pay more with respect to Covered Conduct than the amounts owed by Allergan under this Agreement.
 - e. In the event of any dispute over the sufficiency of the actions taken pursuant to paragraph (c), that Releasor and Allergan may seek review by the National Arbitration Panel, provided that, if the Parties agree, such dispute may be heard by the state court where the relevant Consent Judgment was filed. The National Arbitration Panel shall have authority to require Releasors to implement a remedy that includes one or more of the actions specified in paragraph (c) sufficient to hold Released Entities fully harmless. In the event that the panel's actions do not result in Released Entities being held fully harmless, Allergan shall have a Claim for breach of this Agreement by Releasors, with the remedy being payment of sufficient funds to hold Allergan harmless from the Claim Over. For the avoidance of doubt, the prior sentence does not limit or eliminate any other remedy that Allergan may have.
- C.** To the extent that the Claim Over is based on a contractual indemnity, the obligations under subsection V.B.4 shall extend solely to a Non-Party Covered Conduct Claim against a pharmacy, clinic, hospital or other purchaser or dispenser of Products, a manufacturer that sold or promoted Products, a consultant, and/or a pharmacy benefit manager or other third-party payor. Allergan shall notify the Settling States, to the extent permitted by applicable law, in the event that any of these types of Non-Released Entities asserts a Claim Over arising out of contractual indemnity against it.
- D.** *General Release.* In connection with the releases provided for in the Agreement, each Settling State (for itself and its Releasors), Participating Subdivision and Participating Special District expressly waives, releases, and forever discharges any and all provisions, rights, and benefits conferred by any law of any state or territory of the United States or

other jurisdiction, or principle of common law, which is similar, comparable, or equivalent to § 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

General Release; extent. A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release that, if known by him or her, would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party.

A Releasor may thereafter discover facts other than or different from those which it knows, believes, or assumes to be true with respect to the Released Claims, but each Settling State (for itself and its Releasors), Participating Subdivision and Participating Special District hereby expressly waives and fully, finally, and forever settles, releases, and discharges, upon the Effective Date, any and all Released Claims that may exist as of such date but which Releasors do not know or suspect to exist, whether through ignorance, oversight, error, negligence or through no fault whatsoever, and which, if known, would materially affect the Settling States' decision to enter into the Agreement, the Participating Subdivisions' decision to participate in the Agreement, or the Participating Special District's decision to participate in the Agreement.

- E.** *Res Judicata.* Nothing in the Agreement shall be deemed to reduce the scope of the res judicata or claim preclusive effect that the settlement memorialized in the Agreement, and/or any Consent Judgment or other judgment entered on the Agreement, gives rise to under applicable law.
- F.** *Representation and Warranty.* The signatories hereto on behalf of their respective Settling State, its Participating Subdivisions, and its Participating Special Districts, expressly represent and warrant that they will obtain on or before the Effective Date (or have obtained) the authority to settle and release, to the maximum extent of the State's power, all Released Claims of (1) their respective Settling State; (2) any of the Settling State's past and present executive departments, state agencies, divisions, boards, commissions and instrumentalities with the regulatory authority to enforce state and federal controlled substances acts; (3) any of their respective Settling State's past and present executive departments, agencies, divisions, boards, commissions and instrumentalities that have the authority to bring Claims related to Covered Conduct seeking money (including abatement and/or remediation) or revocation of a pharmaceutical distribution license; (4) any Participating Subdivisions; and (5) any Participating Special District. For the purposes of clause (3) above, executive departments, agencies, divisions, boards, commissions, and instrumentalities are those that are under the executive authority or direct control of the State's Governor. Also, for the purposes of clause (3), a release from a State's Governor is sufficient to demonstrate that the appropriate releases have been obtained.
- G.** *Effectiveness.* The releases set forth in the Agreement shall not be impacted in any way by any dispute that exists, has existed, or may later exist between or among the Releasors. Nor shall such releases be impacted in any way by any current or future law, regulation, ordinance, or court or agency order limiting, seizing, or controlling the distribution or use

of the Settlement Fund or any portion thereof, or by the enactment of future laws, or by any seizure of the Settlement Fund or any portion thereof.

- H.** *Cooperation.* Releasors (i) will not encourage any person or entity to bring or maintain any Released Claim against any Released Entity and (ii) will reasonably cooperate with and not oppose any effort by a Released Entity to secure the prompt dismissal of any and all Released Claims.
- I.** *Non-Released Claims.* Notwithstanding the foregoing or anything in the definition of Released Claims, the Agreement does not waive, release or limit any criminal liability, Claims for any outstanding liability under any tax or securities law, Claims against parties who are not Released Entities, Claims by private individuals, Claims for Medicaid rebates, Claims asserted, or that could be asserted, by any State, Subdivision, or Special District related to the causes of action in *In re: Generic Pharmaceuticals Pricing Antitrust Litigation*, in the United States District court for the District of Pennsylvania, MDL No. 2724, and any related action (such excluded claims include, but are not limited to, all antitrust claims and any claims related to any non-opioid generic drugs), and any claims arising under the Agreement for enforcement of the Agreement.

VI. Monetary Relief Overview and Maximum Payments

- A.** Excluding Allergan's share of Implementation Costs and costs of the Settlement Fund Administrator, there are three main categories of monetary payments:
1. *Annual Payments to the Settlement Fund.* These payments are generally addressed in Section VII. The maximum amount Allergan shall pay in Annual Payments to the Settlement Fund is the Net Abatement Amount of \$1,799,186,751.00, which reflects the application of the Prior Settlements Credit to the Global Settlement Abatement Amount. Annual Payments will be made over ~~six (6)~~seven (7) years on the Payment Dates. The actual amount paid will depend on, among other things, the level of participation of Eligible States, their Subdivisions, and their Special Districts.
 2. *Additional Restitution Amount.* These payments are generally addressed in Section XII. The maximum amount Allergan shall pay for the Additional Restitution Amount is \$16,192,680.76. Payments for the Additional Restitution Amount will be made over ~~three (3)~~four (4) years on the Payment Dates. The actual amount paid will depend on the number of Eligible States listed in Exhibit N that become Settling States.
 3. *Attorney Fee and Cost Payments.* These payments are generally addressed in Section XII and Exhibits M, R, S, and T. They consist of payments for the State Outside Counsel Fee Fund, the State Cost Fund, and the Attorney Fee and Cost Fund. These payments will be made over ~~three (3) years~~four (4) on the Payment Dates. The maximum amount Allergan shall pay into these funds is the Global Settlement Attorney Fee Amount of \$206,906,476.36.

- B.** The aggregate maximum amount Allergan shall pay for these for these payment categories is \$2,022,285,908.12 (the “*Post-Credit Global Settlement Amount*”). This figure does not include costs related to injunctive relief and document disclosure addressed in Exhibit P, Implementation Costs, and Settlement Fund Administrator Costs addressed in this Agreement. AbbVie agrees to satisfy the obligations to make the payments due in this Section VI if for any reason Allergan fails to fulfill its payment obligations under Section VI (the “*Payment Obligations*”).
- C.** For purposes of this Agreement only, Releasors represent that fifty-six percent (56%) of the Post-Credit Global Settlement Amount payable by Allergan constitutes consideration for the settlement of Claims involving, arising from, or related to generic opioid drugs that are Products distributed and/or sold before August 2, 2016 by Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities and the operation of Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities related to those generic opioid drugs that are Products before August 2, 2016 that the Releasors are asserting or might otherwise assert or could assert that Allergan (or any other Released Entity) is directly or indirectly and/or jointly or severally liable, including but not limited to, based on parent or control liability or a substantially similar theory. Releasors represent that forty-four percent (44%) of the Post-Credit Global Settlement Amount payable by Allergan constitutes consideration for the settlement of Claims involving, arising from, or related to branded opioid drugs that are Products of or attributable to Allergan or any other Released Entity (including but not limited to branded opioid drugs that are Products distributed and/or sold before August 2, 2016 by Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities and the operation of the Divested Actavis Generic Entities and the other Divested Entities related to those branded opioid drugs that are Products before August 2, 2016) that the Releasors are asserting or might otherwise assert or could assert against Allergan or any other Released Entity, of which seventy-seven percent (77%) is specifically involving, arising from, or related to Kadian® (including but not limited to Kadian® manufactured, distributed, marketed, and/or sold from 1997 through 2008 by King Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and/or Alpharma Inc.).
- D.** *Settlement Fund Administrator and Implementation Costs.* If this Agreement becomes effective, Allergan shall be responsible for one-third of the Implementation Costs. The full amount of the Implementation Costs shall be jointly advanced by Teva and Allergan. If this Agreement becomes effective, then Allergan shall deduct from Allergan’s Initial Year Payment the difference between the excess amount it advanced for Implementation Costs and its one-third obligation for such costs. Settlement Fund Administrator Costs shall be paid out of interest accrued on the Settlement Fund. Should such interest prove insufficient to fully cover the costs, the remaining cost amounts shall be paid one-third by Teva, one-third by Allergan and one-third from the Settlement Fund through the disbursement of Allergan’s final Payment Allergan shall not be responsible for any costs incurred by the Settlement Fund Administrator after the disbursement of its final Payment.

VII. Annual Payments to Settlement Fund

A. Structure of Payments to Settlement Fund

1. All payments under this Section VII shall be made into the Settlement Fund, except that where specified, they shall be made into the Settlement Fund Escrow. The Settlement Fund shall be allocated and used only as specified in Section VIII.
2. Allergan shall pay into the Settlement Fund the Net Abatement Amount consisting of \$1,799,186,751.00 minus: (1) any offsets specified in subsection VII.C below; (2) any unearned Incentive Payments under subsection VII.E below; and (3) any adjustments under Section XI below.
3. The payments to the Settlement Fund shall be divided into Base Payments and Incentive Payments as provided in subsections VII.D and VII.E below and set out in Exhibit M.

B. Settlement Fund Payment Process

1. Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, Allergan shall make one Initial Year Payment (the first Annual Payment) and six (6) additional Annual Payments of equal installments of the Net Abatement Amount (after all applicable offsets) into the Settlement Fund. The Settlement Payment Schedule is set forth in Exhibit M. Annual Payments shall be made on the Payment Date, provided that the necessary wire instructions, W-9 form, and Allergan's Bank Verification Form process is completed for the Settlement Fund at least twenty-one (21) days before the relevant payment is due and Allergan has completed any process required by the Settlement Fund Administrator and/or its financial institution(s) to complete the transaction. If there is a delay in making a payment because any of these conditions were not completed at least twenty-one (21) days in advance of the Payment Date, then the Annual Payment will be made within twenty-one (21) days of the completion of these conditions.
2. The Initial Year Payment shall consist of only Base Payments (after all applicable offsets). The other six (6) Annual Payments shall each consist of Base Payments (after all applicable offsets) and Incentive Payments (after all applicable offsets). The amount of the Initial Year Payment and each other Annual Payment, payable by Allergan shall not exceed the maximum amounts allocated to each Payment Year in Exhibit M.
3. To determine each Annual Payment for Payment Year 2 forward, the Settlement Fund Administrator shall use the data in its records sixty (60) days prior to the Payment Date for each payment. Prior to the Effective Date, the Parties will include an exhibit to the Agreement setting forth in detail the process for the Settlement Fund Administrator obtaining relevant data and for distributing funds to Settling States and Exhibit G Participants consistent with the terms of this Agreement as quickly as practical.

4. The Settlement Fund Administrator shall determine the Annual Payment and the Statewide Payment Amount for each Settling State, consistent with the provisions in Exhibit L, by:
 - a. determining, for each Settling State, the amount of Base Payments and Incentive Payments to which the State is entitled by applying the criteria in this Section;
 - b. applying any reductions, or offsets required by Sections VII and XI; and
 - c. determining the total amount owed by Allergan to all Settling States and Exhibit G Participant.

5. If, no later than fifty (50) days prior to the Payment Date for each payment for Payment Year 2 forward, Allergan and the Enforcement Committee inform the Settlement Fund Administrator that they agree on the amount of the Annual Payment and the Statewide Payment Amount for each Settling State, Allergan shall pay the agreed-upon Annual Payment amount on the Payment Date and the Settlement Fund Administrator shall treat those amounts as the determination described in subsection VII.B.4. If the Settlement Fund Administrator is not so informed, it shall give notice to Allergan, the Settling States, and the Enforcement Committee of the amount of the Annual Payment, and the Statewide Payment Amount for each Settling State, following the determination described in subsection VII.B.4, and the following timeline shall apply:
 - a. Within twenty-one (21) days of the notice provided by the Settlement Fund Administrator, Allergan, any Settling State or the Enforcement Committee may dispute, in writing, the calculation of the Annual Payment, or the Statewide Payment Amount for a Settling State. Such disputing party must provide a written notice of dispute to the Settlement Fund Administrator, the Enforcement Committee, any affected Settling State, and Allergan identifying the nature of the dispute, the amount of money that is disputed, and the Settling State(s) affected.
 - b. Within twenty-one (21) days of the sending of a written notice of dispute, any affected party may submit a response, in writing, to the Settlement Fund Administrator, the Enforcement Committee, any affected Settling State, and Allergan identifying the basis for disagreement with the notice of dispute.
 - c. If no response is filed, the Settlement Fund Administrator shall adjust the amount calculated consistent with the written notice of dispute, and Allergan shall pay the adjusted amount as the Annual Payment on the Payment Date. If a written response to the written notice of dispute is timely sent to the Settlement Fund Administrator, the Settlement Fund Administrator shall notify Allergan of the preliminary amount to be paid, which shall be the greater of the amount originally calculated by the Settlement Fund Administrator or the amount that would be consistent with

the notice of dispute, *provided, however* that in no circumstances shall the preliminary amount to be paid be higher than the maximum amount of Base Payments and Incentive Payments for that payment as set forth in Exhibit M. For the avoidance of doubt, a transfer of payments from the Settlement Fund Escrow for other Payment Years does not count toward determining whether the amount to be paid is higher than the maximum amount of Base Payments and Incentive Payments for that payment as set forth in Exhibit M.

- d. The Settlement Fund Administrator shall place any disputed amount of the preliminary amount paid by Allergan into the Settlement Fund Escrow and shall disburse any undisputed amount to each Settling State and its Exhibit G Participants.
6. If a Settling State informs the Settlement Fund Administrator that it and its Exhibit G Participants have reached consensus on the amount of its Statewide Payment Amount, determined pursuant to subsection VII.B.3 or VII.B.46, to be distributed to the Settling State, among its separate types of funds (if applicable), and among its Exhibit G Participants, the Settlement Fund Administrator shall disburse the Statewide Payment Amount pursuant to the consensus distribution amounts provided by the Settling State. For a Settling States that does not so notify the Settlement Fund Administrator, the Settlement Fund Administrator shall allocate the Settling State's Statewide Payment Amount, pursuant to Section VII, among the separate types of funds for the Settling State (if applicable), and among its Exhibit G Participants using the following procedures:
- a. As soon as possible for each payment and following the determination described in subsection VII.B.3 and VII.B.46, the Settlement Fund Administrator shall give notice to the relevant Settling States and their Exhibit G Participants of the amount to be received by each Settling State, the amount to be received by the separate types of funds for each Settling State (if applicable), and the amount to be received by each Settling State's Exhibit G Participants.
 - b. Within twenty-one (21) days of the notice provided by the Settlement Fund Administrator, any Settling State or Exhibit G Participant may dispute, in writing, the calculation of the amount to be received by a Settling State and/or its Exhibit G Participants. A dispute will be deemed invalid and disregarded if it challenges the allocations adopted by a State-Subdivision Agreement approved pursuant to the provisions of Exhibit O or by statute. Such disputing party must provide a written notice of dispute to the Settlement Fund Administrator, any affected Settling State, and any affected Exhibit G Participant identifying the nature of the dispute, the amount of money that is disputed, and the Settling State(s) affected.
 - c. Within twenty-one (21) days of the sending of a written notice of dispute, any affected Settling State or any affected Exhibit G Participant may submit

a response, in writing, to the Settlement Fund Administrator, any affected Settling State and any affected Exhibit G Participant identifying the basis for disagreement with the notice of dispute.

- d. If no response is filed, the Settlement Fund Administrator shall adjust the amount calculated consistent with the written notice of dispute.
 - e. The Settlement Fund Administrator shall place any disputed amount into the Settlement Fund Escrow and shall disburse any undisputed amount to the Settling State and its Exhibit G Participants.
7. Disputes described in this subsection (other than those for which no response is filed under subsection VII.B.5.c or VII.B.6.d) shall be resolved in accordance with the terms of Section XIV.
 8. The Settlement Fund Administrator may combine the disbursements of Annual Payments with disbursement of funds under other comparable opioid settlements. In determining when disbursements for each Annual Payment will be made, the Settlement Fund Administrator may take into account the timeline for the availability of disbursements under other comparable opioid settlements.
 9. For the avoidance of doubt, Subdivisions and Special Districts not listed on Exhibit G shall not receive an allocation from the Subdivision Fund.

C. Offsets to Annual Payments to the Settlement Fund for Non-Settling States

1. An offset equal to the Net Abatement Amount of \$1,799,186,751.00 times the State Allocation Percentage assigned to each Non-Settling State in Exhibit F-2 shall be deducted from the total amount to be paid by Allergan to the Settlement Fund.
2. Non-Settling States shall not be eligible for any payments or have any rights in connection with this Agreement. Accordingly, the stated maximum dollar amounts of the Annual Payments specified in Exhibit M are reduced by the aggregate State Allocation Percentage of Non-Settling States as set forth in Exhibit F-2.

D. Base Payments

1. Allergan shall make Base Payments into the Settlement Fund in an amount equal to 45% of the Net Abatement Amount of \$1,799,186,751.00 minus any offsets for Non-Settling States specified in Section VII.C.I. The maximum total for Base Payments is \$809,634,037.95. The Base Payments will be paid in accordance with the Settlement Payment Schedule specified by Exhibit M, subject to potential offsets for Non-Settling States as provided in Section VII.C.1.
2. The Base Payments will be allocated by Settling State proportionate to each Settling State's State Allocation Percentage in Exhibit F-2, adjusted for any Non-Settling State.

E. Incentive Abatement Payments

1. Allergan shall make potential Incentive Payments totaling up to a maximum of 55% of the Net Abatement Amount of \$1,799,186,751.00 for all Settling States with the actual amount depending on whether and the extent to which the criteria set forth below are met in each Settling State. The maximum total for Incentive Payments is \$989,552,713.05.
2. The maximum total Incentive Payment for any Settling State shall be no more than the maximum total for Incentive Payments listed in Section VII.E.1 times the Settling State's State Allocation Percentage specified in Exhibit F-2. Incentive Payments are state-specific, with each Settling State receiving an Incentive Payment based on the incentives for which it is eligible for that year under the criteria set forth below and any offset specified in Section XI.
3. The Incentive Payments shall be divided among four (4) categories, referred to as Incentives A–D. Incentives A–C will be due in installments over six (6) Payment Years beginning with Annual Payment ~~1~~2 and Incentive D will be due in installments over four (4) years beginning with Annual Payment ~~4~~3, as shown on Exhibit M. The total amount of Incentive Payments in an Annual Payment shall be the sum of the Incentive Payments for which individual Settling States are eligible for that Payment Year under the criteria set forth below. The Incentive Payments shall be made with respect to a specific Settling State based on its eligibility for that Payment Year under the criteria set forth below.
4. The maximum amount available for Incentive Payments, \$989,552,713.05, is divided into two pools. The maximum amount of Incentive Payments for Incentives A-C shall be \$863,609,640.48, which is 48% of the maximum Net Abatement Amount. A Settling State may be eligible for its full allocable share of this payment by either achieving Incentive A or by fully earning both Incentives B and C. The maximum amount of Incentive Payments for Incentive D shall be \$125,943,072.57, which is 7% of the maximum Net Abatement Amount. (These figures represent maximum payments prior to being adjusted for any offsets and assumes every State is a Settling State and will satisfy the requirements specified below to earn its maximum incentive amount. The Incentive Payments will be paid in accordance with the payment schedule in Exhibit M, subject to potential deductions as provided herein.) A Settling State qualifies to receive Incentive Payments in addition to Base Payments if it meets the incentive eligibility requirements specified below. Settling States may qualify for Incentive Payments in four ways. If a Settling State qualifies for Incentive A, it will become entitled to receive the maximum payment allocable to the State for Incentives A-C as stated in subsection VII.E.5. If a Settling State does not qualify for Incentive A, it can alternatively qualify for Incentive B and/or Incentive C. A Settling State can qualify for Incentive D regardless of whether it qualifies for another Incentive Payment.

5. *Incentive A: Full Participation or Fully Released Claims of Litigating Subdivisions, Litigating Special Districts, Non-Litigating Subdivisions with Population Greater Than 10,000, and Non-Litigating Covered Special Districts.*
- a. A Settling State’s total potential Incentive A payment allocation is \$863,609,640.48 times the percentage allocation assigned that Settling State in Exhibit F-2.
 - b. A State qualifies for Incentive A by: (1) complete participation in the form of releases consistent with Section V above from all Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts, Non-Litigating Subdivisions with population over 10,000, and Non-Litigating Covered Special Districts; (2) a Bar; or (3) a combination of approaches in clauses (1)-(2) that achieves the same level of resolution of Subdivision and Special District Claims (e.g., a law barring future litigation combined with full joinder by Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts). For purposes of Incentive A, a Subdivision or Special District is considered a “Litigating Subdivision” or “Litigating Special District” if it has brought Released Claims against Released Entities on or before the Reference Date; all other Subdivisions and Special Districts are considered “Non-Litigating.” For purposes of Incentive A, Non-Litigating Covered Special Districts shall not include a Special District with any of the following words or phrases in its name: mosquito, pest, insect, spray, vector, animal, air quality, air pollution, clean air, coastal water, tuberculosis, and sanitary.
 - c. If a Settling State qualifies for Incentive A after receiving an Incentive Payment under Incentives B or C, described below, the Settling State’s payments under Incentive A will equal the remainder of its total potential Incentive A payments less any payments previously received under Incentives B or C. A Settling State that receives all of its total potential Incentive A payment allocation shall not receive additional Incentive Payments under Incentives B or C.
 - d. A Settling State that is not eligible for Incentive A as of two (2) years after the Effective Date shall not be eligible for Incentive A for that Payment Year or any subsequent Payment Years.
6. *Incentive B: Early Participation or Released Claims by Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts.*
- a. If a Settling State does not qualify for Incentive A, it may still qualify to receive up to 60% of its total potential Incentive A payment allocation under Incentive B.
 - b. A Settling State can qualify for an Incentive B payment if Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts collectively representing at least 75% of the Settling State’s litigating population are either Participating

Subdivisions, Participating Special Districts, or have their claims resolved through Case-Specific Resolutions.

(i) A Settling State's litigating population is the sum of the population of all Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts. A Settling State's litigating population shall include all Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts whose populations overlap in whole or in part with other Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts, for instance in the case of a Litigating Special District, city, or township contained within a county.

(ii) For example, if School District A is a Litigating Special District in City B with a population of 1, City B is itself a Litigating Subdivision with a population of 8, and City B is located within County C, and County C is a Litigating Subdivision with a population 10, then each of their individual populations shall be added together (i.e., 1 + 8 +10) to determine the total litigating population (i.e., 19).

c. The following time periods apply to Incentive B payments:

(i) Period 1: Zero to two hundred ten (210) days after the Effective Date.

(ii) Period 2: Two hundred eleven (211) days to one year after the Effective Date.

(iii) Period 3: One year and one day to two years after the Effective Date.

d. Within Period 1: If Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts collectively representing at least 75% of a Settling State's litigating population are Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts, or have their Claims resolved through Case-Specific Resolutions during Period 1, then a sliding scale will determine the share of the funds available under Incentive B, with a maximum of 60% of the Settling State's total potential Incentive Payment allocation available. Under that sliding scale, if Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts collectively representing 75% of a Settling State's litigating population become Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts, or achieve Case-Specific Resolution status by the end of Period 1, a Settling State will receive 50% of the total amount available to it under Incentive B. If more Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts become Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts, or achieve Case-Specific Resolution status, the Settling State shall receive an increased percentage of the total amount available to it under Incentive B as shown in the table below.

Participation or Case-Specific Resolution Levels (As percentage of litigating population)	Incentive B Award (As percentage of total amount available to Settling State for Incentive B)
75%	50%
76%	52%
77%	54%
78%	56%
79%	58%
80%	60%
85%	70%
90%	80%
95%	90%
100%	100%

- e. Within Period 2: If a Settling State did not qualify for an Incentive B payment in Period 1 but Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts collectively representing at least 75% of the Settling State’s litigating population become Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts, or achieve Case-Specific Resolution status by the end of Period 2, then the Settling State qualifies for 75% of the Incentive B payment it would have qualified for in Period 1.
- f. Within Period 3: If a Settling State did not qualify for an Incentive B payment in Periods 1 or 2, but Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts collectively representing at least 75% of the Settling State’s litigating population become Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts, or achieve Case-Specific Resolution status by the end of Period 3, then the Settling State qualifies for 50% of the Incentive B payment it would have qualified for in Period 1.
- g. A Settling State that receives the Incentive B payment for Periods 1 and/or 2 can receive additional payments if it secures participation from additional Litigating Subdivisions and/or Litigating Special Districts (or Case-Specific Resolutions of their Claims) during Periods 2 and/or 3. Those additional payments would equal 75% (for additional participation or Case-Specific Resolutions during Period 2) and 50% (for additional participation or Case-Specific Resolutions during Period 3) of the amount by which the increased litigating population levels would have increased the Settling State’s Incentive B payment if they had been achieved in Period 1.
- h. The percentage of the available Incentive B amount for which a Settling State is eligible by the end of Period 3 shall cap its eligibility for that Payment Year and all subsequent Payment Years. If Litigating Subdivisions and Litigating Special Districts that have become Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts, or achieved Case-Specific Resolution

status collectively represent less than 75% of a Settling State's litigating population by the end of Period 3, the Settling State shall not receive any Incentive B payment.

- i. If there are no Litigating Subdivisions or Litigating Special Districts in a Settling State, and that Settling State is otherwise eligible for Incentive B, that Settling State will receive its full allocable share of Incentive B.
- j. Incentives earned under Incentive B shall accrue after each of Periods 1, 2, and 3. Calculations to increase Incentive Payments in later periods based on additional joinder shall not reduce any amount already vested at the end of a prior period.

7. *Incentive C: Participation or Release of Claims by Primary Subdivisions*

- a. If a Settling State does not qualify for Incentive A, it may still qualify to receive up to 40% of its total potential Incentive A payment allocation under Incentive C, which has two parts.
- b. Part 1: Under Incentive C, Part 1, a Settling State can receive up to 75% of its Incentive C allocation. A Settling State can qualify for a payment under Incentive C, Part 1 only if Primary Subdivisions (whether Litigating Primary Subdivisions or Non-Litigating Primary Subdivisions as of the Reference Date) collectively representing at least 60% of the Settling State's Primary Subdivision population become Participating Subdivisions or achieve Case-Specific Resolution status.

(i) A Settling State's Primary Subdivision population is the sum of the population of all Primary Subdivisions (whether Litigating Primary Subdivisions or Non-Litigating Primary Subdivisions as of the Reference Date). A Settling State's Primary Subdivision population shall include all Primary Subdivisions whose populations overlap in whole or in part with other Primary Subdivisions, for instance in the case of a Primary Subdivision that is a city contained within a Primary Subdivision that is a county. Because Primary Subdivisions include Subdivisions whose populations overlap in whole or in part with other Subdivisions, the Settling State's Primary Subdivision population may be greater than the Settling State's total population. (Special Districts are not relevant for purposes of Incentive C calculations.)

(ii) For example, if City A is a Primary Subdivision with a population of 1 within County B, and County B is a Primary Subdivision with a population of 10, then each of their individual populations shall be added together (i.e., 1+10) to determine the total Primary Subdivision population (i.e., 11).

- c. A sliding scale will determine the share of the funds available under Incentive C, Part 1 to Settling States meeting the minimum 60% threshold. Under that sliding scale, if a Settling State secures participation or Case-Specific Resolutions from Primary Subdivisions representing 60% of its total Primary Subdivision population, it will receive 40% of the total amount potentially available to it under Incentive C, Part 1. If a Settling State secures participation or Case-Specific Resolutions from Primary Subdivisions representing more than 60% of its Primary Subdivision population, the Settling State shall be entitled to receive a higher percentage of the total amount potentially available to it under Incentive C, Part 1, on the scale shown in the table below. If there are no Primary Subdivisions, and that Settling State is otherwise eligible for Incentive C, that Settling State will receive its full allocable share of Incentive C, Part 1.

Participation or Case-Specific Resolution Levels (As percentage of total Primary Subdivision population)	Incentive C, Part 1 Award (As percentage of total amount available to Settling State for Incentive C, Part 1)
60%	40%
70%	45%
80%	50%
85%	55%
90%	60%
91%	65%
92%	70%
93%	80%
94%	90%
95%	100%

- d. Part 2: If a Settling State qualifies to receive an incentive under Incentive C, Part 1, the Settling State can also qualify to receive an additional incentive amount equal to 25% of its total potential Incentive C allocation by securing 100% participation of the ten (10) largest Subdivisions by population in the Settling State. (Special Districts are not relevant for purposes of this calculation.) If a Settling State does not qualify for any amount under Incentive C, Part 1, it cannot qualify for Incentive C, Part 2.
- e. Incentives earned under Incentive C shall accrue on an annual basis up to three years after the Effective Date. At one, two, and three years after the Effective Date, the Settlement Fund Administrator will conduct a lookback to assess which Subdivisions had agreed to participate or had their Claim resolved through a Case-Specific Resolution that year. Based on the lookback, the Settlement Fund Administrator will calculate the incentives accrued under Incentive C for the year. The percentage of the available Incentive C amount, for both Part 1 and Part 2, for which a Settling State is

eligible three years after the Effective Date shall cap its eligibility for that Payment Year and all subsequent Payment Years.

8. *Incentive D: No Qualifying Lawsuits Surviving Threshold Motions at Two Look-Back Dates.*
- a. A Settling State's total potential Incentive D payment allocation is \$125,943,072.57 times the percentage allocation assigned that Settling State in Exhibit F-2.
 - b. If, at any time within five and one-half (5.5) years of the Preliminary Agreement Date, any Subdivision or Special District within a Settling State files litigation pursuing Released Claims against any Released Entity (a "Qualifying Lawsuit"), then Allergan shall, within thirty (30) days of Allergan or any Released Entity being served or otherwise informed of the prosecution of such Released Claims, provide notice to the Settling State in which such Released Claims are being pursued and shall give the relevant Settling State a reasonable opportunity to extinguish the Released Claims without any payment or any other obligations being imposed upon any Released Entities (apart from the Global Settlement Amount payable by Allergan under the Agreement or the Injunctive Relief Terms incurred by it). The relevant Settling State and Allergan shall confer and use reasonable efforts to promptly resolve a Qualifying Lawsuit so that it is dismissed with prejudice. Nothing in this subsection creates an obligation for a Settling State to make a monetary payment or incur any other obligation to an entity filing a Qualifying Lawsuit.
 - c. Part 1: Under Incentive D, Part 1, a Settling State shall receive 50% of its total potential Incentive D payment allocation if, at two years after the Effective Date (the "*First Look-Back Date*"), there are no pending Released Claims from a Qualifying Lawsuit that survived a Threshold Motion within the Settling State against any Released Entities.
 - d. Part 2: Under Incentive D, Part 2, a Settling State shall receive 50% of its total potential Incentive D payment allocation if, at five and one-half (5.5) years after the Preliminary Agreement Date (the "*Second Look-Back Date*"), there are no pending Released Claims from a Qualifying Lawsuit that survived a Threshold Motion within the Settling State against any Released Entities.
 - e. After the First Look-Back Date, a Settling State can become re-eligible for Incentive Payment D Part 1 if the lawsuit that survived a Threshold Motion is dismissed pursuant to a later motion on grounds included in the Threshold Motion, in which case the Settling State shall become eligible for Incentive Payment D less any litigation fees and cost incurred by the Released Entity in the interim, except that if the dismissal motion occurs after the

completion of opening statements in such action, the Settling State shall not be eligible for Incentive Payment D.

VIII. Allocation and Use of Settlement Funds

- A.** *Components of Settlement Fund.* The Settlement Fund shall be comprised of an Abatement Accounts Fund, a State Fund, and a Subdivision Fund for each Settling State. The payments under Section VI into the Settlement Fund shall be initially allocated among those three (3) sub-funds and distributed and used as provided below or as provided for by a State-Subdivision Agreement (or other State-specific allocation of funds). Unless otherwise specified herein, payments placed into the Settlement Fund do not revert back to Allergan.
- B.** *Use of Settlement Payments.* -It is the intent of the Parties that the payments disbursed from the Settlement Fund to Settling States and Exhibit G Participants be for Opioid Remediation, subject to limited exceptions that must be documented in accordance with subsection VII.C. In no event may less than 85% of Allergan’s payments pursuant to Section VI.A.1-3 over the entirety of all Payment Years (but not any single Payment Year) be spent on Opioid Remediation.
- C.** While disfavored by the Parties, a Settling State or Exhibit G Participant may use monies from the Settlement Fund (that have not been restricted by this Agreement solely to future Opioid Remediation) for purposes that do not qualify as Opioid Remediation. If, at any time, a Settling State or Exhibit G Participant uses any monies from the Settlement Fund for a purpose that does not qualify as Opioid Remediation, such Settling State or Exhibit G Participant shall identify such amounts and report to the Settlement Fund Administrator and Allergan how such funds were used, including if used to pay attorneys’ fees, investigation costs, litigation costs, or costs related to the operation and enforcement of this Agreement, respectively. It is the intent of the Parties that the reporting under this subsection VIII.C shall be available to the public. For the avoidance of doubt, (a) any amounts not identified under this subsection VIII.C as used to pay attorneys’ fees, investigation costs, or litigation costs shall be included in the “Compensatory Restitution Amount” for purposes of subsection VIII.G and (b) Participating Subdivisions not listed on Exhibit G or Participating Special Districts that receive monies from the Settlement Fund indirectly may only use such monies from the Settlement Fund for purposes that qualify as Opioid Remediation.
- D.** *Allocation of Settlement Fund.* The allocation of the Settlement Fund allows for different approaches to be taken in different states, such as through a State-Subdivision Agreement. Given the uniqueness of States and their Subdivisions, Settling States and Participating Subdivisions are encouraged to enter into State-Subdivision Agreements in order to direct the allocation of their portion of the Settlement Fund. As set out below, the Settlement Fund Administrator will make an initial allocation to three (3) state-level sub-funds. The Settlement Fund Administrator will then, for each Settling State and its Exhibit G Participants, apply the terms of this Agreement and any relevant State-Subdivision Agreement, Statutory Trust, Allocation Statute, or voluntary redistribution of funds as set out below before disbursing the funds.

1. Base Payments. The Settlement Fund Administrator will allocate Base Payments under subsection VII.D among the Settling States in proportion to their respective State Allocation Percentages. Base Payments for each Settling State will then be allocated 15% to its State Fund, 70% to its Abatement Accounts Fund, and 15% to its Subdivision Fund. Amounts may be reallocated and will be distributed as provided in subsection VIII.E.
2. Incentive Payments. The Settlement Fund Administrator will treat Incentive Payments under subsection VII.E on a State-specific basis. Incentive payments for which a Settling State is eligible under subsection VII.E will be allocated 15% to its State Fund, 70% to its Abatement Accounts Fund, and 15% to its Subdivision Fund. Amounts may be reallocated and will be distributed as provided in subsection VIII.E.
3. Application of Adjustments. If any offset under Section XI applies with respect to a Settling State, the offset shall be applied proportionally to all amounts that would otherwise be apportioned and distributed to the State Fund, the Abatement Accounts Fund, and the Subdivision Fund for that State.
4. Settlement Fund Administrator. Prior to the Initial Participation Date, Allergan and the Enforcement Committee will agree to a detailed mechanism consistent with the foregoing for the Settlement Fund Administrator to follow in allocating, apportioning, and distributing payments, which shall be appended hereto as Exhibit L.

E. *Settlement Fund Reallocation and Distribution.* As set forth below, within a particular Settling State’s account, amounts contained in the Settlement Fund sub-funds may be reallocated and distributed per a State-Subdivision Agreement or other means. If the apportionment of amounts is not addressed and controlled under subsections VIII.E.1-2, then the default provisions of subsection VIII.E.4 apply. It is not necessary that a State-Subdivision Agreement or other means of allocating funds pursuant to subsections VIII.E.1-2 address all of the Settlement Fund sub-funds. For example, a Statutory Trust might only address disbursements from a Settling State’s Abatement Accounts Fund.

1. Distribution by State-Subdivision Agreement. If a Settling State has a State-Subdivision Agreement, amounts apportioned to that State’s State Fund, Abatement Accounts Fund, and Subdivision Fund under subsection VIII.D shall be reallocated and distributed as provided by that agreement. Any State-Subdivision Agreement entered into or amended after July 26, 2022 shall be applied only if it requires: (1) that all amounts be used for Opioid Remediation except as allowed by subsection VIII.C, and (2) that at least 70% of amounts be used solely for future Opioid Remediation (references to “future Opioid Remediation” include amounts paid to satisfy any future demand by another governmental entity to make a required reimbursement in connection with the past care and treatment of a person related to the Alleged Harms). For a State-Subdivision Agreement to be applied to the relevant portion of an Annual Payment, notice must be provided to Allergan

and the Settlement Fund Administrator at least sixty (60) days prior to the Payment Date.

2. Distribution by Allocation Statute. If a Settling State has an Allocation Statute and/or a Statutory Trust that addresses allocation or distribution of amounts apportioned to such State's State Fund, Abatement Accounts Fund, and/or Subdivision Fund and that, to the extent any or all such sub-funds are addressed, requires (1) all amounts to be used for Opioid Remediation except as allowed by subsection VIII.C, and (2) at least 70% of all amounts to be used solely for future Opioid Remediation, then, to the extent allocation or distribution is addressed, the amounts apportioned to that State's State Fund, Abatement Accounts Fund, and Subdivision Fund under subsection VIII.D shall be allocated and distributed as addressed and provided by the applicable Allocation Statute or Statutory Trust. For the avoidance of doubt, an Allocation Statute or Statutory Trust need not address all three (3) sub-funds that comprise the Settlement Fund, and if the applicable Allocation Statute or Statutory Trust does not address distribution of all or some of these three (3) sub-funds, the applicable Allocation Statute or Statutory Trust does not replace the default provisions in subsection VIII.E.4 of any such unaddressed fund. For example, if an Allocation Statute or Statutory Trust that meets the requirements of this subsection VIII.E only addresses funds restricted to abatement, then the default provisions in this Agreement concerning allocation among the three (3) sub-funds comprising the Settlement Fund and the distribution of the State Fund and Subdivision Fund for that State would still apply, while the distribution of the applicable State's Abatement Accounts Fund would be governed by the qualifying Allocation Statute or Statutory Trust.
3. Voluntary Redistribution. A Settling State may choose to reallocate all or a portion of its State Fund to its Abatement Accounts Fund. An Exhibit G Participant may choose to reallocate all or a portion of its allocation from the Subdivision Fund to the State's Abatement Accounts Fund or to another Participating Subdivision or Participating Special District. The Settlement Fund Administrator is not required to honor voluntary redistribution for which notice is provided to it less than sixty (60) days prior to the Payment Date.
4. Distribution in the Absence of a State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, or Statutory Trust. If subsections VIII.E.1-2 do not apply, and subject to any voluntary redistribution pursuant to subsection VIII.E.3, amounts apportioned to that State's State Fund, Abatement Accounts Fund, and Subdivision Fund under subsection VIII.D shall be distributed as follows:
 - a. Amounts apportioned to that State's State Fund shall be distributed to that State.
 - b. Amounts apportioned to that State's Abatement Accounts Fund shall be distributed consistent with subsection VIII.F. Each Settling State shall submit to the Settlement Fund Administrator a designation of a lead state agency or other entity to serve as the single point of contact for that Settling

State's funding requests from the Abatement Accounts Fund and other communications with the Settlement Fund Administrator. The designation of an individual entity is for administrative purposes only and such designation shall not limit funding to such entity or even require that such entity receive funds from this Agreement. The designated entity shall be the only entity authorized to request funds from the Settlement Fund Administrator to be disbursed from that Settling State's Abatement Accounts Fund. If a Settling State has established a Statutory Trust then that Settling State's single point of contact may direct the Settlement Fund Administrator to release the State's Abatement Accounts Fund to the Statutory Trust.

- c. Amounts apportioned to that State's Subdivision Fund shall be distributed to Participating Subdivisions in that State listed on Exhibit G per the Subdivision Allocation Percentage listed in Exhibit G. Subsection X.I shall govern amounts that would otherwise be distributed to Non-Participating Subdivisions listed in Exhibit G.
 - d. Special Districts shall not be allocated funds from the Subdivision Fund, except through a voluntary redistribution allowed by subsection VIII.E.3. A Settling State may allocate funds from its State Fund or Abatement Accounts Fund for Special Districts.
5. Restrictions on Distribution. No amounts may be distributed from the Subdivision Fund contrary to Section IX, *i.e.*, no amounts may be distributed directly to Non-Participating Subdivisions or to Later Participating Subdivisions in excess of what is permissible under subsection IX.E. Amounts allocated to the Subdivision Fund that cannot be distributed by virtue of the preceding sentence shall be distributed into the sub-account in the Abatement Accounts Fund for the Settling State in which the Subdivision is located, unless those payments are redirected elsewhere by a State-Subdivision Agreement described in subsection VIII.E.1 or by an Allocation Statute or a Statutory Trust described in subsection VIII.E.2.

F. *Provisions Regarding Abatement Accounts Fund.*

1. State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, and Statutory Trust Fund Provisions. A State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, or Statutory Trust may govern the operation and use of amounts in that State's Abatement Accounts Fund so long as it complies with the requirements of subsection VIII.E.1 or VIII.E.2 as applicable, and all direct payments to Subdivisions comply with subsections IX.E-H.
2. Absence of a State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, or Statutory Trust. In the absence of a State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, or Statutory Trust that addresses distribution, the Abatement Accounts Fund will be used solely for future Opioid Remediation and the following shall apply with respect to a Settling State:

a. *Regional Remediation.*

- (i) At least 50% of distributions for remediation from a State's Abatement Accounts Fund shall be annually allocated and tracked to the regional level. A Settling State may allow the Advisory Committee established pursuant to subsection VIII.F.2.d to define its regions and assign regional allocations percentages. Otherwise, a Settling State shall (1) define its initial regions, which shall consist of one (1) or more Subdivisions and which shall be designated by the State agency with primary responsibility for substance abuse disorder services employing, to the maximum extent practical, existing regions established in that State for opioid abuse treatment or other public health purposes; and (2) assign initial regional allocation percentages to the regions based on the Subdivision Allocation Percentages in Exhibit G and an assumption that all Subdivisions listed on Exhibit G will become Participating Subdivisions.
- (ii) This minimum regional expenditure percentage is calculated on the Settling State's initial Abatement Accounts Fund allocation and does not include any additional amounts a Settling State has directed to its Abatement Accounts Fund from its State Fund, or any other amounts directed to the fund. A Settling State may dedicate more than 50% of its Abatement Accounts Fund to the regional expenditure and may annually adjust the percentage of its Abatement Accounts Fund dedicated to regional expenditures as long as the percentage remains above the minimum amount.
- (iii) The Settling State (1) has the authority to adjust the definition of the regions, and (2) may annually revise the percentages allocated to each region to reflect the number of Subdivisions in each region that are Non-Participating Subdivisions.

- b. *Subdivision Block Grants.* Certain Subdivisions listed on Exhibit G shall be eligible to receive regional allocation funds in the form of a block grant for future Opioid Remediation. A Participating Subdivision listed on Exhibit G eligible for block grants is a county or parish (or in the case of States that do not have counties or parishes that function as political subdivisions, a city) that (1) does not contain a Litigating Subdivision or a Later Litigating Subdivision for which it has the authority to end the litigation through a release, Bar, or other action; (2) either (i) has a population of 400,000 or more or (ii) in the case of California has a population of 750,000 or more; and (3) has funded or otherwise managed an established health care or treatment infrastructure (e.g., health department or similar agency). Each Subdivision listed on Exhibit G eligible to receive block grants shall be assigned its own region.

- c. *Small States.* Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection VIII.F.2.a, Settling States with populations under four (4) million that do not have existing regions described in subsection VIII.F.2.a shall not be required to establish regions. However, such a Settling State that contains one (1) or more Subdivisions listed on Exhibit G eligible for block grants under subsection VIII.F.2.b shall be divided regionally so that each block-grant eligible Subdivision listed on Exhibit G is a region and the remainder of the State is a region.
- d. *Advisory Committee.* The Settling State shall designate an Opioid Settlement Remediation Advisory Committee (the “*Advisory Committee*”) to provide input and recommendations regarding remediation spending from that Settling State’s Abatement Accounts Fund. A Settling State may elect to use an existing advisory committee or similar entity (created outside of a State-Subdivision Agreement or Allocation Statute); *provided, however,* the Advisory Committee or similar entity shall meet the following requirements:
 - (i) Written guidelines that establish the formation and composition of the Advisory Committee, terms of service for members, contingency for removal or resignation of members, a schedule of meetings, and any other administrative details;
 - (ii) Composition that includes at least an equal number of local representatives as state representatives;
 - (iii) A process for receiving input from Subdivisions and other communities regarding how the opioid crisis is affecting their communities, their abatement needs, and proposals for abatement strategies and responses; and
 - (iv) A process by which Advisory Committee recommendations for expenditures for Opioid Remediation will be made to and considered by the appropriate state agencies.

3. Abatement Accounts Fund Reporting. The Settlement Fund Administrator shall track and assist in the report of remediation disbursements as agreed to among the Parties.

G. *Nature of Payment.* Allergan, the Settling States, the Participating Subdivisions, and the Participating Special Districts, acknowledge and agree that notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Agreement, including, but not limited to, the scope of the Released Claims:

- 1. Allergan has entered into this Agreement to avoid the delay, expense, inconvenience, and uncertainty of further litigation;
- 2. The Settling States, the Participating Subdivisions, and the Participating Special Districts sought compensatory restitution (within the meaning of 26 U.S.C.

§ 162(f)(2)(A)) as damages for the Alleged Harms allegedly suffered by the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts;

3. By executing this Agreement the Settling States, the Participating Subdivisions, and the Participating Special Districts certify that: (a) the Compensatory Restitution Amount is no greater than the amount, in the aggregate, of the Alleged Harms allegedly suffered by the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts; and (b) the portion of the Compensatory Restitution Amount received by each Settling State, Participating Subdivision or Participating Special Districts is no greater than the amount of the Alleged Harms allegedly suffered by such Settling State, Participating Subdivision or Participating Special Districts;
4. The payment of the Compensatory Restitution Amount by Allergan constitutes, and is paid for, compensatory restitution (within the meaning of 26 U.S.C. § 162(f)(2)(A)) for alleged damage or harm (as compensation for alleged damage or harm arising out of alleged bodily injury) allegedly caused by Allergan;
5. The Compensatory Restitution Amount is being paid as compensatory restitution (within the meaning of 26 U.S.C. § 162(f)(2)(A)) in order to restore, in whole or in part, the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts to the same position or condition that they would be in had the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts not suffered the Alleged Harms;
6. No portion of the Compensatory Restitution Amount represents reimbursement to any Settling State, Participating Subdivision, Participating Special District, or other person or entity for the costs of any investigation or litigation. The entire Compensatory Restitution Amount is properly characterized as described in subsection VIII.G. No portion of the Compensatory Restitution Amount constitutes disgorgement or is properly characterized as the payment of statutory or other fines, penalties, punitive damages, other punitive assessments, or attorneys' fees; and
7. The Designated State, on behalf of all Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts (the "Form 1098-F Filer") shall complete and file Form 1098-F with the Internal Revenue Service on or before February 28 (March 31 if filed electronically) of the year following the calendar year in which the order entering this Agreement becomes binding. On the Form 1098-F, the Form 1098-F Filer shall identify the entire Compensatory Restitution Amount received by the Form 1098-F Filer as remediation/restitution, ~~including the provision of Settlement Product set out in section VIII below~~. The Form 1098-F Filer shall also, on or before January 31 of the year following the calendar year in which the order entering this Agreement becomes binding, furnish Copy B of such Form 1098-F (or an acceptable substitute statement) to Allergan.

IX. Participation by Subdivisions and Special Districts

- A.** *Notice.* No later than fifteen (15) days after the Preliminary Agreement Date, the Settling States, with the cooperation of Allergan, shall send individual written notice (which may be delivered via e-mail or other electronic means) of the opportunity to participate in this Agreement and the requirements of participation to all Subdivisions and Special Districts in the Settling State that are (1) Litigating Subdivisions or Litigating Special Districts, or (2) Non-Litigating Subdivisions listed in Exhibit G. To the extent a Non-Litigating Special District is entitled to an allocation for a direct payment through its inclusion in Exhibit G pursuant to a State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution, the Settling States shall also send individual written notice (which may be delivered via e-mail or other electronic means) of the opportunity to participate in this Agreement and the requirements of participation to such Special District. Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, the version of Exhibit G used for notice shall be the one in place as of the Preliminary Agreement Date. Allergan's share of costs of the written notice shall be paid by Allergan as part of the Implementation Costs. Notice (which may be delivered via e-mail or other electronic means) shall also be provided simultaneously to counsel of record for Litigating Subdivisions, Litigating Special Districts, and known counsel for Non-Litigating Subdivisions listed on Exhibit G and Non-Litigating Special Districts listed on Exhibit G. The notice will include that the deadline for becoming an Initial Participating Subdivision or Initial Participating Special District is the Initial Participation Date. Nothing contained herein shall preclude a Settling State from providing further notice to or otherwise contacting any of its Subdivisions or Special Districts about becoming a Participating Subdivision or Participating Special District, including beginning any of the activities described in this paragraph prior to the Preliminary Agreement Date.
- B.** *Requirements for Becoming a Participating Subdivision: Non-Litigating Subdivisions.* A Non-Litigating Subdivision in a Settling State may become a Participating Subdivision by returning an executed Settlement Participation Form to the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator (which may be executed and returned by electronic means established by the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator) specifying (1) that the Subdivision agrees to the terms of this Agreement pertaining to Subdivisions, (2) that the Subdivision releases all Released Claims against all Released Entities, (3) that the Subdivision agrees to use monies it receives, if any, from the Settlement Fund pursuant to the applicable requirements of Section VIII, and (4) that the Subdivision submits to the jurisdiction of the Court where the Consent Judgment is filed for purposes limited to that Court's role under the Agreement. The required Settlement Participation Form is attached as Exhibit K. A Non-Litigating Subdivision will decide whether to become a Participating Subdivision for both this Agreement and the Teva Global Opioid Settlement Agreement, or neither. However, if Teva enters bankruptcy prior to the Effective Date, a Non-Litigating Subdivision can choose to only join this Agreement.
- C.** *Requirements for Becoming a Participating Subdivision: Litigating Subdivisions/Later Litigating Subdivisions.* A Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating Subdivision in a Settling State may become a Participating Subdivision by returning an executed Settlement Participation Form to the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator (which may be executed and returned by electronic means established by the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator) that, in addition to the requirements set out in subsection IX.B for Non-Litigating Subdivisions, commits it to

promptly dismissal its legal action. The required Settlement Participation Form is attached as Exhibit K. A Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating Subdivision will decide whether to become a Participating Subdivision for both this Agreement and the Teva Global Opioid Settlement Agreement, or neither. However, if Teva enters bankruptcy prior to the Effective Date, a Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating Subdivision can choose to only join this Agreement. Except for trials begun before the Initial Participation Date, a Litigating Subdivision or a Later Litigating Subdivision may not become a Participating Subdivision after the completion of opening statements in a trial of a legal action it brought that includes a Released Claim against a Released Entity.

D. *Initial Participating Subdivisions.* A Subdivision qualifies as an Initial Participating Subdivision if it meets the applicable requirements for becoming a Participating Subdivision set forth in subsections IX.B or IX.C by the Initial Participation Date. Provided however, all Subdivision Settlement Participation Forms shall be held by the Implementation Administrator until Allergan provides the notice in subsection X.B that it intends to proceed with the settlement, at which time the obligations created by such forms become effective. If Allergan determines not to proceed, all Settlement Participation Forms shall be returned to Counsel for Litigating Subdivisions or to the Subdivisions not represented by counsel or destroyed to the extent that such destruction is not prohibited by then existing document preservation obligations.

E. *Later Participating Subdivisions.* A Subdivision that is not an Initial Participating Subdivision may become a Later Participating Subdivision by meeting the applicable requirements for becoming a Participating Subdivision after the Initial Participation Date and agreeing to be subject to the terms of a State-Subdivision Agreement (if any) or any other structure adopted or applicable pursuant to subsections VIII.E or VIII.F. The following provisions govern what a Later Participating Subdivision can receive (but do not apply to Initial Participating Subdivisions):

1. A Later Participating Subdivision shall not receive any share of any Base or Incentive Payments paid to the Subdivision Fund that were due before it became a Participating Subdivision.
2. A Later Participating Subdivision that becomes a Participating Subdivision after the Initial Participation Date but before June 15, 2023 shall receive 75% of the share of the Initial Year Payment that it would have received had it become an Initial Participating Subdivision (unless the Later Participating Subdivision is subject to subsections IX.E.3 or IX.E.4 below). A Later Participating Subdivision that becomes a Participating Subdivision after June 15, 2023 shall receive no share of the Initial Year Payment.
3. A Later Participating Subdivision that, after the Initial Participation Date, maintains a lawsuit for a Released Claim(s) against a Released Entity and has judgment entered against it on every such Claim before it became a Participating Subdivision (other than a consensual dismissal with prejudice) shall receive 50% of the share of future Base Payments or Incentive Payments that it would have received had it become a Later Participating Subdivision prior to such judgment; *provided,*

however, that if the Subdivision appeals the judgment and the judgment is affirmed with finality before the Subdivision becomes a Participating Subdivision, the Subdivision shall not receive any share of any Base Payments or Incentive Payments.

4. A Later Participating Subdivision that becomes a Participating Subdivision while a Bar or Case-Specific Resolution involving a different Subdivision exists in its State shall receive 25% of the share of future Base Payments or Incentive Payments that it would have received had it become a Later Participating Subdivision without such Bar or Case-Specific Resolution.
- F.** *No Increase in Payments.* Amounts to be received by Later Participating Subdivisions or Later Participating Special Districts shall not increase the payments due from Allergan.
- G.** *Ineligible Subdivisions and Special Districts.* Prior Settling Subdivisions and Subdivisions and Special Districts in Non-Settling States or Prior Settling States are not eligible to be Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts.
- H.** *Non-Participating Subdivisions and Non-Participating Special Districts.* Non-Participating Subdivisions and Non-Participating Special Districts shall not directly receive any portion of any Base Payments or Incentive Payments, including from the State Fund and direct distributions from the Abatement Accounts Fund; however, a Settling State may choose to fund future Opioid Remediation that indirectly benefits Non-Participating Subdivisions and Non-Participating Special Districts.
- I.** *Unpaid Allocations to Later Participating and Non-Participating Subdivisions.* Any Base Payments and Incentive Payments allocated pursuant to subsection VII.E to a Later Participating or Non-Participating Subdivision or a Later Participating or Non-Participating Special District that cannot be paid pursuant to Section IX, will be allocated to the Abatement Accounts Fund for the Settling State in which the Subdivision is located, unless those payments are redirected elsewhere by a State-Subdivision Agreement or by a Statutory Trust.
- J.** *Requirements for Becoming a Participating Special District: Non-Litigating Special Districts.* A Non-Litigating Special District in a Settling State may become a Participating Special District by returning an executed Settlement Participation Form to the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator (which may be executed and returned by electronic means established by the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator) specifying (1) that the Special District agrees to the terms of this Agreement pertaining to Special Districts, (2) that the Special District releases all Released Claims against all Released Entities, (3) that the Special District agrees to use monies it receives, if any, from the Settlement Fund pursuant to the applicable requirements of Section VIII, and (4) that the Special District submits to the jurisdiction of the Court where the Consent Judgment is filed for purposes limited to that Court's role under the Agreement. The required Settlement Participation Form is attached as Exhibit K. A Non-Litigating Special District will decide whether to become a Participating Special District for both this Agreement and the Teva Global Opioid Settlement Agreement, or neither.

However, if Teva enters bankruptcy prior to the Effective Date, a Non-Litigating Special District can choose to only join this Agreement.

- K.** *Requirements for Becoming a Participating Special District: Litigating Special Districts/Later Litigating Special Districts.* A Litigating Special District or Later Litigating Special District in a Settling State may become a Participating Special District by returning an executed Settlement Participation Form to the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator (which may be executed and returned by electronic means established by the Implementation Administrator or Settlement Fund Administrator) that, in addition to the requirements set out in subsection IX.J for Non-Litigating Special Districts, commits it to promptly dismiss its legal action. The required Settlement Participation Form is attached as Exhibit K. A Litigating Special District or Later Litigating Special District will decide whether to become a Participating Special District for both this Agreement and the Teva Global Opioid Settlement Agreement, or neither. However, if Teva enters bankruptcy prior to the Effective Date, a Litigating Special District or Later Litigating Special District can choose to only join this Agreement. Except for trials begun before the Initial Participation Date, a Litigating Special District or a Later Litigating Special District may not become a Participating Special District after the completion of opening statements in a trial of a legal action it brought that includes a Released Claim against a Released Entity.
- L.** *Initial Participating Special Districts.* A Special District qualifies as an Initial Participating Special District if it meets the applicable requirements for becoming a Participating Special District set forth in subsections IX.J or IX.K by the Initial Participation Date. Provided however, all Special District Settlement Participation Forms shall be held by the Implementation Administrator until Allergan provides the notice in subsection X.B that it intends to proceed with the settlement, at which time the obligations created by such forms become effective.
- M.** *Later Participating Special Districts.* A Special District that is not an Initial Participating Special District may become a Later Participating Special District by meeting the applicable requirements for becoming a Participating Special District after the Initial Participation Date and agreeing to be subject to the terms of a State-Subdivision Agreement (if any) or any other structure adopted or applicable pursuant to subsections VIII.E or VIII.F. or any agreement reached by the applicable Settling State with Initial Participating Special Districts. The following provisions govern what a Later Participating Special District can receive (but do not apply to Initial Participating Special Districts):
1. Except for the Initial Year Payment, a Later Participating Special District shall not receive any share of any Base or Incentive Payments paid to the Subdivision Fund that were due before it became a Participating Special District.
 2. A Later Participating Special District that becomes a Participating Special District after Initial Participation Date but before June 15, 2023 shall receive 75% of the share of the Initial Year Payment that it would have received had it become an Initial Participating Special District (unless the Later Participating Special District is subject to subsections IX.M.3 or IX.M.4 below). A Later Participating Special

District that becomes a Participating Special District after June 15, 2023 shall receive no share of the Initial Year Payment.

3. A Later Participating Special District that, after the Initial Participation Date, maintains a lawsuit for a Released Claim(s) against a Released Entity and has judgment entered against it on every such Claim before it became a Participating Special District (other than a consensual dismissal with prejudice) shall receive 50% of the share of future Base Payments or Incentive Payments that it would have received had it become a Later Participating Special District prior to such judgment; *provided, however*, that if the Special District appeals the judgment and the judgment is affirmed with finality before the Special District becomes a Participating Special District, the Special District shall not receive any share of any Base Payments or Incentive Payments.
4. A Later Participating Special District that becomes a Participating Special District while a Bar or Case-Specific Resolution involving a different Special District exists in its State shall receive 25% of the share of future Base Payments or Incentive Payments that it would have received had it become a Later Participating Special District without such Bar or Case-Specific Resolution.

X. Condition to Effectiveness of Agreement and Filing of Consent Judgment

- A. *Determination to Proceed With Settlement.* Allergan will determine on or before the Reference Date whether there has been a sufficient resolution of the Claims of the Subdivisions and Special Districts in the Settling States (through participation under Section IX, Case-Specific Resolution(s), and Bar(s)) to proceed with this Agreement. The determination shall be in the sole discretion of Allergan, in good faith, and may be based on any criteria or factors deemed relevant by Allergan.
- B. *Notice by Allergan.* On or before the Reference Date, Allergan shall inform the Settling States and MDL Plaintiffs' Executive Committee of its determination pursuant to subsection X.A. If Allergan determines to proceed, the Parties will proceed to file the Consent Judgments. If Allergan determines not to proceed, this Agreement will have no further effect and all releases (including those given by Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts) and other commitments or obligations contained herein will be void and Settlement Participation Forms returned to the Subdivision or Special District or destroyed to the extent not prohibited by then existing legal obligations or document holds.

XI. Potential Payment Adjustments

- A. *Settlement Class Resolution Opt Outs.* If a Settling State is eligible for Incentive A on the basis of a Settlement Class Resolution, and a Primary Subdivision that opted out of the Settlement Class Resolution maintains a lawsuit asserting a Released Claim against a Released Entity, the following shall apply. If the lawsuit asserting a Released Claim either survives a Threshold Motion or has an unresolved Threshold Motion fewer than sixty (60) days prior to the scheduled start of a trial involving a Released Claim, and is resolved with

finality on terms requiring payment by the Released Entity, Allergan shall receive a dollar-for-dollar offset for the amount paid against its obligation to make remaining Incentive A payments that would be apportioned to that State or Participating Subdivisions listed on Exhibit G.

B. *Revoked Bar, Settlement Class Resolution, or Case-Specific Resolution.*

1. If Allergan made a payment as a result of the existence of a Bar, Settlement Class Resolution, or Case-Specific Resolution in a Settling State, and that Bar, Settlement Class Resolution, or Case-Specific Resolution is subject to a Revocation Event, Allergan shall receive a dollar-for-dollar offset against its obligation to make remaining payments that would be apportioned to that State or Participating Subdivisions or Participating Special Districts listed on Exhibit G. This offset will be calculated as the dollar amount difference between (1) the total amount of Incentive Payments paid by Allergan during the time the Bar, Settlement Class Resolution, or Case-Specific Resolution subject to the Revocation Event was in effect, and (2) the total amount of Incentive Payments that would have been due from Allergan during that time without the Bar, Settlement Class Resolution, or Case-Specific Resolution subject to the Revocation Event being in effect. The amount of Incentive Payments that would have been due, referenced in (2) above, will be calculated based on considering any Subdivision or Special District that provides a release within one hundred eighty (180) days after the Revocation Event as having been a Participating Subdivision or Participating Special District (in addition to all other Participating Subdivisions and Participating Special Districts) during the time that the Bar, Settlement Class Resolution, or Case-Specific Resolution subject to the Revocation Event was in effect. If a Revocation Event causes a Settling State to no longer qualify for one or both parts of Incentive D, the Settling State and its Exhibit G participants shall return to Allergan all relevant payments made under Incentive D through offsets as set forth above.
2. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in paragraph 1 above, if a Bar or Case-Specific Resolution is reinstated by the Settling State, either through the same or different means as the initial Bar or Case-Specific Resolution, Allergan's right to an offset is extinguished and any amounts withheld to offset amounts paid on account of the revoked, rescinded, reversed, or overruled Bar or Case-Specific Resolution shall be returned to the Settling State, less and except any Incentive Payments that would have been paid during the period in which the Bar or Case-Specific Resolution was revoked, rescinded, reversed, or overruled.

XII. Additional Restitution Amount

- A. *Additional Restitution Amount.* Allergan shall pay an Additional Restitution Amount to each Settling State listed in Exhibit N in the amount and on the schedule set forth in Exhibit M. The maximum Additional Restitution Amount of \$16,192,680.76 shall be reduced by the allocation set forth on Exhibit N for any Non-Settling States listed on Exhibit N. The Settlement Fund Administrator shall allocate such funds among and within the Settling

States listed in Exhibit N at the same time as its allocation of Annual Payments pursuant to Section VII.B.

~~A.B.~~ Additional Restitution Amount funds shall not be subject to allocation as provided in Sections VIII.D through VIII.F

XIII. Plaintiffs' Attorneys' Fees and Costs

- A. Attorneys' fees and costs are addressed in the following exhibits and are incorporated herein by reference:
1. The State Outside Counsel Fee Fund is addressed in Exhibit U.
 2. The State Cost Fund is addressed in Exhibit S.
 3. The Attorney Fee and Cost Fund is addressed and the Agreement on Attorneys' Fees, Expenses and Costs is set forth in Exhibit R.

XIV. Enforcement and Dispute Resolution

- A. *Enforceability.* The terms of the Agreement and Consent Judgment applicable to or in a Settling State will be enforceable solely by that Settling State and Allergan. Settling States or Participating Subdivisions shall not have enforcement rights with respect either to the terms of this Agreement that apply only to or in other States or to any Consent Judgment entered into by another Settling State. Participating Subdivisions shall not have enforcement rights against Allergan with respect to the Agreement or any Consent Judgment except as to payments that would be allocated to the Subdivision Fund or Abatement Accounts Fund pursuant to Section VII; *provided, however*, that each Settling State shall allow Participating Subdivisions in that State to notify it of any perceived violations of the Agreement or Consent Judgment.
- B. *Consent to Jurisdiction and Service of Process.* Allergan consents to the jurisdiction of the Court in which the Consent Judgment is filed, and any appellate court thereof, limited to resolution of disputes identified in subsection XIV.G.2; for a civil action for any appropriate relief to enforce compliance with the Parties' Agreement for Injunctive Relief pursuant to Exhibit P, Section K.5 herein; and for any proceedings for or related to the enforcement or collection of any payments on the Consent Judgment for resolution in the Court in which the Consent Judgment is filed. Allergan further agrees any service of process or notice required for such action or proceeding may be effectuated on Allergan through delivery of all required papers by hand or by a nationally recognized private courier on Allergan's representatives identified in Section XVI.~~PN~~ herein. To be clear, for the purposes of this Agreement only, Allergan consents to personal jurisdiction before such courts, and will not contend service must be effectuated through personal service of the Hague Convention process.
- C. *Specific Terms Dispute Resolution.*

1. Any dispute that is addressed by the provisions set forth in the Injunctive Relief Terms in Exhibit P shall be resolved as provided therein and pursuant to Section VIII.E.3 herein.
2. In the event Allergan believes the 85% threshold established in subsection VIII.B is not being satisfied, any Party may request that Allergan and the Enforcement Committee meet and confer regarding the use of funds under subsection VIII.B. The completion of such meet-and-confer process is a precondition to further action regarding any such dispute. Further action concerning subsection VIII.B shall: (i) be limited to Allergan seeking to reduce its Annual Payments by no more than 5% of the difference between the actual amount of Opioid Remediation and the 85% threshold established in subsection VIII.B; (ii) only reduce Annual Payments to those Settling States and its Participating Subdivisions that are below the 85% threshold established in subsection VIII.B; and (iii) not reduce Annual Payments restricted to future Opioid Remediation.

D. *State-Subdivision Enforcement.*

1. A Participating Subdivision shall not have enforcement rights against a Settling State in which it is located with respect to the Agreement or any Consent Judgment except: (1) as provided for in a State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, or Statutory Trust with respect to intrastate allocation; or (2) in the absence of a State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, or Statutory Trust, as to allegations that: (a) the Settling State's use of Abatement Accounts Fund monies were not used for uses similar to or in the nature of those uses contained in Exhibit E; or (b) a Settling State failed to pay funds directly from the Abatement Accounts Fund to a Participating Subdivision eligible to receive a block grant pursuant to subsection VIII.F.2.b.
2. A Settling State shall have enforcement rights against a Participating Subdivision located in its territory: (1) as provided for in a State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, or Statutory Trust; or (2) in the absence of a State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, or Statutory Trust, as to allegations that the uses of Abatement Accounts Fund monies by Participating Subdivisions listed on Exhibit G were not for uses similar to or in the nature of those uses contained in Exhibit E.
3. As between Settling States and Participating Subdivisions, the above rights are contractual in nature and nothing herein is intended to limit, restrict, change, or alter any other existing rights under law.

E. *Enforcement Committee Actions to Enforce Agreement.*

1. The Parties agree that in the event of any failure by Allergan to make any required payments under this Agreement, the Enforcement Committee, on its own or through its designee such as a Settling State or Participating Subdivision acting by its authorization and on its behalf, shall have the ability and right to file an action or proceeding in any New York state court, or federal court of the United States of

America, sitting in New York, for or related to the enforcement or collection of such payments.

2. If any National Dispute involving a Settling State, Participating Subdivision, and/or Allergan is pending before a National Arbitration Panel concerning a given year's payment to all Settling States, any action or proceeding pursuant to this subsection XIV.E shall be stayed as to any disputed amounts only, but may proceed as to any and all undisputed amounts. In the event there is a dispute between the Parties as to the disputed amounts at issue, the Enforcement Committee or any party to that dispute may seek an expedited determination from the National Arbitration Panel for that proceeding as to the disputed and undisputed amounts.
3. The Parties further Agree that in the event of Allergan's breach of the Parties' Agreement for Injunctive Relief (Exhibit P attached hereto), the Enforcement Committee, on its own or through a single designee such as a Settling State shall have the ability and right to file a civil action pursuant to Exhibit P, after completing the processes laid out in Exhibit P, in any New York state court, or federal court of the United States of America, sitting in New York, seeking any appropriate relief to enforce compliance with such Agreement for Injunctive Relief.
4. Allergan and other Released Entities consent to the jurisdiction of the New York state court, or federal court of the United States of America, sitting in New York, and any appellate court from any thereof, in which any action or proceeding is initiated pursuant to this subsection XIV.E, and for enforcement or collection of any related judgment entered by such court. Allergan further agrees any service of process or notice required for such action or proceeding, including for any action or proceeding for enforcement or collection of any judgment entered thereon, may be effectuated on Allergan through delivery of all required papers by hand or by a nationally recognized private courier on Allergan's representatives identified in Section XVI.P herein. For the purposes of this Agreement only, Allergan consents to personal jurisdiction before such courts and will not contend service must be effectuated through personal service or the Hague Convention process.
5. The enforcement rights under this subsection XIV.E are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other enforcement and collection rights of the Parties herein, including but not limited to enforcement rights as to payments as allowed by subsection XV.A.

F. *Subdivision Payment Enforcement.* A Participating Subdivision shall have the same right as a Settling State pursuant to subsection XIV.G.4.a(iv4) to seek resolution of any failure by Allergan to make its required Base Payments and/or Incentive Payments in a Payment Year.

G. *Other Dispute Resolution Terms.*

1. Except as provided in subsection VIII.C, the parties to a dispute shall promptly meet and confer in good faith to resolve any dispute prior to any filing or

presentation to the Court or National Arbitration Panel. If the parties cannot resolve the dispute informally, and unless otherwise agreed in writing, they shall follow the remaining provisions of this Section XIV to resolve the dispute.

2. Except as provided in subsections XIV.C and XIV.G.4, disputes not resolved informally shall be resolved in either the Court that entered the relevant Consent Judgment or, if no Consent Judgment was entered, a state or territorial court with jurisdiction located wherever the seat of state government is located. State court proceedings shall be governed by the rules and procedures of the forum. For the avoidance of doubt, disputes to be resolved in state court include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. disputes concerning whether expenditures qualify for Opioid Remediation;
 - b. disputes between a Settling State and Participating Subdivisions located in such Settling State as provided by subsection XIV.D, except to the extent the State-Subdivision Agreement provides for other dispute resolution mechanisms. For the avoidance of doubt, disputes between a Settling State and any Participating Subdivision shall not be considered National Disputes;
 - c. whether this Agreement and relevant Consent Judgment are binding under state law;
 - d. the extent of the Attorney General's or other participating entity's authority under state law, including the extent of the authority to release Claims;
 - e. whether the requirements of a Bar, a Case-Specific Resolution, State-Specific Finality, Later Litigating Subdivision, Litigating Subdivision, or a Threshold Motion have been met; and
 - f. all other disputes not specifically identified in subsections XIV.C and XIV.G.4.
3. Any Party may request that the National Arbitration Panel provide an interpretation of any provision of the settlement that is relevant to the state court determination, and the National Arbitration Panel shall make reasonable best efforts to supply such interpretation within the earlier of thirty (30) days or the time period required by the state court proceedings. Any Party may submit that interpretation to the state court to the extent permitted by, and for such weight provided by, the state court's rules and procedures. If requested by a Party, the National Arbitration Panel shall request that its interpretation be accepted in the form of an amicus curiae brief, and any attorneys' fees and costs for preparing any such filing shall be paid for by the requesting Party.
4. National Disputes involving a Settling State, Participating Subdivision, and/or Allergan shall be resolved by a National Arbitration Panel.

- a. “*National Disputes*” are disputes that are exceptions to subsection XIV.G.2’s presumption of resolution in state courts because they involve issues of interpretation of Agreement terms applicable to all Settling States without reference to a particular State’s law. Disputes between a State and any Participating Subdivisions shall not be considered National Disputes. National Disputes are limited to the following:
- (i) the amount of offset and/or credit attributable to Non-Settling States;
 - (ii) issues involving the scope and definition of “Product”;
 - (iii) interpretation and application of the terms “Covered Conduct” and “Released Entities”;
 - (iv) disputes over a given year’s Annual Payment or the payment of the Additional Restitution Amount to all Settling States (for the avoidance of doubt, disputes between a Settling State and Allergan over the amounts owed to only that State shall not be considered National Disputes);
 - (v) questions regarding the performance and/or removal of the Settlement Fund Administrator;
 - (vi) disputes involving liability of successor entities;
 - (vii) disputes that require a determination of sufficient Subdivision and Special District participation to qualify for Incentives A, B, C, or D,;
 - (viii) disputes that require interpretation of Agreement terms (i) that concretely affect four (4) or more Settling States; and (ii) do not turn on unique definitions and interpretations under State law; and
 - (ix) any dispute subject to resolution under subsection XIV.G.2 but for which all parties to the dispute agree to arbitration before the National Arbitration Panel under the provisions of this subsection XIV.G.4.
- b. The “*National Arbitration Panel*” shall be comprised of three (3) neutral arbitrators. One (1) arbitrator shall be chosen by Allergan, one (1) arbitrator shall be chosen by the Enforcement Committee with due input from Participating Subdivisions, and the third arbitrator shall be agreed upon by the first two (2) arbitrators. The membership of the National Arbitration Panel is intended to remain constant throughout the term of this Agreement, but in the event that replacements are required, the retiring arbitrator shall be replaced by the party that selected him/her.

- (i) The National Arbitration Panel shall make reasonable best efforts to decide all matters within one hundred eighty (180) days of filing, and in no event shall it take longer than one (1) year.
 - (ii) The National Arbitration Panel shall conduct all proceedings in a reasonably streamlined process consistent with an opportunity for the parties to be heard. Issues shall be resolved without the need for live witnesses where feasible, and with a presumption in favor of remote participation to minimize the burdens on the parties.
 - (iii) To the extent allowed under state law, a Settling State, Participating Subdivision, and (at any party's request) the National Arbitration Panel may certify to an appropriate state court any question of state law. The National Arbitration Panel shall be bound by a final state court determination of such a certified question. The time period for the arbitration shall be tolled during the course of the certification process.
 - (iv) The arbitrators will give due deference to any authoritative interpretation of state law, including any declaratory judgment or similar relief obtained by a Settling State, Participating Subdivision, or Allergan on a state law issue.
 - (v) The decisions of the National Arbitration Panel shall be binding on Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, Allergan, and the Settlement Fund Administrator. In any proceeding before the National Arbitration Panel involving a dispute between a Settling State and Allergan whose resolution could prejudice the rights of a Participating Subdivision(s) or Participating Special District(s) in that Settling State, such Participating Subdivision(s) or Participating Special District(s) shall be allowed to file a statement of view in the proceeding.
- c. Nothing herein shall be construed so as to limit or otherwise restrict a State from seeking injunctive or other equitable relief in state court to protect the health, safety, or welfare of its citizens.
 - d. Each party shall bear its own costs in any arbitration or court proceeding arising under this subsection XIV.G. The costs for the arbitrators on the National Arbitration Panel shall be divided and paid equally by the disputing sides for each individual dispute, *e.g.*, a dispute between Allergan and Settling States/Participating Subdivisions shall be split 50% by Allergan and 50% by the Settling States/Participating Subdivisions that are parties to the dispute; a dispute between a Settling State and a Participating Subdivision shall be split 50% by the Settling State and 50% by any Participating Subdivisions that are party to the dispute.

5. Prior to initiating an action to enforce pursuant to this subsection XIV.G, the complaining party must:
 - a. Provide written notice to the Enforcement Committee of its complaint, including the provision of the Consent Judgment and/or Agreement that the practice appears to violate, as well as the basis for its interpretation of the disputed provision. The Enforcement Committee shall establish a reasonable process and timeline for obtaining additional information from the involved parties; *provided, however*, that the date the Enforcement Committee establishes for obtaining additional information from the parties shall not be more than forty-five (45) days following the notice. The Enforcement Committee may advise the involved parties of its views on the complaint and/or seek to resolve the complaint informally.
 - b. Wait to commence any enforcement action until thirty (30) days after the date that the Enforcement Committee establishes for obtaining additional information from the involved parties.
6. If the parties to a dispute cannot agree on the proper forum for resolution of the dispute under the provisions of subsections XIV.G.2 or XIV.G.4, a committee comprising the Enforcement Committee and sufficient representatives of Allergan such that the members of the Enforcement Committee have a majority of one (1) member will determine the forum where the dispute will be initiated within twenty-eight (28) days of receiving notification of the dispute relating to the proper forum. The forum identified by such committee shall be the sole forum for determining where the dispute shall be heard, and the committee's identification of such forum shall not be entitled to deference by the forum selected.

H. *No Effect.* Nothing in this Agreement shall be interpreted to limit the Settling State's Civil Investigative Demand ("CID") or investigative subpoena authority, to the extent such authority exists under applicable state law and the CID or investigative subpoena is issued pursuant to such authority, and Allergan reserves all of its rights in connection with a CID or investigative subpoena issued pursuant to such authority.

XV. Judgment and Settlement Set-Off Related to Teva

A. The Parties recognize that some of the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts are pursuing Claims against Teva Ltd., Teva USA, Cephalon, Divested Actavis Generic Entities, and/or other Divested Entities, and/or each of their respective parents, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates. If any of them achieves a judgment by verdict, judicial decision, or means other than settlement against any of Teva Ltd., Teva USA, Cephalon, Divested Actavis Generic Entities, and/or other Divested Entities, and/or each of their respective parents, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates, each plaintiff listed above shall represent and agree that any payment(s) that the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts or their counsel receives from Teva Ltd., Teva USA, Cephalon, Divested Actavis Generic Entities, and/or other Divested Entities, and/or each of their respective parents, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates

reflects the amount over and above 56% of the amount they or their counsel received from the Global Settlement Amount due under this Agreement that each and all of them deem to reflect a fair overall settlement value for liability attributable to the generic opioid drugs that are Products distributed and/or sold before August 2, 2016 by Divested Actavis Generic Entities and/or other Divested Entities and/or attributable to the operation of the Divested Actavis Generic Entities and/or other Divested Entities related to those generic opioid drugs that are Products before August 2, 2016.

- B.** The Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts may reach a settlement agreement with Teva Ltd., Teva USA, Cephalon, Divested Actavis Generic Entities, and/or other Divested Entities, and/or each of their respective parents, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates that resolves some or all of their respective Claims. In that event, the Releasors represent and agree that any payment(s) that the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts or their counsel receives from Teva Ltd., Teva USA, Cephalon, Divested Actavis Generic Entities, and/or other Divested Entities, and/or each of their respective parents, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates reflects the amount over and above 56% of the amount they or they counsel received from the Global Settlement Amount due under this Agreement that each and all of them deem to reflect a fair overall settlement value for liability attributable to the generic opioid drugs that are Products distributed and/or sold before August 2, 2016 by Divested Actavis Generic Entities and/or other Divested Entities and/or attributable to the operation of the Divested Actavis Generic Entities and/or other Divested Entities related to those generic opioid drugs that are Products before August 2, 2016. In any such settlement agreement with Teva Ltd., Teva USA, Cephalon, Divested Actavis Generic Entities, and/or other Divested Entities, and/or each of their respective parents, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates, the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts agree that the agreed settlement amount reflects the value the parties to the agreement deem a fair settlement value over and above the payments made or due to be paid under the Allergan Public Global Opioid Settlement Agreement for generic opioid drugs that are Products distributed and/or sold before August 2, 2016 by Divested Actavis Generic Entities and/or other Divested Entities and/or relate to the operation of Divested Actavis Generic Entities and other Divested Entities related to those generic opioid drugs that are Products before August 2, 2016.

XVI. Miscellaneous

- A.** *No Admission.* Allergan does not admit liability or wrongdoing. Neither this Agreement nor the Consent Judgments shall be considered, construed, or represented to be (1) an admission, concession, or evidence of liability or wrongdoing or (2) a waiver or any limitation of any defense otherwise available to Allergan.
- B.** *Population of Subdivisions.* The population figures for Subdivisions shall be the published U.S. Census Bureau's population estimates for July 1, 2019, released May 2020. These population figures shall remain unchanged during the term of this Agreement.
- C.** *Population of Special Districts.* For any purpose in this Agreement in which the population of a Special District is used: (a) School Districts' population will be measured by the

number of students enrolled who are eligible under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“*IDEA*”) or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; (b) Health Districts’ and Hospital Districts’ population will be measured at 25% of discharges; and (c) all other Special Districts’ (including Fire Districts’ and Library Districts’) population will be measured at 10% of the population served.

D. *Population Associated with Sheriffs.* For any purpose in this Agreement in which the population associated with a lawsuit by a sheriff is used, the population will be measured at 20% of the capacity of the jail(s) operated by the sheriff.

E. *Most-Favored-Nation Provision.*

1. If Allergan enters into any settlement agreement with any Non-Settling State after November 23, 2022 that resolves Claims similar in scope to the Claims released by a Settling State under this Agreement on overall payment terms that are more favorable to such Non-Settling State on a net present value basis (calculated with a 7% discount rate) on overall payment terms the Non-Settling State would have received under this Agreement based on the same level of participation, then the Settling States, individually or collectively, may elect to seek review, pursuant to Section XVI.E.3, of the overall payment terms of this Agreement and the Non-Settling State agreement so that the Settling State(s) may obtain, with respect to Allergan, overall payment terms at least as favorable as those obtained by such Non-Settling State. “*Overall payment terms*” refers to consideration of all payment terms of the two agreements, taken together, including, but not limited to the amount of payments, the timing of payments, and conditions or contingencies on payments.

2. For any settlement with a Non-Settling State involving Released Claims, Allergan shall provide the Enforcement Committee with a copy of the settlement agreement or relevant Consent Judgment within thirty (30) calendar days of the consummation of such settlement. The Enforcement Committee will promptly distribute such copy to all Settling States.

3. In the event that ~~the~~ one or more Settling State(s) believes that the overall payment terms of an agreement by Allergan with a Non-Settling State are more favorable to the Non-Settling State, when compared based on the totality of the considerations set forth in Section XVI.E.1, the Settling State(s) and Allergan shall engage in the following process:

a. The Settling State(s) shall provide notice, within sixty (60) calendar days of the date on which a settlement agreement or Consent Judgment is provided to the Enforcement Committee, to Allergan of its intent to seek revision of this Agreement to provide payment terms that are, on an overall basis, as favorable as those obtained by the Non-Settling State. Such notice shall be confidential and not disclosed publicly to the extent allowed by law and shall state, in detail, the basis for the Settling State’s belief that it is entitled to a revision of the Agreement.

- b. Allergan shall, within thirty (30) calendar days, provide a response to the Settling State(s), explaining its position, in detail, as to whether the Settling State(s) is entitled to more favorable overall payment terms than those provided for in this Agreement.
 - c. In the event the Settling State(s) and Allergan do not reach agreement as to the application of Section XVI.E.1, the Settling State(s) may petition the National Arbitration Panel to seek a ruling from the Panel as to the applicability of Section XVI.E.1, provided that the Settling State(s) may seek such review only if at least five (5) Settling States co-sign the petition. The Panel shall consider submissions and argument by the parties pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section XIV.G.4.
 - d. The Settling State(s) and Allergan shall be bound by the determination of the National Arbitration Panel.
4. This Section XVI.E does not apply to, and there is no ability of any Settling State to seek or obtain revision of this Agreement based on, any Non-Settling State agreement with Allergan that is entered into: (a) either the earlier of (i) after the close of expert discovery or (ii) after a date ninety (90) calendar days prior to the scheduled start date of a trial between Allergan and the Non-Settling State or any severed or bifurcated portion thereof, provided that, where, in order to complete a settlement, a Non-Settling State and Allergan jointly request an adjournment of the scheduled start date of a trial within ninety (90) days of that date, this exception will apply as if the trial date had not been adjourned; (b) with a Non-Settling State that previously litigated to judgment a case related to opioids against any manufacturer, distributor, or pharmacy; or (c) the earlier of (i) after a Non-Settling State has obtained any court order or judicial determination that grants judgment (in whole or in part) against Allergan in the Non-Settling State's case, (ii) after a sanctions ruling against Allergan in the Non-Settling State's case against Allergan; or (iii) after any ruling has issued in the Non-Settling State's case against any manufacturer, distributor, or pharmacy on the issue of joint and several liability. The National Arbitration Panel shall have no power to review agreements that satisfy any of the conditions described in this paragraph.
5. This Section does not apply to, and there is no ability of any Settling State to seek or obtain revision of this Agreement based on, any agreement between Allergan and (a) federally-recognized tribe(s), (b) Non-Participating Subdivisions or (3) Non-Participating Special Districts. This Section XVI.E will not apply to any agreement entered into more than six (6) months after the Reference Date.

F. *Tax Reporting and Cooperation.*

1. The Parties agree that, unless otherwise required by law, Allergan's payment of the Compensatory Restitution Amount (after all applicable offsets) payable by Allergan shall be directed to Opioid Remediation for restitution of Alleged Harms allegedly caused by Allergan. By executing this Agreement (or the Settlement

Participation Form and thereby becoming a signatory to this Agreement), each Settling State, Participating Subdivision, and Participating Special District certify that: (1) the entity suffered Alleged Harms allegedly caused by Allergan; (2) the Compensatory Restitution Amount to be paid by Allergan to the entity represent an amount that is less than or equal to the actual monetary damage allegedly caused by Allergan; and (3) the entity shall use such payments for the sole purpose of Opioid Remediation.

2. Upon request by Allergan, the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts agree to perform such further acts and to execute and deliver such further documents as may be reasonably necessary for Allergan to establish the statements set forth in subsection VIII.G to the satisfaction of their tax advisors, their independent financial auditors, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other governmental authority, including as contemplated by Treasury Regulations Section 1.162-21(b)(3)(ii) and any subsequently proposed or finalized relevant regulations or administrative guidance.
3. Without limiting the generality of subsection XVI.FE, each Settling State, Participating Subdivision, and Participating Special District shall cooperate in good faith with Allergan with respect to any tax claim, dispute, investigation, audit, examination, contest, litigation, or other proceeding relating to this Agreement.
4. The Designated State, on behalf of all Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts, shall designate one of its officers or employees to act as the “appropriate official” within the meaning of Treasury Regulations Section 1.6050X-1(f)(1)(ii)(B) (the “Appropriate Official”).
5. Neither Allergan nor the Settling States, Participating Subdivisions, and Participating Special Districts make any warranty or representation to any Settling jurisdiction or Releasor as to the tax consequences of the payment of the Compensatory Restitution Amount (or any portion thereof).

G. *No Third-Party Beneficiaries.* Except as expressly provided in this Agreement, no portion of this Agreement shall provide any rights to, or be enforceable by, any person or entity that is not a Settling State or Released Entity. No Settling State may assign or otherwise convey any right to enforce any provision of this Agreement.

H. *Calculation.* Any figure or percentage referred to in this Agreement shall be carried to seven decimal places.

I. *Construction.* None of the Parties and no Participating Subdivision shall be considered to be the drafter of this Agreement or of any of its provisions for the purpose of any statute, case law, or rule of interpretation or construction that would or might cause any provision to be construed against the drafter of this Agreement. The headings of the provisions of this Agreement are not binding and are for reference only and do not limit, expand, or otherwise affect the contents or meaning of this Agreement.

- J.** *Cooperation.* Each Party and each Participating Subdivision agrees to use its best efforts and to cooperate with the other Parties and Participating Subdivisions to cause this Agreement and the Consent Judgments to become effective, to obtain all necessary approvals, consents and authorizations, if any, and to execute all documents and to take such other action as may be appropriate in connection herewith. Consistent with the foregoing, each Party and each Participating Subdivision agrees that it will not directly or indirectly assist or encourage any challenge to this Agreement or any Consent Judgment by any other person, and will support the integrity and enforcement of the terms of this Agreement and the Consent Judgments.
- K.** *Entire Agreement.* This Agreement, its exhibits and any other attachments, including the attorneys' fees and cost agreement in Exhibit R, embodies the entire agreement and understanding between and among the Parties and Participating Subdivisions relating to the subject matter hereof and supersedes (1) all prior agreements and understandings relating to such subject matter, whether written or oral and (2) all purportedly contemporaneous oral agreements and understandings relating to such subject matter.
- L.** *Execution.* This Agreement may be executed in counterparts and by different signatories on separate counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which shall together be one and the same Agreement. One or more counterparts of this Agreement may be delivered by facsimile or electronic transmission with the intent that it or they shall constitute an original counterpart hereof. One or more counterparts of this Agreement may be signed by electronic signature.
- M.** *Good Faith and Voluntary Entry.* Each Party warrants and represents that it negotiated the terms of this Agreement in good faith. Each of the Parties and signatories to this Agreement warrants and represents that it freely and voluntarily entered into this Agreement without any degree of duress or compulsion. The Parties state that no promise of any kind or nature whatsoever (other than the written terms of this Agreement) was made to them to induce them to enter into this Agreement.
- N.** *No Prevailing Party.* The Parties each agree that they are not the prevailing party in this action, for purposes of any Claim for fees, costs, or expenses as prevailing parties arising under common law or under the terms of any statute, because the Parties have reached a good faith settlement. The Parties each further waive any right to challenge or contest the validity of this Agreement on any ground, including, without limitation, that any term is unconstitutional or is preempted by, or in conflict with, any current or future law.
- O.** *Non-Admissibility.* The settlement negotiations resulting in this Agreement have been undertaken by the Parties and by certain representatives of the Participating Subdivisions in good faith and for settlement purposes only, and no evidence of negotiations or discussions underlying this Agreement shall be offered or received in evidence in any action or proceeding for any purpose. This Agreement shall not be offered or received in evidence in any action or proceeding for any purpose other than in an action or proceeding arising under or relating to this Agreement or in any litigation or arbitration concerning Allergan's right to coverage under an insurance contract.

P. *Notices.* All notices or other communications under this Agreement shall be in writing (including but not limited to electronic communications) and shall be given to the recipients indicated below:

1. For the Attorney(s) General:

Josh Stein, Attorney General
North Carolina Department of Justice
Attn: Daniel Mosteller
PO Box 629
Raleigh, NC 27602
Dmosteller@ncdoj.gov

Tom Miller, Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General of Iowa
Attn: Nathan Blake
1305 E. Walnut St.
Des Moines, IA 50319

Jonathan Skrmetti, Attorney General
Office of the Tennessee Attorney General
Attn: Michael Leftwich
P.O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN, 37202-0207

2. For the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee:

Paul F. Farrell
Farrell Law
P.O. Box 1180
Huntington, WV 25714-1180

Jayne Conroy
Simmons Hanly Conroy LLC
112 Madison Avenue, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10016-7416
JConroy@simmonsfirm.com

Joseph F. Rice
Motley Rice LLC
28 Bridgeside Blvd.
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
jrice@motleyrice.com

Peter Mougey

Levin Papantonio Rafferty
316 South Baylen St.
Pensacola, FL 32502
pmougey@levinlaw.com

Paul J. Geller
Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP
120 East Palmetto Park Road
Boca Raton, FL 33432
PGeller@rgrdlaw.com

Steven Skikos
Skikos, Crawford, Skikos & Joseph, LLC
One Sansom Street, Suite 2830
San Francisco, CA 94104
sskikos@skikos.com

3. For Allergan:

Office of General Counsel
One North Waukegan Road
North Chicago, IL 60064

Copy to Allergan's attorneys at:

James F. Hurst, P.C.
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
300 North LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654
james.hurst@kirkland.com

Any Party or the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee may change or add the contact information of the persons designated to receive notice on its behalf by notice given (effective upon the giving of such notice) as provided in this subsection.

- Q.** *No Waiver.* The waiver of any rights conferred hereunder shall be effective only if made by written instrument executed by the waiving Party or Parties. The waiver by any Party of any breach of this Agreement shall not be deemed to be or construed as a waiver of any other breach, whether prior, subsequent, or contemporaneous, nor shall such waiver be deemed to be or construed as a waiver by any other Party.
- R.** *Preservation of Privilege.* Nothing contained in this Agreement or any Consent Judgment, and no act required to be performed pursuant to this Agreement or any Consent Judgment, is intended to constitute, cause, or effect any waiver (in whole or in part) of any attorney-client privilege, work product protection, or common interest/joint defense privilege, and each Party agrees that it shall not make or cause to be made in any forum any assertion to the contrary.

S. *Successors*

1. The Agreement shall be binding upon, and insure to the benefit of, Allergan and its respective successors and assigns.
2. Prior to Allergan's last Payment Date, Allergan shall not sell the majority of its voting stock or substantially all its assets without obtaining the acquiror's agreement that it will constitute a successor with respect to Allergan's obligations under this Agreement.
3. Prior to Allergan's last Payment Date, Allergan shall not in one (1) transaction, or a series of related transactions, sell, or transfer assets (other than sales or transfers of inventories, or sales or transfers to an entity owed directly or indirectly by Allergan) having a fair market value equal to twenty-five percent (25%) or more of the consolidated assets of Allergan where the sale or transfer transaction is announced after the Reference Date, is not for fair consideration, and would foreseeably and unreasonably jeopardize Allergan's ability to make the payments under this Agreement that are due on or before the third Payment Date following the close of a sale or transfer transaction. The above restriction shall not apply if Allergan obtains the acquiror's agreement that it will be either a guarantor of or successor to the percentage of Allergan's remaining Payment Obligations under this Agreement equal to the percentage of Allergan's consolidated assets being sold or transferred in such transaction. Percentages under this section shall be determined in accordance with the United States generally accepted accounting principles and as of the date of Allergan's most recent publicly filed consolidated balance sheet prior to the date of entry into the sale or transfer agreement at issue. This Section XVI.QS.3 shall be enforceable solely by the Enforcement Committee, and any objection under this Section X.VI.QS.3 not raised within twenty (20) calendar days from the date that Allergan transmits notice of the transaction to the Enforcement Committee is waived. Any dispute under this Section XVI.QS.3 shall be a National Dispute as described in Section XIV.G and must be raised exclusively with the National Arbitration Panel as described therein within twenty (20) calendar days of the announcement, and the sole remedy shall be an order enjoining the transaction.

- T.** *Modification, Amendment, Alteration.* After the Reference Date, any modification, amendment, or alteration of this Agreement by the Parties shall be binding only if evidenced in writing signed by Allergan along with the signatures of at least thirty-seven (37) of those then-serving Attorneys General of the Settling States along with a representation from each Attorney General that either: (1) the advisory committee or similar entity established or recognized by that Settling State (either pursuant to subsection VIII.F.2, by a State-Subdivision Agreement, or by statute) voted in favor of the modification, amendment, or alteration of this Agreement including at least one Participating Subdivision-appointed member; or (2) in States without any advisory committee, that 50.1% of the Participating Subdivisions by population expressed approval of the modification, amendment, or alteration of this Agreement in writing. Provided, however, in the event the modification, amendment, or alteration relates to injunctive relief,

interstate allocation between the Settling States, intrastate allocation in a particular Settling State, or fees or costs of Settling States and Participating Subdivisions, then every Settling State and each Participating Subdivision affected by that modification, amendment, or alteration must assent in writing. Provided further that, in the event the modification, amendment, or alteration relates to injunctive relief, then such amendment, modification, or alteration of injunctive relief against Allergan will not be effective unless and until any Consent Judgment is modified by a court of competent jurisdiction, except as otherwise provided by the Injunctive Terms.

U. *Termination.*

1. Unless otherwise agreed to by Allergan and the Settling State in question, this Agreement and all of its terms (except subsection XVI.~~OM~~ and any other non-admissibility provisions, which shall continue in full force and effect) shall be canceled and terminated with respect to the Settling State, and the Agreement and all orders issued by the courts in the Settling State pursuant to the Agreement shall become null and void and of no effect if one or more of the following conditions applies:
 - a. A Consent Judgment approving this Agreement without modification of any of the Agreement's terms has not been entered as to the Settling State by a court of competent jurisdiction on or before one hundred eighty (180) days after the Effective Date; or
 - b. This Agreement or the Consent Judgment as to that Settling State has been disapproved by a court of competent jurisdiction to which it was presented for approval and/or entry (or, in the event of an appeal from or review of a decision of such a court to approve this Agreement and the Consent Judgment, by the court hearing such appeal or conducting such review), and the time to appeal from such disapproval has expired, or, in the event of an appeal from such disapproval, the appeal has been dismissed or the disapproval has been affirmed by the court of last resort to which such appeal has been taken and such dismissal or disapproval has become no longer subject to further appeal (including, without limitation, review by the United States Supreme Court).
2. If this Agreement is terminated with respect to a Settling State and its Participating Subdivisions for whatever reason pursuant to subsection XVI.US.1, then:
 - a. An applicable statute of limitation or any similar time requirement (excluding any statute of repose) shall be tolled from the date the Settling State signed this Agreement until the later of the time permitted by applicable law or for one year from the date of such termination, with the effect that Allergan and the Settling State in question shall be in the same position with respect to the statute of limitation as they were at the time the Settling State filed its action; and

- b. Allergan and the Settling State and its Participating Subdivisions in question shall jointly move the relevant court of competent jurisdiction for an order reinstating the actions and Claims dismissed pursuant to the terms of this Agreement governing dismissal, with the effect that Allergan and the Settling State and its Participating Subdivisions in question shall be in the same position with respect to those actions and Claims as they were at the time the action or Claim was stayed or dismissed.
 3. Unless Allergan and the Enforcement Committee agree otherwise, this Agreement, with the exception of the Injunctive Relief Terms that have their own provisions on duration, shall terminate as to all Parties as of Annual Payment 6, *provided* that Allergan has performed its payment obligations under the Agreement as of that date. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Agreement, all releases under this Agreement will remain effective despite any termination under this paragraph.
- V. *Waiver.* Allergan, for good and valuable consideration the receipt of which is acknowledged, hereby (a) waives, foregoes and relinquishes all rights to utilize and/or seek relief under any of the following laws of the State of Texas for the restructuring of its debts or liabilities related to Released Claims or Claims that would have been Released Claims if they had been brought by a Releasor against a Released Entity before the Effective Date, or this Agreement: Tex. Bus. Orgs. Code § 10.003 (Contents of Plan of Merger: More Than One Successor) or any other statute of Subchapter A of Chapter 10 of Tex. Bus. Orgs. Code to the extent such statute relates to multi-successor or divisive mergers (and/or any other similar laws or statutes in any other state or territory); Tex. Bus. Orgs. Code §§ 11.01–11.414 (Winding Up and Termination of Domestic Entity); or Tex. Bus. & Com. Code §§ 23.01–23.33 (Assignments for the Benefit of Creditors) (collectively, the “Texas Statutes”), and (b) agrees, warrants and represents that it will not file, request or petition for relief under the Texas Statutes related to its debts or liabilities related to Released Claims or Claims that would have been Released Claims if they had been brought by a Releasor against a Released Entity before the Effective Date, or this Agreement, in each case until such time as all of Allergan’s payment obligations incurred hereunder are satisfied in full. The foregoing waiver and relinquishment includes, without limitation, until such time as all of Allergan’s payment obligations hereunder are satisfied in full, Allergan’s rights to execute a divisional merger or equivalent transaction or restructuring related to its debts or liabilities related to Released Claims or Claims that would have been Released Claims if they had been brought by a Releasor against a Released Entity before the Effective Date, or this Agreement that in each case has the intent or foreseeable effect of (i) separating material assets from material liabilities and (ii) assigning or allocating all or a substantial portion of those liabilities to any subsidiary or affiliate that files for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, or pursuant to which such subsidiary or affiliate that files for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code would be assuming or retaining all or a substantial portion of those liabilities.
- W. *Governing Law.* Except (1) as otherwise provided in the Agreement or (2) as necessary, in the sole judgment of the National Arbitration Panel, to promote uniformity of interpretation for matters within the scope of the National Arbitration Panel’s authority, this Agreement shall be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the respective laws of the Settling

State, without regard to the conflict of law rules of such Settling State, that is seeking to enforce the Agreement against Allergan or against which Allergan is seeking enforcement. Notwithstanding any other provision in this subsection on governing law, any disputes relating to the Settlement Fund Escrow shall be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the law of the state where the escrow agent has its primary place of business.

ALLERGAN PUBLIC GLOBAL OPIOID SETTLEMENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT A Alleged Harms..... A-1

EXHIBIT B Enforcement Committee Organizational Bylaws..... B-1

EXHIBIT C Litigating Subdivisions and Special Districts List C-1

EXHIBIT D [Intentionally Omitted]..... D-1

EXHIBIT E List of Opioid Remediation Uses E-1

EXHIBIT F-1 List of States and Pre-Credit Overall Allocation Percentages.....F-1

EXHIBIT F-2 List of Eligible Settling States and Overall Allocation PercentagesF-3

EXHIBIT G Subdivisions and Special Districts Eligible to Receive Direct Allocations from the Subdivision Fund and Subdivision Fund Allocation Percentages G-1

EXHIBIT H [Intentionally Omitted] H-1

EXHIBIT I Subdivisions with a Population Greater than 10,000..... I-1

EXHIBIT J-1 AbbVie Entities..... J-1

EXHIBIT J-2 Allergan Entities J-2

EXHIBIT J-3 Divested Entities J-3

EXHIBIT K Subdivision and Special District Settlement Participation Form K-1

EXHIBIT L Settlement Fund Administrator..... L-1

EXHIBIT M-1 Payment Schedule..... M-1

EXHIBIT M-2 Payment Schedule for Fee Funds, Cost Funds, and Additional Restitution..... M-2

EXHIBIT N Additional Restitution Amount Allocation..... N-1

EXHIBIT O Adoption of a State-Subdivision Agreement O-1

EXHIBIT P Injunctive Relief P-1

EXHIBIT Q [Intentionally Omitted] Q-1

EXHIBIT R Agreement on Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses	R-1
EXHIBIT S Agreement on the State Outside Counsel Fee Fund for Manufacturer Settlements.....	S-1
EXHIBIT T Agreement on the State Cost Fund Administration	T-1

EXHIBIT A
Alleged Harms

The following expert reports that were filed in connection with the case captioned *In re National Prescription Opiate Litigation*, No. 1:17-md-02804 (N.D. Ohio):

1. Expert report of Professor David Cutler, dated March 25, 2019.
2. Expert report of Dr. Jeffrey B. Liebman, dated March 25, 2019.
3. Expert report of Professor Thomas McGuire regarding damages to Bellwethers, dated March 25, 2019.
4. Report of Professor Thomas McGuire regarding public nuisance, dated March 25, 2019.

EXHIBIT B
Enforcement Committee Organizational Bylaws

ARTICLE I

These bylaws constitute the code of rules adopted by the Settling States and Participating Subdivisions for the creation of an Enforcement Committee (the “Committee”) to exist and operate during the term of the Agreement in connection with Allergan and shall control the regulation and management of the Committee’s affairs.

ARTICLE II

Purpose

The Committee is organized for the sole purpose of evaluating and taking such action as deemed reasonable, necessary, and appropriate by the members of the Committee on the matters delegated to the Committee under that certain Settlement Agreement between the Settling States and Allergan, dated November ____, 2022.

ARTICLE III

Members of the Committee

(1) Number of Members

The Committee will consist of thirteen (13) members (the “Members”). Upon majority resolution of the Committee, the number of Members may be increased or decreased from time to time, but in no event shall a decrease have the effect of decreasing the total number of Members to less than seven Members.

(2) Initial Members

The Committee initially will consist of eight (8) Settling State Members and five (5) Participating Subdivision Members; two (2) of the Participating Subdivisions shall be counties and two (2) shall be municipalities, and the fifth Participating Subdivision member may be either a county or a municipality. The initial Settling State Members are representatives from: California, Illinois, Iowa, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, and Virginia. The initial Participating Subdivision Members are: [•]. Until the date fifteen (15) months from the Effective Date contained in the Settlement Agreement, the Participating Subdivisions may designate their outside counsel to serve as their representative. After the date fifteen (15) months from the Effective Date, an employee or official of the Participating Subdivision must be the designated as the representative of the Participating Subdivision.

(3) Term of Members

The term of office for Members of the Committee will be until the end of the term of the Settlement Agreement, six (6) years, unless and until a Member withdraws or resigns from the Committee.

(4) Resignation

Any Member may resign at any time by delivering written notice to the Chairperson of the Committee. Such resignation shall take effect upon receipt or, if later, at the time specified in the notice.

(5) Removal

(a) Any Member may be removed without cause, at any time, by a majority of the entire Committee, at a Regular or Special Meeting called for that purpose. Any Member under consideration of removal must first be notified about the consideration by written notice at least five days prior to the meeting at which the vote takes place.

(b) In the event that any Member is not a Settling State or a Participating Subdivision or the Member subsequently becomes a Later Litigating Subdivision, the Member shall be removed immediately without notice or vote of the Committee.

(6) Vacancies

In the event of a vacancy, the Members of the same type (Settling State or Participating Subdivision) shall select another Settling State or Participating Subdivision to fill that Member's position.

(7) Compensation

Members shall not receive any salaries or other compensation for their services, but, by resolution of the Committee, may be reimbursed for any actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties for the Committee, as long as a majority of disinterested Members approve the reimbursement. Any reimbursement shall be sought from the Settlement Fund Administrator.

ARTICLE IV

Conflicts of Interest and Code of Ethics

If a Member, agent, or employee of the Committee has a conflict of interest, he or she may not participate in a vote, discussion, or decision about the matter. Each Member shall follow any applicable state or local law with respect to conflicts, gifts, and ethics.

ARTICLE V

Committee Meetings

(1) Place of Meetings

Meetings of the Committee will be held at any place that the Chairperson may designate, including by telephonic or electronic means.

(2) **Regular Meetings**

Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held as deemed necessary by the Chairperson or any three members.

(3) **Notice of Meetings**

Written notice of the date, time, place and subject of each meeting must be provided to the Members at least 72 hours before the scheduled time of the meeting, except when there is an emergency or urgent public necessity.

(4) **Quorum**

A majority of the incumbent Members (not counting vacancies) shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of convening a meeting or conducting business.

(5) **Voting and Proxy**

When it is necessary to vote on any matter before the Committee, Members may vote by electronic means as provided in these Bylaws. Proxy voting is permitted. In order for a matter to pass, the matter must have a majority vote of Members present and must have at least one vote from a Settling State Member and a Participating Subdivision Member. In the event that there is a Quorum, but no Settling State or Participating Subdivision Member is present, then a matter may pass with a simple majority vote.

(6) **Minutes**

The Committee shall prepare and keep minutes. The minutes must state the subject of each deliberation and indicate each vote, order, decision, or other action taken.

ARTICLE VI

Officers

(1) **Roster of Officers**

The Committee shall have a Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson, and a Secretary. The Committee may have at its discretion, such other officers as may be appointed by the Members of the Committee. One person may hold two or more offices, except those serving as Chairperson.

(2) **Election and Removal of Officers**

All officers shall serve two-year terms. The election shall be conducted at the first meeting of the fiscal year. Officers shall remain in office until their successors have been selected. Officers may serve consecutive terms without limit. The election of officers shall be by majority vote of the Members of the Committee attending the meeting.

(3) Vacancies

If a vacancy occurs during the term of office for any elected officer, the Members of the Committee shall elect a new officer to fill the remainder of the term as soon as practical, by majority vote of Members present.

(4) Chairperson

The Chairperson will supervise and control the affairs of the Committee and shall exercise such supervisory powers as may be given him/her by the Members of the Committee. The Chairperson will perform all duties incident to such office and such other duties as may be provided in these bylaws or as may be prescribed from time to time by the Committee. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings and shall exercise parliamentary control in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

(5) Vice Chairperson

The Vice Chairperson shall act in place of the Chairperson in the event of the Chairperson's absence, inability, or refusal to act, and shall exercise and discharge such other duties as may be required by the Committee. The Vice Chairperson shall serve as the parliamentarian and interpret any ambiguities of the bylaws.

(6) Secretary

The Secretary will keep and maintain all records related to the Committee and take minutes of all meetings.

(7) Records

All elected officers and committee chairpersons shall relinquish their records to the Chairperson immediately upon the completion of their term of office or completion of a project.

(8) Resignation

An officer may resign the office while not resigning membership from the Committee, by submitting a letter to the Chairperson. Vacancies occurring in any office shall be appointed for the remainder of the term.

ARTICLE VII

Duties

(1) **Prior to the Reference Date**

The Committee shall be responsible for any additional negotiations with Allergan, including, but not limited to, negotiating extensions of any periods created by the Settlement Agreement.

(2) **After the Effective Date**

The Committee shall establish procedures for the receipt of notices that a dispute exists concerning the Agreement and review of such disputes, pursuant to **Section XIV** of the Agreement. Members may engage with Allergan, Settling States, and Participating Subdivisions attempting to resolve any dispute without further action by the Committee. The Committee may request additional information from Allergan, Settling States, and Participating Subdivisions to the extent the Committee believes such information is necessary to understand, resolve, or provide advice related to a dispute. The Committee shall endeavor to provide advice relative to the dispute no later than 60 days after receipt of notice.

ARTICLE VIII

Rules of Procedure

The proceedings and business of the Committee shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order unless otherwise waived by the Committee.

ARTICLE IX

Operations

(1) **Records**

The Committee will keep correct and complete records and will also keep minutes of the proceedings of the Committee meetings and Committees. The Committee will keep such records at its principal place of business at a place designated by the Chairperson.

All elected officers and committee chairpersons shall relinquish their records to the Chairperson, immediately upon the completion of their term of office.

(2) **Inspection of Books and Records**

The minutes of a meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to the Committee's Chairperson or the Chairperson's designee.

(3) **Amendments**

The bylaws may be amended at any time by a vote of a majority of Members present and must have at least one vote from a Settling State Member and a Participating Subdivision

Member. In the event that there is a Quorum, but no Settling State or Participating Subdivision Member is present, then a matter may pass with a simple majority vote.

EXHIBIT C
Litigating Subdivisions and Special Districts List¹

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	Attentus Moulton, LLC d/b/a Lawrence Medical Center	<i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care Authority Of Morgan County - City Of Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Bibb County Healthcare Authority d/b/a Bibb Medical Center	<i>Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority</i>	CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)

¹ This list is subject to amendment in the event it proves to be incomplete and other entities that satisfy the definition for “Litigating Subdivision” or “Litigating Special District” are subsequently identified.

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>		
AL	City of Abbeville	<i>City of Abbeville, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45437	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Alabaster	<i>City of Alabaster, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45013	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Albertville	<i>Marshall County; the Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville; and the Towns of Douglas and Grant, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Alexander	<i>City of Alexander City, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45827	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Arab	<i>Marshall County; the Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville; and the Towns of Douglas and Grant, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Argo	<i>City of Argo v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45744	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Ashland	<i>City of Ashland, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46102	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Ashville	<i>City of Leesburg, City of Jacksonville, City of Rainbow City, City of Ashville, City of Springville, City of Moody, City of Ragland and City of Thomasville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Athens	<i>City of Athens, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45953	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Attalla	<i>City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilbertown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Auburn	<i>City of Auburn, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45282	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Bay Minette	<i>City of Bay Minette, Alabama; Town of Loxley, Alabama; and Town of Summerdale, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Bessemer	<i>The City of Bessemer, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45014	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Birmingham	<i>City of Birmingham v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45008	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Boaz	<i>Marshall County; the Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville; and the Towns of Douglas and Grant, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	City of Brent	<i>City of Brent, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45910	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Brewton	<i>City of Brewton, Alabama, and City of Semmes, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45113	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Bridgeport	<i>Jackson County, City of Bridgeport, City of Henagar, City of New Hope, City of Scottsboro, Town of Geraldine and Town of Woodville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45634	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Brundidge	<i>City of Brundidge, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46128	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Calera	<i>City of Calera, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45070	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Carbon Hill	<i>The City of Nauvoo, The City of Cordova, The City of Carbon Hill, The City of Sipsy, The City of Parrish and The City of Oakman, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45737	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Center Point	<i>City of Center Point, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46103	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Centre	<i>City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilbertown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Centreville	<i>City of Centreville, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46120	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Chickasaw	<i>City of Chickasaw, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45115	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Childersburg	<i>City of Childersburg, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45020	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Clanton	<i>City of Clanton, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al. / The City of Clanton, Alabama; The City of Columbiana, Alabama; The City of Helena, Alabama; The City of Pelham, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46084 / 1:22-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Columbiana	<i>The City of Clanton, Alabama; The City of Columbiana, Alabama; The City of Helena, Alabama; The City of Pelham, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Cordova	<i>The City of Nauvoo, The City of Cordova, The City of Carbon Hill, The City of Sipsy, The City of Parrish and The City of Oakman, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45737	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	City of Cullman	<i>City of Cullman, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45248	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Dadeville	<i>City of Dadeville, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. / City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilbertown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45779 / 1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Daleville	<i>City of Daleville, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45778	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Daphne	<i>City of Daphne, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45227	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Decatur	<i>City of Decatur, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45201	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Demopolis	<i>City of Demopolis, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45183	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Dora	<i>The Counties of Marion, Pickens and Walker, Alabama and the Cities of Dora, Jasper, and Sumiton, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Dothan	<i>City of Dothan, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45886	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of East Brewton	<i>City of East Brewton, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45005	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Enterprise	<i>City of Enterprise, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45213	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Eufaula	<i>City of Eufaula v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46132	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Evergreen	<i>City of Evergreen, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45422	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Fairfield	<i>City of Fairfield, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45089	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Fairhope	<i>City of Fairhope, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45002	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Fayette	<i>Fayette County, City of Fayette, Town of Berry and Rodney Ingle, in his capacity as Sheriff of Fayette County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45211	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Florence	<i>The City of Florence v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45073	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Foley	<i>City of Foley, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45287	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Fort Payne	<i>City of Fort Payne, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45079	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Fultondale	<i>City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of</i>	1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilbertown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
AL	City of Gadsden	<i>City of Gadsden, Etowah County, and Todd Entrekin, Sheriff of Etowah County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45101	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Geneva	<i>City of Geneva, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45986	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Georgiana	<i>City of Georgiana, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45436	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Graysville	<i>City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilbertown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Greensboro	<i>City of Greensboro, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45421	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Greenville	<i>City of Greenville, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45023	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Guin	<i>City of Guin, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45457	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Gulf Shores	<i>The City of Gulf Shores, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45019	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Guntersville	<i>Marshall County; the Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville; and the Towns of Douglas and Grant, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Haleyville	<i>City of Haleyville, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46118	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Hamilton	<i>City of Hamilton, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45564	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Hartselle	<i>City of Hartselle, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45736	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Headland	<i>City of Headland, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46131	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Helena	<i>The City of Clanton, Alabama; The City of Columbiana, Alabama; The City of Helena, Alabama; The City of Pelham, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Henagar	<i>Jackson County, City of Bridgeport, City of Henagar, City of New Hope, City of Scottsboro, Town of Geraldine and Town of Woodville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45634	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Homewood	<i>City of Homewood, Alabama v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45973	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	City of Hoover	<i>City of Hoover, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45746	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Hueytown	<i>Jefferson County, Jefferson County Board of Health, City of Pleasant Grove, City of Hueytown and City of Mountain Brook and Mike Hale, in his capacity as Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45558	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Huntsville	<i>City of Huntsville, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45947	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Irondale	<i>City of Irondale, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45012	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Jacksonville	<i>City of Leesburg, City of Jacksonville, City of Rainbow City, City of Ashville, City of Springville, City of Moody, City of Ragland and City of Thomasville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Jasper	<i>The Counties of Marion, Pickens and Walker, Alabama and the Cities of Dora, Jasper, Sumiton, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Killen	<i>The City of Killen, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45218	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Lanett	<i>City of Lanett, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46130	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Leeds	<i>City of Leeds, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45088	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Leesburg	<i>City of Leesburg, City of Jacksonville, City of Rainbow City, City of Ashville, City of Springville, City of Moody, City of Ragland and City of Thomasville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Level Plains	<i>City of Level Plains, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45100	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Lincoln	<i>City of Lincoln, Alabama v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45786	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Linden	<i>City of Linden v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45118	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Louisville	<i>The City of Louisville, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46058	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Luverne	<i>City of Luverne, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45109	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Madison	<i>The City of Madison, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45198	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Marion	<i>City of Marion, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45217	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Midfield	<i>City of Midfield, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45416	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Millbrook	<i>City of Millbrook, Alabama and City of Wetumpka, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45135	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	City of Mobile	<i>City of Mobile, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45076	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Monroeville	<i>Monroe County, Alabama; The City of Monroeville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:20-op-45273	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Montgomery	<i>City of Montgomery, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45494	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Moody	<i>City of Leesburg, City of Jacksonville, City of Rainbow City, City of Ashville, City of Springville, City of Moody, City of Ragland and City of Thomasville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Moulton	<i>City of Moulton, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45202	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Mountain Brook	<i>Jefferson County, Jefferson County Board of Health, City of Pleasant Grove, City of Hueytown and City of Mountain Brook and Mike Hale, in his capacity as Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45558	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Muscle Shoals	<i>The City of Muscle Shoals, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:20-op-45268	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Nauvoo	<i>The City of Nauvoo, The City of Cordova, The City of Carbon Hill, The City of Sipsey, The City of Parrish and The City of Oakman, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45737	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of New Hope	<i>Jackson County, City of Bridgeport, City of Henagar, City of New Hope, City of Scottsboro, Town of Geraldine and Town of Woodville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45634	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Northport	<i>City of Northport, City of Robertsdale and Town of Brookwood, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45272	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Oakman	<i>The City of Nauvoo, The City of Cordova, The City of Carbon Hill, The City of Sipsey, The City of Parrish and The City of Oakman, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45737	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Oneonta	<i>The City of Oneonta, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45210	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Opelika	<i>City of Opelika, City of Spanish Fort, City of Centreville, City of Slocomb and Town of West Blocton v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45208	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	City of Opp	<i>City of Opp, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45011	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Orange Beach	<i>City of Orange Beach, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45784	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Oxford	<i>City of Oxford, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45774	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Ozark	<i>City of Ozark, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45214	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Parrish	<i>The City of Nauvoo, The City of Cordova, The City of Carbon Hill, The City of Sipsy, The City of Parrish and The City of Oakman, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45737	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Pelham	<i>The City of Clanton, Alabama; The City of Columbiana, Alabama; The City of Helena, Alabama; The City of Pelham, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Pell City	<i>City of Pell City, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45091	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Phenix	<i>Phenix City, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45179	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Piedmont	<i>City of Piedmont v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	21-op-45049	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Pleasant Grove	<i>Jefferson County, Jefferson County Board of Health, City of Pleasant Grove, City of Hueytown and City of Mountain Brook and Mike Hale, in his capacity as Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45558	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Prattville	<i>City of Prattville, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45783	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Prichard	<i>City of Prichard, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45690	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Ragland	<i>City of Leesburg, City of Jacksonville, City of Rainbow City, City of Ashville, City of Springville, City of Moody, City of Ragland and City of Thomasville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Rainbow City	<i>City of Leesburg, City of Jacksonville, City of Rainbow City, City of Ashville, City of Springville, City of Moody, City of Ragland and City of Thomasville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Rainsville	<i>City of Rainsville and Town of Hammondville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45135	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Red Bay	<i>City of Red Bay, City of Russellville, City of Sheffield and Town of Leighton,</i>	1:19-op-45136	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>		
AL	City of Roanoke	<i>City of Roanoke, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	22-op-45011	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Robertsdale	<i>City of Northport, City of Robertsdale and Town of Brookwood, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45272	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Russellville	<i>City of Red Bay, City of Russellville, City of Sheffield and Town of Leighton, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45136	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Saraland	<i>City of Saraland, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	22-op-45017	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Satsuma	<i>City of Satsuma, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45116	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Scottsboro	<i>Jackson County, City of Bridgeport, City of Henagar, City of New Hope, City of Scottsboro, Town of Geraldine and Town of Woodville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45634	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Selma	<i>City of Selma, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45198	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Semmes	<i>City of Brewton, Alabama, and City of Semmes, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45113	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Sheffield	<i>City of Red Bay, City of Russellville, City of Sheffield and Town of Leighton, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45136	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Sipsy	<i>The City of Nauvoo, The City of Cordova, The City of Carbon Hill, The City of Sipsy, The City of Parrish and The City of Oakman, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45737	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Slocomb	<i>City of Opelika, City of Spanish Fort, City of Centreville, City of Slocomb and Town of West Blocton v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45208	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Spanish Fort	<i>City of Opelika, City of Spanish Fort, City of Centreville, City of Slocomb and Town of West Blocton v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45208	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Springville	<i>City of Leesburg, City of Jacksonville, City of Rainbow City, City of Ashville, City of Springville, City of Moody, City of Ragland and City of Thomasville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Sumiton	<i>The Counties of Marion, Pickens and Walker, Alabama and the Cities of Dora, Jasper, Sumiton, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	City of Sylacauga	<i>City of Sylacauga, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45900	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Talladega	<i>Talladega County and City of Talladega, Alabama v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45190	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Thomasville	<i>City of Leesburg, City of Jacksonville, City of Rainbow City, City of Ashville, City of Springville, City of Moody, City of Ragland and City of Thomasville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Troy	<i>City of Troy, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45947	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Trussville	<i>The City of Trussville, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45192	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Tuscaloosa	<i>City of Tuscaloosa, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45553	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Tuscumbia	<i>The Town of Cherokee and the City of Tuscumbia, Alabama, and the Counties of Colbert and Franklin, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45005	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Tuskegee	<i>City of Tuskegee, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45544	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Union Springs	<i>City of Union Springs, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45204	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Uniontown	<i>City of Uniontown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Vernon	<i>Lamar County, Alabama, City of Vernon, Alabama and Hal Allred, in his capacity as Sheriff of Lamar County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45210	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Vestavia Hills	<i>City of Vestavia Hills, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45141	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Weaver	<i>City of Weaver, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45565	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Wetumpka	<i>City of Millbrook, Alabama and City of Wetumpka, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45135	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	City of Winfield	<i>The City of Winfield, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45738	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Autauga	<i>Autauga County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45086	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Babour	<i>Babour County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45244	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Baldwin	<i>Baldwin County, Alabama, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45152	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Bibb	<i>Bibb County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45413	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	County of Blount	<i>Blount County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45415	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Bullock	<i>Bullock County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45246	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Butler	<i>Butler County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45441	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Calhoun	<i>Calhoun County, Alabama v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45191	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Chambers	<i>Chambers County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45408	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Cherokee	<i>Cherokee County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45207	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Chilton	<i>Chilton County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45735	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Choctaw	<i>Choctaw County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45770	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Clarke	<i>Clarke County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45247	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Clay	<i>Clay County, Alabama v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45248	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Cleburne	<i>Cleburne County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45566	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Coffee	<i>Coffee County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45182	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Colbert	<i>The Town of Cherokee and the City of Tusculumbia, Alabama, and the Counties of Colbert and Franklin, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45005	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Conecuh	<i>Conecuh County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45957	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Coosa	<i>Coosa County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45995	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Covington	<i>Covington County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45751	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Crenshaw	<i>Crenshaw County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45983	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Cullman	<i>Cullman County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45227	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Dale	<i>Dale County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45561	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Dallas	<i>Dallas County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45667	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of DeKalb	<i>Dekalb County and the Town of Powell, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45209	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	County of Elmore	<i>Elmore County, Alabama, and Randolph County, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45003	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Escambia	<i>Escambia County, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45112	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Etowah	<i>City of Gadsden, Etowah County, and Todd Entrekin, Sheriff of Etowah County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45101	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Fayette	<i>Fayette County, City of Fayette, Town of Berry and Rodney Ingle, in his capacity as Sheriff of Fayette County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45211	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Franklin	<i>The Town of Cherokee and the City of Tuscumbia, Alabama, and the Counties of Colbert and Franklin, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45005	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Geneva	<i>Geneva County, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45105	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Greene	<i>Greene County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45209	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Hale	<i>Hale County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45420	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Henry	<i>Henry County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45543	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Houston	<i>Houston County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45019	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Jackson	<i>Jackson County, City of Bridgeport, City of Henagar, City of New Hope, City of Scottsboro, Town of Geraldine and Town of Woodville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45634	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Jefferson	<i>Jefferson County, Jefferson County Board of Health, City of Pleasant Grove, City of Hueytown and City of Mountain Brook and Mike Hale, in his capacity as Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45558	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Lamar	<i>Lamar County, Alabama, City of Vernon, Alabama and Hal Allred, in his capacity as Sheriff of Lamar County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45210	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Lauderdale	<i>Lauderdale County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45845	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Lawrence	<i>Lawrence County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45228	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Limestone	<i>Limestone County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45328	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Lowndes	<i>Lowndes County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45203	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	County of Macon	<i>Macon County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45982	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Madison	<i>Madison County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45006	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Marengo	<i>Marengo County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45188	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Marion	<i>The Counties of Marion, Pickens and Walker, Alabama and the Cities of Dora, Jasper, Sumiton, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Marshall	<i>Marshall County; the Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville; and the Towns of Douglas and Grant, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Mobile	<i>Mobile County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45186	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Monroe	<i>Monroe County, Alabama; The City of Monroeville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:20-op-45273	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Montgomery	<i>Montgomery County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45445	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Morgan	<i>Morgan County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45200	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Perry	<i>Perry County, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45158	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Pickens	<i>The Counties of Marion, Pickens and Walker, Alabama and the Cities of Dora, Jasper, Sumiton, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Pike	<i>Pike County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45803	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Randolph	<i>Elmore County, Alabama, and Randolph County, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45003	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Russell	<i>Russell County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45826	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Shelby	<i>Shelby County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45414	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of St. Clair	<i>St. Clair County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45614	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Sumter	<i>Sumter County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45194	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Talladega	<i>Talladega County and City of Talladega, Alabama v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45190	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	County of Tallapoosa	<i>Tallapoosa County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al.</i>	1:17-op-45097	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Tuscaloosa	<i>Tuscaloosa County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45196	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Walker	<i>The Counties of Marion, Pickens and Walker, Alabama and the Cities of Dora, Jasper, Sumiton, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Washington	<i>Washington County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45180	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	County of Wilcox	<i>Wilcox County, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45181	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Cullman Regional Medical Center, Inc.	<i>The Health Care Authority of Cullman County; Cullman Regional Medical Center, Inc. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46059	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Dale County Health Care Authority d/b/a Dale Medical Center	<i>Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)
AL	DCH Health Care Authority	<i>The DCH Health Care Authority, The Healthcare Authority for Baptist Health, an affiliate of UAB Health System,</i>	CV-2019-000007 / CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Medical West Hospital Authority, an affiliate of Uab Health System, Evergreen Medical Center, LLC, Gilliard Health Services, Inc., Crest Wood Healthcare, L.P., Triad of Alabama, LLC, QHG of Enterprise, Inc., Affinity Hospital, LLC, Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC, Foley Hospital Corporation, The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama, BBH PBMC, LLC, BBH, WBMC, LLC, BBH SB MC, LLC, BBH CBMC, LLC, BBH BMC, LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. / Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i></p>		County (State)
AL	Geneva County Health Care Authority d/b/a Wiregrass Medical Center	<p><i>Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville</i></p>	CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>		
AL	Greene County Hospital Board	<i>Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)
AL	Healthcare Authority for Baptist Health	<i>The DCH Health Care Authority, The Healthcare Authority for Baptist Health, an affiliate of UAB Health System, Medical West Hospital Authority, an affiliate of Uab Health System, Evergreen</i>	CV-2019-000007 / CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Medical Center, LLC, Gilliard Health Services, Inc., Crest Wood Healthcare, L.P., Triad of Alabama, LLC, QHG of Enterprise, Inc., Affinity Hospital, LLC, Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC, Foley Hospital Corporation, The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama, BBH PBMC, LLC, BBH, WBMC, LLC, BBH SB MC, LLC, BBH CBMC, LLC, BBH BMC, LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. / Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i></p>		
AL	HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC d/b/a Athens Limestone Hospital	<p><i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care Authority Of Morgan County - City Of</i></p>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
AL	HH Health System-Morgan, LLC d/b/a Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur and Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway	<i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care Authority Of Morgan County - City Of Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	HH Health System-Shoals, LLC d/b/a Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital	<i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care Authority Of Morgan County - City Of Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Jefferson County Board of Health	<i>Jefferson County, Jefferson County Board of Health, City of Pleasant Grove, City of Hueytown and City of Mountain Brook and Mike Hale, in his capacity as Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45558	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	Medical West Hospital Authority	<i>The DCH Health Care Authority, The Healthcare Authority for Baptist Health, an affiliate of UAB Health System, Medical West Hospital Authority, an affiliate of Uab Health System, Evergreen Medical Center, LLC, Gilliard Health Services, Inc., Crest Wood Healthcare, L.P., Triad of Alabama, LLC, QHG of Enterprise, Inc., Affinity Hospital, LLC, Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC, Foley Hospital Corporation, The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama, BBH PBMC, LLC, BBH, WBMC, LLC, BBH SB MC, LLC, BBH CBMC, LLC, BBH BMC, LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. / Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	CV-2019-000007 / CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)
AL	Mobile County Board of Health	<i>Mobile County Board of Health and Family Oriented Primary Health Care Clinic v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al</i>	02-CV-2019-902806	AL - Circuit Court of Mobile County (State)
AL	Monroe County Healthcare Authority	<i>Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority;</i>	CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>		County (State)
AL	Sheriff of Etowah County (Sheriff Todd Entrekin)	<i>City of Gadsden, Etowah County, and Todd Entrekin, Sheriff of Etowah County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45101	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Sheriff of Fayette County (Sheriff Rodney Ingle)	<i>Fayette County, City of Fayette, Town of Berry and Rodney Ingle, in his capacity as Sheriff of Fayette County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45211	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Sheriff of Jefferson County (Sheriff Mike Hale)	<i>Jefferson County, Jefferson County Board of Health, City of Pleasant Grove, City of Hueytown and City of Mountain Brook and Mike Hale, in his capacity as Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45558	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Sheriff of Lamar County (Sheriff Hal Allred)	<i>Lamar County, Alabama, City of Vernon, Alabama and Hal Allred, in his capacity as Sheriff of Lamar County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45210	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Sylacauga Health Care Authority d/b/a Coosa Valley Medical Center	<i>Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga</i>	CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i></p>		
AL	The Health Care Authority of Clarke County	<p><i>The DCH Health Care Authority, The Healthcare Authority for Baptist Health, an affiliate of UAB Health System, Medical West Hospital Authority, an affiliate of Uab Health System, Evergreen Medical Center, LLC, Gilliard Health Services, Inc., Crest Wood Healthcare, L.P., Triad of Alabama, LLC, QHG of Enterprise, Inc., Affinity Hospital, LLC, Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC, Foley Hospital Corporation, The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama, BBH PBMC, LLC, BBH, WBMC, LLC, BBH SB MC, LLC, BBH CBMC, LLC, BBH BMC, LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. / Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An</i></p>	CV-2019-000007 / CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>		
AL	The Health Care Authority of Cullman County	<i>The Health Care Authority of Cullman County; Cullman Regional Medical Center, Inc. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46059	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	The Health Care Authority of Morgan County - City of Decatur	<i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care Authority Of Morgan County - City Of Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville d/b/a HH Health System	<i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care Authority Of Morgan County - City Of Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A</i>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
AL	The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville d/b/a Huntsville Hospital	<i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care Authority Of Morgan County - City Of Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville d/b/a Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children	<i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care Authority Of Morgan County - City Of Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville d/b/a Madison Hospital	<i>The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A HH Health System; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Madison Hospital; The Health Care Authority of the City of Huntsville D/B/A Huntsville Hospital for Women and Children; HH Health System-Morgan, LLC D/B/A Decatur Morgan Hospital - Decatur And Decatur Morgan Hospital - Parkway; The Health Care</i>	1:19-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Authority Of Morgan County - City Of Decatur; HH Health System-Shoals, LLC D/B/A Helen Keller Hospital and Red Bay Hospital; HH Health System-Athens Limestone, LLC D/B/A Athens Limestone Hospital; Attentus Moulton, LLC D/B/A Lawrence Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
AL	The Jackson County Health Care Authority	<i>The Jackson County Health Care Authority v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	The Marshall County Health Care Authority d/b/a Marshall Medical Center North d/b/a Marshall Medical Center South	<i>The Marshall County Health Care Authority, a Public Corporation d/b/a Marshall Medical Center North d/b/a Marshall Medical Center South v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al</i>	1:18-op-45538	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Tombigbee Health Care Authority d/b/a Brian W. Whitfield Memorial Hospital	<i>Fort Payne Hospital Corporation; The Bibb County Healthcare Authority; The Dale County Health Care Authority; Greene County Hospital Board; Jackson Hospital & Clinic, Inc.; Escambia County Alabama Community Hospitals, Inc.; Mizell Memorial Hospital, Inc.; The Tombigbee Health Care Authority; Geneva County Health Care Authority; Community Hospital, Inc.; The Sylacauga Health Care Authority; Russellville Hospital, Inc.; Lakeland Community Hospital, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; The DCH Health Care Authority; The Healthcare Authority For Baptist Health, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Medical West Hospital Authority, An Affiliate Of UAB Health System; Evergreen Medical Center, LLC; Gilliard Health Services, Inc.; Crestwood Healthcare, L.P.; Triad Of Alabama, LLC; QHG Of Enterprise, Inc.; Affinity Hospital, LLC; Gadsden Regional Medical Center, LLC; Foley Hospital Corporation; The Health Care Authority Of Clarke County, Alabama; BBH PBMC, LLC; BBH, WBMC, LLC; BBH SBMC, LLC; BBH CBMC, LLC; and BBH BMC, LLC v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	CV-2021-900016	AL - Circuit Court of Conecuh County (State)
AL	Town of Berry	<i>Fayette County, City of Fayette, Town of Berry and Rodney Ingle, in his capacity as Sheriff of Fayette County, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45211	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	Town of Brookwood	<i>City of Northport, City of Robertsdale and Town of Brookwood, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45272	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Butler	<i>Town of Butler, Alabama v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45216	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Camp Hill	<i>City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilberttown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Cedar Bluff	<i>City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilberttown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Cherokee	<i>The Town of Cherokee and the City of Tuscumbia, Alabama, and the Counties of Colbert and Franklin, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45005	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Cleveland	<i>Town of Cleveland, Town of Gurley and Town of Priceville, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45217	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Dauphin Island	<i>Town of Dauphin Island, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45119	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Double Springs	<i>Town of Double Springs, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45739	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Douglas	<i>Marshall County; the Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville; and the Towns of Douglas and Grant, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Faunsdale	<i>Town of Faunsdale, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Fort Deposit	<i>Town of Fort Deposit, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45427	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Geraldine	<i>Jackson County, City of Bridgeport, City of Henagar, City of New Hope, City of Scottsboro, Town of Geraldine and Town of Woodville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45634	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Gilberttown	<i>City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilberttown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Grant	<i>Marshall County; the Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville; and the Towns of Douglas and Grant, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
AL	Town of Gurley	<i>Town of Cleveland, Town of Gurley and Town of Priceville, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45217	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Hammondville	<i>City of Rainsville and Town of Hammondville, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45135	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Leighton	<i>City of Red Bay, City of Russellville, City of Sheffield and Town of Leighton, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45136	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Locust Fork	<i>Town of Locust Fork v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45777	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Loxley	<i>City of Bay Minette, Alabama; Town of Loxley, Alabama; and Town of Summerdale, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of McKenzie	<i>Town of McKenzie, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45435	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Munford	<i>Town of Munford, Alabama v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45785	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Oakman	<i>City of Fultondale, City of Graysville, City of Centre, Town of Cedar Bluff, City of Dadeville, Town of Camp Hill, Town of Oakman, City of Attalla and Town of Gilbertown, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Powell	<i>Dekalb County and the Town of Powell, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45209	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Priceville	<i>Town of Cleveland, Town of Gurley and Town of Priceville, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45217	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Rockford	<i>Town of Rockford, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45915	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Summerdale	<i>City of Bay Minette, Alabama; Town of Loxley, Alabama; and Town of Summerdale, Alabama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Sweet Water	<i>Town of Sweet Water, Alabama v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45120	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Vance	<i>Town of Vance, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45909	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of West Blocton	<i>City of Opelika, City of Spanish Fort, City of Centreville, City of Slocomb and Town of West Blocton v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45208	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AL	Town of Woodville	<i>Jackson County, City of Bridgeport, City of Henagar, City of New Hope, City of Scottsboro, Town of Geraldine and Town of Woodville, Alabama v.</i>	1:18-op-45634	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>		
AL	Town of Yellow Bluff	<i>Town of Yellow Bluff, Alabama v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45423	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	City of Bullhead	<i>Bullhead City, Arizona v. Actavis, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45085	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	City of Glendale	<i>City of Glendale, Arizona v. Actavis, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45086	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	City of Kingman	<i>City of Kingman v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46057	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	City of Phoenix	<i>City of Phoenix, Arizona v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45510	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	City of Prescott	<i>The City of Prescott, Arizona v. Actavis, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45090	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	City of Surprise	<i>City of Surprise, Arizona v. Actavis, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45091	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	City of Tucson	<i>City of Tucson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45267	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of Apache	<i>County of Apache, Arizona v. Actavis, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45084	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of Cochise	<i>Cochise County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45855	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of La Paz	<i>County of La Paz, Arizona v. Actavis, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45087	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of Maricopa	<i>Maricopa County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45020	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of Mohave	<i>Mohave County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of Navajo	<i>Navajo County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45217	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of Pima	<i>Pima County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45268	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of Pinal	<i>Pinal County, Arizona v. Actavis, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45088	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
AZ	County of Yuma	<i>Yuma County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45575	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City and County of San Francisco (City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera)	<i>The City and County of San Francisco, California and the People of the State of California, acting by and through San Francisco City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	3:18-cv-07591	N.D. California (Federal)
CA	City of Anaheim (City Attorney Robert Fabela)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith,</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
CA	City of Chico	<i>City of Chico, California; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the City of Chico, Plaintiffs v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:20-op-45189	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Chula Vista	<i>City of Chula Vista, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45750	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Clearlake	<i>City of Clearlake, California; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the City of Clearlake v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45251	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Costa Mesa (City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Dublin (City Attorney John Bakker)	<i>City of Dublin, City of Murrieta and The People of the State of California, by and through Dublin City Attorney John Bakker and Murrieta City Attorney Leslie Devaney v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45255	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of El Monte (City Attorney Rick Olivarez)	<i>City of El Monte and the People of the State of California, by and through El Monte City Attorney Rick Olivarez v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al</i>	JCCP 5029	MDL - Prescription Opioid Cases (CA - County of Los Angeles) (State MDL)
CA	City of Encinitas (City Attorney Leslie Devaney)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
CA	City of Eureka (City Attorney Robert Norris Black)	<i>City of Eureka, the People of the State of California, acting by and through Interim Eureka City Attorney, Robert Norris Black v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46092	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Fullerton (City Attorney Richard D. Jones)	<i>City of Fullerton, City of Westminster and the People of the State of California, by and through Fullerton and Westminster City Attorney Richard D. Jones v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Huntington Beach	<i>City of Huntington Beach, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45588	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Irvine (City Attorney Jeffrey Melching)	<i>City of Irvine and the People of the State of California, by and through Irvine City Attorney Jeffrey Melching v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45734	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of La Habra (City Attorney Richard D. Jones)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of La Mesa (City Attorney Glenn Sabine)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
CA	City of Laguna Beach	<i>City of Laguna Beach, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45447	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Lakeport	<i>City of Lakeport, California; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the City of Lakeport v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45242	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Los Angeles	<i>City of Los Angeles, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45601	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Murrieta (City Attorney Leslie Devaney)	<i>City of Dublin, City of Murrieta and The People of the State of California, by and through Dublin City Attorney John Bakker and Murrieta City Attorney Leslie Devaney v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45255	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Oakland (City Attorney Barbara J. Parker)	<i>The People of the State of California, acting by and through Santa Clara County Counsel James R. Williams, Orange County District Attorney Tony Rackauckas, Los Angeles County Counsel Mary C. Wickham, and Oakland City Attorney Barbara J. Parker v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	30-2014-00725287-CU-BT-CXC	CA - County of Orange (State)
CA	City of Oxnard (City Attorney Stephen Fischer)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine,</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
CA	City of Placentia (City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Sacramento (City Attorney Susana Alcalá Wood)	<i>The City of Sacramento and The People of the State of California, acting by and through the City of Sacramento City Attorney Susana Alcalá Wood v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45290	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of San Clemente (City Attorney Scott C. Smith)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of San Diego (City Attorney Mara W. Elliot)	<i>The City of San Diego and the People of the State of California, by and through Mara W. Elliot, City Attorney of San Diego v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45192	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of San Jose	<i>City of San Jose, California, The People of the State of California, acting by and</i>	1:19-op-45768	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>through the City of San Jose v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
CA	City of Santa Ana (City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	City of Westminster (City Attorney Richard D. Jones)	<i>City of Fullerton, City of Westminster and the People of the State of California, by and through Fullerton and Westminster City Attorney Richard D. Jones v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Alameda (County Counsel Donna Ziegler)	<i>County of Alameda; City of Costa Mesa; City of Anaheim; City of Santa Ana; City of San Clemente; City of Encinitas; City of La Habra; City of La Mesa; City of Oxnard; City of Placentia; and The People of The State of California, by and through Alameda County Counsel Donna Ziegler, Costa Mesa City Attorney Kimberly Hall Barlow, and Anaheim City Attorney Robert Fabela, Santa Ana City Attorney Sonia R. Carvalho, San Clemente City Attorney Scott C. Smith, Encinitas City Attorney Leslie Devaney, La Habra City Attorney Richard D. Jones, La Mesa City Attorney Glenn Sabine, Oxnard City Attorney Stephen Fischer, Placentia City Attorney Christian Bettenhausen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Amador	<i>County of Amador; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the County of Amador v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46075	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Butte	<i>County of Butte; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the County of Butte v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45627	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
CA	County of Calaveras	<i>County of Calaveras; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the County of Calaveras v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45645	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Contra Costa	<i>County of Contra Costa; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the County of Contra Costa v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45656	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Del Norte	<i>County of Del Norte; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the County of Del Norte v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45655	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of El Dorado	<i>County of El Dorado; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the County of El Dorado v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45629	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Fresno	<i>County of Fresno v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45644	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Glenn	<i>County of Glenn; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the County of Glenn v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45639	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Humboldt	<i>Humboldt County, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45942	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Imperial	<i>County of Imperial; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the County of Imperial v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45631	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Inyo	<i>County of Inyo v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45646	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Kern (County Attorney Margo Raison)	<i>County of Kern and the People of the State of California, by and through Kern County Attorney Margo Raison v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	JCCP 5029	MDL - Prescription Opioid Cases (CA - County of Los Angeles) (State MDL)
CA	County of Lassen	<i>County of Lassen v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45609	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Los Angeles (County Counsel Mary C. Wickham)	<i>The People of the State of California, acting by and through Santa Clara County Counsel James R. Williams, Orange County District Attorney Tony Rackauckas, Los Angeles County Counsel Mary C. Wickham, and Oakland City Attorney Barbara J. Parker v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	30-2014-00725287-CU-BT-CXC	CA - County of Orange (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
CA	County of Madera	<i>County of Madera v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45647	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Marin	<i>County of Marin v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45657	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Mariposa	<i>County of Mariposa v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45618	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Mendocino	<i>County of Mendocino v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45654	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Merced	<i>County of Merced v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45643	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Modoc	<i>County of Modoc v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45641	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Mono	<i>County of Mono v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45626	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Monterey	<i>County of Monterey v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45615	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Napa	<i>County of Napa, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45750	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Nevada	<i>County of Nevada v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45628	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Orange (District Attorney Tony Rackauckas)	<i>The People of the State of California, acting by and through Santa Clara County Counsel James R. Williams, Orange County District Attorney Tony Rackauckas, Los Angeles County Counsel Mary C. Wickham, and Oakland City Attorney Barbara J. Parker v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	30-2014-00725287-CU-BT-CXC	CA - County of Orange (State)
CA	County of Placer	<i>County of Placer v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45642	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Plumas	<i>County of Plumas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45649	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Riverside	<i>County of Riverside v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45878	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Sacramento	<i>County of Sacramento v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45608	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of San Benito	<i>County of San Benito v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45653	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of San Bernardino	<i>County of San Bernardino v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46032	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of San Diego	<i>County of San Diego v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45613	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of San Luis Obispo	<i>County of San Luis Obispo, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46290	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
CA	County of San Mateo	<i>County of San Mateo, California v. McKesson Corporation, et al. / County of San Mateo v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46319 / 1:19-op-45126	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Santa Barbara	<i>County of Santa Barbara, the People of the State of California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45128	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Santa Clara (County Counsel James R. Williams)	<i>The People of the State of California, acting by and through Santa Clara County Counsel James R. Williams, Orange County District Attorney Tony Rackauckas, Los Angeles County Counsel Mary C. Wickham, and Oakland City Attorney Barbara J. Parker v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	30-2014-00725287-CU-BT-CXC	CA - County of Orange (State)
CA	County of Santa Cruz	<i>County of Santa Cruz, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45679	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Shasta	<i>County of Shasta v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45651	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Siskiyou	<i>County of Siskiyou v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45630	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Sonoma	<i>County of Sonoma, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45849	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Sutter	<i>County of Sutter v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45640	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Tehama	<i>County of Tehama v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45680	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Trinity	<i>County of Trinity v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45650	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Tulare	<i>County of Tulare, California v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45997	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Tuolumne	<i>County of Tuolumne v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45619	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Ventura	<i>County of Ventura v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45747	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Yolo (County Counsel Philip Pogledich)	<i>County of Yolo; The People of the State of California, acting by and through the Yolo County Counsel v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45351	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	County of Yuba	<i>County of Yuba v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45648	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	Downey Unified School District	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville,</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		
CA	Elk Grove Unified School District	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	Health Plan of San Joaquin	<i>Health Plan of San Joaquin v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46093	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	Kern High School District	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	Lassen County Office of Education	<i>Susanville Elementary School District and Lassen County Office of Education v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45031	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	Local Initiative Health Authority for Los Angeles County o/a L.A. Care Health Plan	<i>Local Initiative Health Authority for Los Angeles County, a California local public agency operating as L.A. Care Health Plan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45212	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	Pleasant Valley School District	<i>Pleasant Valley School District v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45120	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	San Leandro Unified School District	<i>San Leandro Unified School District v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45114	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CA	Susanville Elementary School District	<i>Susanville Elementary School District and Lassen County Office of Education v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45031	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City and County of Broomfield	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
CO	City and County of Denver	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Alamosa	<i>Conejos County; Las Animas County; Chaffee County; Otero County; Alamosa County; and The City of Alamosa v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45740	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Aurora	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Black Hawk	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
CO	City of Brighton	<i>City of Brighton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45298	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Commerce City	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Federal Heights	<i>City of Federal Heights v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45573	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Greeley	<i>City of Greeley v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45977	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Lakewood	<i>The City of Lakewood, and the City of Wheat Ridge v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45800	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Northglenn	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Sheridan	<i>City of Sheridan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45572	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Thornton	<i>City of Thornton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45034	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
CO	City of Westminster	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	City of Wheat Ridge	<i>The City of Lakewood, and the City of Wheat Ridge v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45800	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Adams (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Alamosa	<i>Conejos County; Las Animas County; Chaffee County; Otero County; Alamosa County; and The City of Alamosa v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45740	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Arapahoe (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
CO	County of Boulder (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Chaffee	<i>Conejos County; Las Animas County; Chaffee County; Otero County; Alamosa County; and The City of Alamosa v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45740	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Conejos	<i>Conejos County; Las Animas County; Chaffee County; Otero County; Alamosa County; and The City of Alamosa v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45740	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Fremont (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Huerfano	<i>County of Huerfano v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45168	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Jefferson (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Jefferson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45035	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
CO	County of Larimer (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Las Animas	<i>Conejos County; Las Animas County; Chaffee County; Otero County; Alamosa County; and The City of Alamosa v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45740	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Mesa (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Mesa v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45923	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Otero	<i>Conejos County; Las Animas County; Chaffee County; Otero County; Alamosa County; and The City of Alamosa v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45740	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Pueblo	<i>Pueblo County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45801	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	County of Teller (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	Mesa County Valley School District 51	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CO	Town of Hudson	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Adams, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Arapahoe, City of Aurora, City of Black Hawk, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Fremont, Town of Hudson, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Larimer, City of Northglenn, The Board of County Commissioners of The County of Teller, City of Westminster, and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CT	City of Ansonia	<i>The City of Ansonia, The City of Danbury, The City of Derby and The City of Norwalk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	X07 HHD CV 17 6086134 S (consolidated)	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (CT - Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford) (State MDL)
CT	City of Danbury	<i>The City of Ansonia, The City of Danbury, The City of Derby and The City of Norwalk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	X07 HHD CV 17 6086134 S (consolidated)	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (CT -

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford) (State MDL)
CT	City of Derby	<i>The City of Ansonia, The City of Danbury, The City of Derby and The City of Norwalk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	X07 HHD CV 17 6086134 S (consolidated)	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (CT - Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford) (State MDL)
CT	City of Middletown	<i>City of Middletown v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45651	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CT	City of New London	<i>City of New London v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	X07 HHD CV 17 6086134 S (consolidated)	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (CT - Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford) (State MDL)
CT	City of Norwalk	<i>The City of Ansonia, The City of Danbury, The City of Derby and The City of Norwalk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	X07 HHD CV 17 6086134 S (consolidated)	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (CT - Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford) (State MDL)
CT	City of Norwich	<i>City of Norwich v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45840	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CT	Town of Enfield	<i>Town of Enfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45581	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CT	Town of Monroe	<i>The Town of Monroe, Connecticut v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45441	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CT	Town of Wallingford	<i>Town of Wallingford v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	X07 HHD CV 17 6086134 S (consolidated)	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (CT - Superior Court, Judicial District of

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Hartford) (State MDL)
CT	Town of Wethersfield	<i>Town of Wethersfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45663	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
CT	Town of Windham	<i>Town of Windham v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45103	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
DE	City of Dover	<i>City of Dover, City of Seaford and Kent County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	K19C-06-022	DE - Superior Court of the State of Delaware (State)
DE	City of Seaford	<i>City of Dover, City of Seaford and Kent County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	K19C-06-022	DE - Superior Court of the State of Delaware (State)
DE	County of Kent	<i>City of Dover, City of Seaford and Kent County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	K19C-06-022	DE - Superior Court of the State of Delaware (State)
DE	County of Sussex	<i>Sussex County, Delaware v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45723	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
FL	Halifax Hospital Medical Center	<i>Florida Health Sciences Center, Inc., North Broward Hospital District, Halifax Hospital Medical Center, Bayfront HMA Medical Center, LLC, CGH Hospital, Ltd., Citrus HMA, LLC, Central Florida Health, Crestview Hospital Corporation, Delray Medical Center, Inc., Flagler Hospital, Inc., Good Samaritan Medical Center, Inc., Haines City HMA, LLC, Hernando HMA, LLC, Hialeah Hospital, Inc., HMA Santa Rosa Medical Center, LLC, Key West HMA, LLC, Lake Shore HMA, LLC, Lake Wales Hospital Corporation, Larkin Community Hospital Palm Springs Campus, LLC, Larkin Community Hospital, Inc., Larkin Community Hospital Behavioral Service, Inc., Leesburg Regional Medical Center, Inc., Lifemark Hospitals Of Florida, Inc., Live Oak HMA, LLC, Naples HMA, LLC, North Shore Medical Center, Inc., Osceolasc LLC, Palm Beach Gardens Community Hospital, Inc., Port Charlotte HMA, LLC, Punta Gorda HMA, LLC, St. Mary's Medical Center, Inc., Starke HMA, LLC, The Villages Tri-County Medical Center, Inc., and Venice HMA, LLC v. Richard Sackler, et al.</i>	CACE-19-018882	FL - 17th Judicial Circuit Court of Broward County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
FL	Lee Memorial Health System d/b/a Lee Health	<i>Lee Memorial Health System v. Actavis LLC, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45092	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
FL	North Broward Hospital District	<i>Florida Health Sciences Center, Inc., North Broward Hospital District, Halifax Hospital Medical Center, Bayfront HMA Medical Center, LLC, CGH Hospital, Ltd., Citrus HMA, LLC, Central Florida Health, Crestview Hospital Corporation, Delray Medical Center, Inc., Flagler Hospital, Inc., Good Samaritan Medical Center, Inc., Haines City HMA, LLC, Hernando HMA, LLC, Hialeah Hospital, Inc., HMA Santa Rosa Medical Center, LLC, Key West HMA, LLC, Lake Shore HMA, LLC, Lake Wales Hospital Corporation, Larkin Community Hospital Palm Springs Campus, LLC, Larkin Community Hospital, Inc., Larkin Community Hospital Behavioral Service, Inc., Leesburg Regional Medical Center, Inc., Lifemark Hospitals Of Florida, Inc., Live Oak HMA, LLC, Naples HMA, LLC, North Shore Medical Center, Inc., Osceolasc LLC, Palm Beach Gardens Community Hospital, Inc., Port Charlotte HMA, LLC, Punta Gorda HMA, LLC, St. Mary's Medical Center, Inc., Starke HMA, LLC, The Villages Tri-County Medical Center, Inc., and Venice HMA, LLC v. Richard Sackler, et al.</i>	CACE-19-018882	FL - 17th Judicial Circuit Court of Broward County (State)
FL	Putnam County School Board	<i>Putnam County School Board v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45025	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
FL	Sarasota County Public Hospital District d/b/a Memorial Healthcare System, Inc.	<i>Sarasota County Public Hospital District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46136	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
FL	School Board of Miami-Dade	<i>The School Board of Miami-Dade v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45913	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
FL	South Florida Behavioral Health Network	<i>South Florida Behavioral Health Network v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46070	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Bibb County School District	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		/ N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Chatham County Hospital Authority	<i>Chatham County Hospital Authority, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45725	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Adel	<i>City of Adel, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45318	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Albany	<i>The City of Albany v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46337	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Alma	<i>City of Alma, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45620	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Arlington	<i>The City of Blakely; the City of Arlington; the City of Damascus v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45129	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Atlanta	<i>The City of Atlanta v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46308	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Augusta	<i>Augusta, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45233	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Bainbridge	<i>The City of Bainbridge, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45383	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Blackshear	<i>City of Blackshear v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45802	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Blakely	<i>The City of Blakely; the City of Arlington; the City of Damascus v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45129	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Brunswick	<i>City of Brunswick, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45270	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Cartersville	<i>City of Rome, Floyd County, Chattooga County, Whitefield County and City of Cartersville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45282	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
GA	City of Columbus	<i>Columbus, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45567	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Damascus	<i>The City of Blakely; the City of Arlington; the City of Damascus v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45129	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Dawson	<i>City of Dawson, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45619	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Demorest	<i>City of Demorest, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46113	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Doraville	<i>The City of Doraville, Georgia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46056	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Dunwoody	<i>The City of Dunwoody, Georgia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46054	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Fitzgerald	<i>The City of Fitzgerald, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45603	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Gainesville	<i>The City of Gainesville, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45486	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Lakeland	<i>City of Lakeland, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45618	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Milledgeville	<i>The City of Milledgeville, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45495	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Nashville	<i>City of Nashville, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45617	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Pooler	<i>City of Pooler, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45391	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Richmond Hill	<i>City of Richmond Hill, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45305	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Rome	<i>City of Rome, Floyd County, Chattooga County, Whitefield County and City of Cartersville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45282	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Sandy Springs	<i>The City of Sandy Springs, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45516	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Savannah	<i>The Mayor and Alderman of the City of Savannah v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45550	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Springfield	<i>City of Springfield, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45199	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Tifton	<i>The City of Tifton, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45454	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	City of Warwick	<i>City of Warwick, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45621	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
GA	City of Woodbury	<i>The City of Woodbury v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45575	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Clinch County Hospital Authority	<i>Clinch County Hospital Authority v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45453	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Appling	<i>Appling County, Georgia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45081	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Athens-Clarke (Unified Government)	<i>The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45218	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Atkinson	<i>Atkinson County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45118	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Bacon	<i>Bacon County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46105	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Banks	<i>Banks County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45378	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Bartow	<i>Bartow County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45045	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Ben Hill	<i>Ben Hill County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45505	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Berrien	<i>Berrien County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45834	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Brantley	<i>Brantley County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45714	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Brooks	<i>Brooks County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45981	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Bulloch	<i>Bulloch County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45394	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Burke	<i>Burke County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45207	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Butts	<i>Butts County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45490	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Camden	<i>Camden County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45717	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Candler	<i>Candler County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45165	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Carroll	<i>Carroll County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46269	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Catoosa	<i>Catoosa County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45497	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Charlton	<i>Charlton County v. Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45713	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
GA	County of Chatham	<i>Chatham County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45267	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Chattooga	<i>City of Rome, Floyd County, Chattooga County, Whitefield County and City of Cartersville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45282	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Cherokee	<i>Cherokee County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45174	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Clay	<i>Clay County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45194	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Clayton	<i>Clayton County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46298	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Clinch	<i>Clinch County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45197	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Cobb	<i>Cobb County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45817	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Columbia	<i>Columbia County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45607	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Cook	<i>Cook County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45284	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Crisp	<i>Crisp County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45238	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Dade	<i>Dade County, Georgia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46099	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Dawson	<i>Dawson County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-op-45210	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Decatur	<i>Decatur County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45334	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of DeKalb	<i>DeKalb County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45503	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Dooly	<i>Dooly County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45712	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Dougherty	<i>Dougherty County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45491	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Early	<i>Early County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45180	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Echols	<i>Echols County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-46204	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Effingham	<i>Effingham County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45178	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Elbert	<i>Elbert County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45381	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Emanuel	<i>Emanuel County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45209	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Evans	<i>Evans County, Georgia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45080	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
GA	County of Fannin	<i>County of Fannin v. Rite Aid of Georgia, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45269	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Fayette	<i>Fayette County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45293	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Floyd	<i>City of Rome, Floyd County, Chattooga County, Whitefield County and City of Cartersville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45282	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Forsyth	<i>Forsyth County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45420	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Fulton	<i>County of Fulton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-45374	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Glascock	<i>Glascock County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45175	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Glynn	<i>Glynn County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-46115	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Grady	<i>Grady County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-46338	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Greene	<i>Greene County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-op-45203	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Gwinnett	<i>Gwinnett County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-45758	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Habersham	<i>Habersham County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45559	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Hall	<i>Hall County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45286	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Hancock	<i>Hancock County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45535	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Heard	<i>Heard County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45130	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Henry	<i>Henry County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-46310	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Houston	<i>Houston County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-45946	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Irwin	<i>Irwin County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45283	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Jackson	<i>Jackson County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45581	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Jasper	<i>Jasper County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45504	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Jeff Davis	<i>Jeff Davis County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45237	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Jefferson	<i>Jefferson County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45201	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Johnson	<i>Johnson County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45716	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
GA	County of Jones	<i>Jones County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45424	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Lanier	<i>Lanier County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-46066	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Laurens	<i>Laurens County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45945	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Lee	<i>Lee County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-46171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Liberty	<i>Liberty County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45200	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45508	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Long	<i>Long County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45196	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Lowndes	<i>Lowndes County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-45835	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Lumpkin	<i>Lumpkin County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45211	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Macon	<i>The County of Macon, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45577	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Madison	<i>Madison County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45296	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of McDuffie	<i>McDuffie County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45509	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of McIntosh	<i>McIntosh County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Meriwether	<i>Meriwether County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45305	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Monroe	<i>Monroe County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45672	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Montgomery	<i>Montgomery County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45292	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Newton	<i>Newton County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45578	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Oconee	<i>Oconee County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45219	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Oglethorpe	<i>Oglethorpe County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45262	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Peach	<i>The County of Peach, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45579	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
GA	County of Pierce	<i>Pierce County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46107	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Pike	<i>Pike County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45179	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Polk	<i>Polk County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45046	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Pulaski	<i>Pulaski County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al</i>	1:19-op-45176	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Rabun	<i>Rabun County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45177	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Randolph	<i>Randolph County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45202	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Rockdale	<i>Rockdale County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46296	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Schley	<i>The County of Schley, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45580	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Screven	<i>Screven County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45198	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Seminole	<i>Seminole County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45181	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Spalding	<i>Spalding County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45208	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Stephens	<i>Stephens County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45195	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Sumter	<i>Sumter County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45250	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Taliaferro	<i>Taliaferro County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45562	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Tattnall	<i>Tattnall County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45574	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Toombs	<i>Toombs County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45576	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Towns	<i>Towns County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45172	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Troup	<i>Troup County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45715	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Twiggs	<i>Twiggs County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45379	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Union	<i>Union County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46284	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
GA	County of Walton	<i>Walton County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45297	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Warren	<i>Warren County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45425	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Washington	<i>Washington County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45563	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Wayne	<i>Wayne County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45204	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Whitefield	<i>City of Rome, Floyd County, Chattooga County, Whitefield County and City of Cartersville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45282	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Wilcox	<i>The County of Wilcox, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45506	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Wilkes	<i>Wilkes County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Wilkinson	<i>Wilkinson County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45671	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	County of Worth	<i>Worth County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45602	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Dodge County Hospital Authority d/b/a Dodge County Hospital	<i>Dodge County Hospital Authority d/b/a Dodge County Hospital v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45830	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Habersham County Medical Center	<i>Habersham County Medical Center v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-46114	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Hospital Authority of Bainbridge and Decatur County	<i>Hospital Authority of Bainbridge and Decatur County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45382	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Hospital Authority of Baxley County and Appling County d/b/a Appling Health Care System	<i>Hospital Authority of Baxley and Appling County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46157	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Hospital Authority of Bleckley County d/b/a Bleckley Memorial Hospital	<i>Hospital Authority of Bleckley County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46170	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Macon-Bibb County (Unified Government)	<i>The Unified Government of Macon-Bibb County, Georgia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45407	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Appling County (Sheriff Mark Melton)	<i>Mark Melton in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Appling County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45307	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Baldwin County (Sheriff	<i>William C. Masee, Jr. in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Baldwin County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45361	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
	William C. Masee, Jr.)			
GA	Sheriff of Bibb County (Sheriff David J. Davis)	<i>David J. Davis, in his official capacity as Sheriff of Bibb County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45360	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Coffee County (Sheriff Doyle T. Wooten)	<i>Doyle T. Wooten, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Coffee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45145	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Crawford County (Sheriff Lewis S. Walker)	<i>Lewis S. Walker, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Crawford County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-op-45146	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Crisp County (Sheriff H.W. "Billy" Hancock)	<i>H.W. "Billy" Hancock, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Crisp County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45562	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Glynn County (Sheriff E. Neal Jump)	<i>E. Neal Jump, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Glynn County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-op-45155	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Harris County (Sheriff Mike Jolley)	<i>Mike Jolley, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Harris County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45147	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Houston County (Sheriff Cullen Talton)	<i>Cullen Talton in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Houston County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45308	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Jeff Davis County (Sheriff Preston Bohannon)	<i>Preston Bohannon, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Jeff Davis County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45161	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Jones County (Sheriff R.N. "Butch" Reece)	<i>R.N. "Butch" Reece, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Jones County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45162	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Laurens County (Sheriff Larry H. Dean)	<i>Larry H. Dean, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Laurens County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45163	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Meriwether County (Sheriff Chuck Smith)	<i>Chuck Smith in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Meriwether County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45306	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Murray County (Sheriff Gary Langford)	<i>Gary Langford, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Murray County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45164	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Oconee County (Sheriff Scott R. Berry)	<i>Scott R. Berry, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Oconee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45165	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Peach County (Sheriff Terry Deese)	<i>Terry Deese in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Peach County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45314	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Pierce County (Sheriff Ramsey Bennett)	<i>Ramsey Bennett, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Pierce County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45166	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Screven County (Sheriff Mike Kile)	<i>Mike Kile, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Screven County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45167	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
GA	Sheriff of Telfair County (Sheriff Chris Steverson)	<i>Chris Steverson in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Telfair County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45313	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Tift County (Sheriff Gene Scarbrough)	<i>Gene Scarbrough, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Tift County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45168	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Ware County (Sheriff Randy F. Royal)	<i>Randy F. Royal, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Ware County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45169	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	Sheriff of Wayne County (Sheriff John G. Carter)	<i>John G. Carter, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Wayne County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45170	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	The Candler County Hospital Authority	<i>The Candler County Hospital Authority v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45167	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	The Hospital Authority of Valdosta County and Lowndes County d/b/a South Georgia Medical Center	<i>The Hospital Authority of Valdosta and Lowndes County, Georgia d/b/a South Georgia Medical Center v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45133	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
GA	The Hospital Authority of Wayne County	<i>The Hospital Authority of Wayne County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45278	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
HI	County of Hawai'i	<i>County of Hawai'i v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45014	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
HI	County of Kaua'i	<i>County of Kaua'i v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45862	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Adair	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Adams	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Allamakee	<i>Allamakee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45983	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Appanoose	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Audubon	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Benton	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Black Hawk	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Bremer	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Buchanan	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Buena Vista	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County,</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Calhoun	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Carroll	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Cedar	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Cerro Gordo	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Cherokee	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Chickasaw	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Clay	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Clayton	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County,</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Clinton	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Dallas	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Delaware	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Des Moines	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Emmet	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Fayette	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Fremont	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Hamilton	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County,</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Hancock	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Hardin	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Harrison	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Henry	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County,</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>		
IA	County of Howard	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Humboldt	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Ida	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Jasper	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Johnson	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Jones	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Keokuk	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Lee	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Lyon	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Madison	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
IA	County of Mahaska	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Marion	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Mills	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Mitchell	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Monroe	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Montgomery	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Muscatine	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of O'Brien	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Osceola	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Plymouth	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Pocahontas	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Polk	<i>Polk County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45116	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Pottawattamie	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Poweshiek	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Sac	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Scott	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Shelby	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Sioux	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Tama	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Taylor	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County,</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IA	County of Union	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Webster	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Winnebago	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County, Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Winneshiek	<i>Adair County, Adams County, Audubon County, Benton County, Bremer County, Buchanan County, Buena Vista County, Calhoun County, Carroll County, Cedar County, Clay County, Clayton County, Clinton County, Dallas County, Delaware County, Fayette County, Hamilton County, Hardin County, Humboldt County, Johnson County, Lee County, Mahaska County, Marion County, Mitchell County, Monroe County, Montgomery County, O'Brien County, Plymouth County, Pottawattamie County, Sac County, Scott County, Shelby County, Sioux County, Taylor County, and Winneshiek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Worth	<i>Black Hawk County, Des Moines County, Harrison County, Howard County, Jasper County, Lyon County, Mills County, Tama County, Union County, and Worth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IA	County of Wright	<i>Appanoose County, Cerro Gordo County, Cherokee County, Chickasaw County,</i>	1:21-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Emmet County, Fremont County, Hancock County, Henry County, Ida County, Jones County, Keokuk County, Madison County, Muscatine County, Osceola County, Pocahontas County, Poweshiek County, Webster County, Winnebago County, and Wright County v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>		
ID	City of Boise	<i>City of Boise v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46289	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	City of Cubbuck	<i>City of Cubbuck v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45729	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	City of Pocatello	<i>City of Pocatello v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45578	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	City of Preston	<i>City of Preston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45067	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	City of Twin Falls	<i>City of Twin Falls v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45743	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Ada	<i>Ada County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45775	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Adams	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Bannock	<i>Bannock County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45359	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Bingham	<i>Bingham County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45758	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Blaine	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Boise	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Bonneville	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Camas	<i>Camas County, Idaho v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45407	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Canyon	<i>Canyon County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46277	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
ID	County of Caribou	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Cassia	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Elmore	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Gooding	<i>Gooding County, Idaho v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45404	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Latah	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Minidoka	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Owyhee	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Payette	<i>Adams County, Blaine County, Boise County, Bonneville County, Caribou County, Cassia County, Elmore County, Latah County, Minidoka County, Owyhee County and Payette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ID	County of Twin Falls	<i>Twin Falls County, Idaho v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45828	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Board of Education of East Aurora, School District 131	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools,</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
IL	Board of Education of Joliet Township High School, District 204	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Schools, Meniffee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
IL	Board of Education of Thornton Fractional Township High Schools, District 215	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Meniffee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
IL	Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
IL	City of Berwyn	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Chicago	<i>City of Chicago v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:14-cv-04361	N.D. Illinois (Federal)
IL	City of Chicago Heights	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Granite City	<i>City of Granite City, IL v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	2018-L-010351	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (IL - Circuit Court of Cook County) (State MDL)
IL	City of Harrisburg	<i>City of Harrisburg, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45594	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Harvey	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Herrin	<i>City of Herrin, Illinois, a home rule unit v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45192	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Kankakee	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
IL	City of Marion	<i>City of Marion, Illinois v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45215	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Metropolis	<i>City of Metropolis, Illinois v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45537	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Northlake	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Pekin	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Peoria	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Princeton	<i>City of Princeton, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45599	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Rockford	<i>City of Rockford v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45309	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of Streator	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	City of West Frankfort	<i>City of West Frankfort, Illinois v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45191	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Alexander	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, the People of Alexander County, and County of Alexander v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45050	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Bond	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Bond County, and County of</i>	1:18-op-45004	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Bond v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>		
IL	County of Calhoun	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Calhoun County, and County of Calhoun v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46294	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Christian	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Christian County, and County of Christian v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	17-op-45078	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Coles	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Coles County, and County of Coles v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45138	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Edwards	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Edwards County, and The County of Edwards v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45049	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Effingham	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Effingham County, and The County of Effingham v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45499	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Franklin	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Franklin County, and County of Franklin v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45194	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Gallatin	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Gallatin County, and County of Gallatin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	17-op-45152	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Hamilton	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Hamilton County, and County of Hamilton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45157	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Hardin	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Hardin County, and County of Hardin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45003	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Jasper	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Jasper County, and The County of Jasper v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45026	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Jefferson	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Jefferson County, and The County of Jefferson v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45539	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Jersey	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Jersey County, and Jersey County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-L-003908	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (IL - Circuit Court of Cook

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				County) (State MDL)
IL	County of Johnson	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Johnson County and County of Johnson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46148	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of LaSalle	<i>The People of the State of Illinois and LaSalle County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-L-008722	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (IL - Circuit Court of Cook County) (State MDL)
IL	County of Lawrence	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Lawrence County, and The County of Lawrence v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45518	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Lee	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Lee County, and The County of Lee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45606	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Livingston	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Livingston County, and The County of Livingston v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45527	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Marion	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Marion County, and The County of Marion v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45532	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Massac	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Massac County, and The County of Massac v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45519	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of McLean	<i>The People of the State of Illinois and McLean County, Illinois v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-L-013365	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (IL - Circuit Court of Cook County) (State MDL)
IL	County of Pulaski	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Pulaski County, and County of Pulaski v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45158	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Saline	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Saline County, and The County of Saline v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45528	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Sangamon	<i>The People of the State Of Illinois, The People of Sangamon County, and County</i>	1:20-op-45154	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of Sangamon v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
IL	County of Schuyler	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Schuyler County, and The County of Schuyler v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46147	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Shelby	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of Shelby County, and The County of Shelby v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45007	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Union	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Union County, and Union County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45286	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Wabash	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Wabash County, and County of Wabash v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45103	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Washington	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Washington County, and Washington County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45151	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of White	<i>The People of The State of Illinois, The People of White County, and The County of White v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45024	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	County of Winnebago	<i>The People of the State of Illinois, The People of Winnebago County, and the County of Winnebago v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45310	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Illinois Public Risk Fund	<i>Illinois Public Risk Fund v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019 CH 05847	IL - Circuit Court of Cook County (State)
IL	Orland Fire Protection District	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	The Board of Education of the City of Chicago, School District No. 299	<i>The Board of Education of the City of Chicago, School District No. 299 (“Chicago Public Schools”) v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46042	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Addison	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
IL	Village of Bellwood	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Bensenville	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Berkeley	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Bolingbrook	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Broadview	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Chicago Ridge	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IL	Village of Dolton	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Forest Park	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Franklin Park	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Harwood Heights	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Hillside	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Hoffman Estates	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IL	Village of La Grange Park	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Maywood	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of McCook	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Melrose Park	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Merrionette Park	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of North Riverside	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IL	Village of Oak Lawn	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Oak Park	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Orland Park	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Posen	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of River Forest	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of River Grove	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
IL	Village of Riverside	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Schiller Park	<i>Village of Addison, Village of Bensenville, Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Forest Park, Village of Franklin Park, Village of Harwood Heights, City of Kankakee, Village of La Grange Park, Village of McCook, Village of Oak Park, Village of Riverside, Village of Schiller Park, City of Streator v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Stone Park	<i>City of Harvey, Village of Broadview, Village of Chicago Ridge, Village of Dolton, Village of Hoffman Estates, Village of Maywood, Village of Merrionette Park, Village of North Riverside, Village of Orland Park, City of Peoria, Village of Posen, Village of River Grove, Village of Stone Park, and Orland Fire Protection District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Village of Tinley Park	<i>Village of Melrose Park, Village of Bellwood, Village of Berkeley, City of Berwyn, City of Chicago Heights, Village of Hillside, City of Northlake, Village of Oak Lawn, City of Pekin, Village of River Forest, And Village of Tinley Park v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46312	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IL	Waukegan Community Unit School District	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville,</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		
IN	City of Alexandria	<i>City of Alexandria, City of Elwood and Madison County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45151	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Beech Grove	<i>City of Beech Grove, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46103	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Bloomington	<i>City of Bloomington and Monroe County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45235	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Connersville	<i>City of Connersville and Fayette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45159	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Elwood	<i>City of Alexandria, City of Elwood and Madison County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45151	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Evansville	<i>City of Evansville, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45591	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Fishers	<i>City of Fishers, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45845	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Fort Wayne	<i>City of Fort Wayne, Indiana v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45123	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Franklin	<i>City of Franklin, Town of Pendleton and City of Richmond v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46182	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Gary	<i>City of Gary, Indiana v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45929	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Greenwood	<i>City of Greenwood, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45109	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Hammond	<i>City of Hammond v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45082	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Hartford	<i>Hartford City, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45854	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
IN	City of Indianapolis	<i>City of Indianapolis and Marion County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45091	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Jasper	<i>City of Jasper, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-46027	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Jeffersonville	<i>City of Jeffersonville, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45961	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Kokomo	<i>City of Kokomo, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45127	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Lafayette	<i>City of Lafayette v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45081	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Lawrence	<i>City of Lawrence, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45805	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Logansport	<i>City of Logansport v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18-op-45692	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Martinsville	<i>City of Martinsville, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	18-op-45346	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Mishawaka	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Montpelier	<i>City of Montpelier, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45806	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
IN	City of Muncie	<i>City of Muncie, Indiana v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45126	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of New Albany	<i>City of New Albany, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46333	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of New Castle	<i>City of New Castle v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Noblesville	<i>City of Noblesville, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45124	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Peru	<i>City of Peru, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45794	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Portland	<i>City of Portland and Jay County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46140	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Richmond	<i>City of Franklin, Town of Pendleton and City of Richmond v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46182	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Seymour	<i>City of Seymour, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45673	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Shelbyville	<i>City of Shelbyville, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45960	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of South Bend	<i>City of South Bend, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45400	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Terre Haute	<i>City of Terre Haute, Indiana v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45129	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of West LaFayette	<i>City of West LaFayette v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45300	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	City of Westfield	<i>City of Westfield, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46056	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Allen (Board of Commissioners)	<i>The Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45121	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Benton	<i>Benton County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46201	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Blackford	<i>Blackford County, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46336	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Delaware	<i>Delaware County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45963	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Fayette	<i>City of Connersville and Fayette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45159	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Franklin (Board of Commissioners)	<i>The Board of Commissioners of the County of Franklin v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45827	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Harrison	<i>Harrison County, Indiana v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45130	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
IN	County of Howard	<i>Howard County, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45172	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Jackson	<i>Jackson County, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45439	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Jay	<i>City of Portland and Jay County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46140	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Jennings	<i>Jennings County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45131	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Lake	<i>Lake County, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45156	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of LaPorte	<i>LaPorte County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45280	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Lawrence	<i>Lawrence County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46188	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Madison	<i>City of Alexandria, City of Elwood and Madison County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45151	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Marion	<i>City of Indianapolis and Marion County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45091	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Marshall	<i>Marshall County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45157	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Monroe	<i>City of Bloomington and Monroe County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45235	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Morgan	<i>Morgan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45828	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Orange	<i>Orange County, Indiana v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45356	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Porter	<i>Porter County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45074	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Pulaski	<i>Pulaski County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46110	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Ripley	<i>Ripley County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46155	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of St. Joseph	<i>St. Joseph County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45500	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Starke	<i>Starke County, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46358	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Tippecanoe	<i>Tippecanoe County, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45796	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Vanderburgh	<i>Vanderburgh County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45498	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	County of Vigo	<i>Vigo County, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45128	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Fort Wayne Community Schools	<i>Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan</i>	1:21-op-45080	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		
IN	Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation	<i>Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45080	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	School City of Mishawaka	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		
IN	Scott County (Board of Commissioners)	<i>Scott County, Indiana, by and through its Board of Commissioners v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Smith-Green Community Schools	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	South Bend Community School Corporation	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		
IN	Town of Atlanta	<i>Town of Atlanta, Indiana v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45125	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Brownstown	<i>Town of Brownstown, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45666	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Chandler	<i>Town of Chandler, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45440	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Danville	<i>Town of Danville v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45215	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Huntington	<i>Town of Huntington, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46357	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Mooresville	<i>Town of Mooresville, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Pendleton	<i>City of Franklin, Town of Pendleton and City of Richmond v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46182	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Plainfield	<i>Town of Plainfield, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45017	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Sheridan	<i>The Town of Sheridan v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Upland	<i>Town of Upland, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46356	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
IN	Town of Zionsville	<i>Town of Zionsville, Indiana v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45846	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	City of Kansas	<i>Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45015	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	City of Overland Park	<i>City of Overland Park, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46287	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Bourbon	<i>Bourbon County, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45781	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
KS	County of Cherokee (Board of Commissioners)	<i>Board of Commissioners of Cherokee County, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45452	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Cowley (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the Cowley County, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45898	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Crawford (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Crawford v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46108	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Ford (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Ford, State of Kansas v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45263	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Harvery	<i>County of Harvery v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45848	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Johnson	<i>Johnson County, Kansas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45443	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Montgomery	<i>Montgomery County, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45780	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Neosho (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Neosho v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46125	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Pratt (Board of Commissioners)	<i>Board of Commissioners of Pratt County, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45451	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Reno	<i>County of Reno v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45718	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Sedgwick (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45025	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Shawnee (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Shawnee, State of Kansas v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45226	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	County of Wyandotte	<i>Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45015	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KS	Leavenworth County (Board of Commissioners)	<i>Board of Commissioners of Leavenworth County, Kansas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45602	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	Board of Education of Breathitt County Public Schools	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
KY	Board of Education of Bullitt County Public Schools	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
KY	Board of Education of Estill County Public Schools	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
KY	Board of Education of Fayette County Public Schools	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
KY	Board of Education of Harrison County Public Schools	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	Board of Education of Hart County Public Schools	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools,</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
KY	Board of Education of Jefferson County Public Schools	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Schools, Meniffee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
KY	Board of Education of Johnson County Public School District	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Meniffee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
KY	Board of Education of LaRue County Public Schools	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
KY	Board of Education of Lawrence County Public Schools	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	Board of Education of Martin County Public Schools	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
KY	Board of Education of Menifee County Public Schools	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
KY	Board of Education of Owsley County Public Schools	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
KY	Board of Education of Wolfe County Public Schools	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District,</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
KY	City of Bellefonte	<i>City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Benham	<i>City of Benham v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45105	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Buckhorn	<i>City of Buckhorn v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45111	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Campbellsville	<i>City of Campbellsville v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46057	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Columbia	<i>City of Columbia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46129	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Covington	<i>City of Covington, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45967	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Florence	<i>City of Florence v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45084	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Grayson	<i>City of Grayson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45085	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Greenup	<i>City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Harlan	<i>City of Harlan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45106	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Henderson	<i>City of Henderson, Kentucky, on behalf of Themselves v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Hillview	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		/ N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Hyden	<i>City of Hyden v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45101	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Inez	<i>The City of Inez v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45499	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Jamestown	<i>The Fiscal Court Of Russell County, Kentucky and City of Jamestown v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46096	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Jenkins	<i>City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of London	<i>City of London v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45103	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Loyall	<i>City of Loyall v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45107	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Lynch	<i>City of Lynch v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45102	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Manchester	<i>City of Manchester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45138	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Morehead	<i>City of Morehead v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45104	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Morganfield	<i>City of Morganfield, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45167	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Mt. Washington	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		(State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Murray	<i>The Fiscal Court of Calloway County Kentucky and City of Murray v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45038	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Owensboro	<i>City of Owensboro v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45076	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Paducah	<i>The City of Paducah, Kentucky, a Home Rule Class City in the Commonwealth of Kentucky v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45592	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Paintsville	<i>The City of Paintsville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45559	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Pineville	<i>City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Pippa Passes	<i>City of Pippa Passes v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45137	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Prestonburg	<i>The City of Prestonburg v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45294	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Russell	<i>City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Russell Springs	<i>City of Russell Springs v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45125	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
KY	City of Shepherdsville	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of South Shore	<i>City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Vanceburg	<i>City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Warfield	<i>The City of Warfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45787	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of West Liberty	<i>The City of West Liberty v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45329	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Whitesburg	<i>City of Whitesburg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45218	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	City of Winchester	<i>City of Winchester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46348	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
KY	City of Worthington	<i>City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Adair (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Adair County, on behalf of Adair County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45059	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Allen (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Allen County, on behalf of Allen County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45008	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Anderson (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Anderson County, on behalf of Anderson County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45006	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Ballard	<i>The County of Ballard, Kentucky v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45593	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Bath (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Bath County, on behalf of Bath Count, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45012	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Bell (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Bell County, on behalf of Bell County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45026	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Boone (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Boone County, on behalf of Boone County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45020	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Bourbon (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Bourbon County, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45533	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Boyd (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Boyd County, on behalf of Boyd County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45084	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Boyle (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Boyle County, on behalf of Boyle County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Bracken (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Bracken County, on behalf of Bracken County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45395	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Breathitt (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Breathitt County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46082	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Breckinridge (Fiscal Court)	<i>Breckinridge County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Breckinridge County v. AmerisourceBergen, et al. / Hardin County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Hardin</i>	1:18-op-46273 / 1:20-op-45063	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>County; Breckinridge County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Breckinridge County; Green County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Green County; Meade County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Meade County; Ohio County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Ohio County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
KY	County of Bullitt (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Bullitt County, on behalf of Bullitt County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45009	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Caldwell (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Caldwell County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46001	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Calloway (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Calloway County Kentucky and City of Murray v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45038	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Campbell (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Campbell County, on behalf of Campbell County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45022	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Carlisle (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Carlisle County, on behalf of Carlisle County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Carter (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Carter County, on behalf of Carter County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45392	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Casey (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court Of Casey County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45887	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Christian (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Christian County, on behalf of Christian County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45070	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Clark (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Clark County, on behalf of Clark County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45172	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Clay (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Clay County, on behalf of Clay County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45031	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Clinton (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Clinton County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45901	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Cumberland (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Cumberland County, on behalf of Cumberland County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45012	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
KY	County of Daviess (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Daviess County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Edmonson (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Edmonson County, on behalf of Edmonson County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45084	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Elliott (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Elliott County, on behalf of Elliott County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45393	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Estill (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Estill County, on behalf of Estill County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46126	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Fleming (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Fleming County, on behalf of Fleming County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45019	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Floyd	<i>The County of Floyd v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45369	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Franklin (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Franklin County, on behalf of Franklin County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45007	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Fulton (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Fulton County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45045	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Gallatin (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court Of Gallatin County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45891	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Garrard (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Garrard County, on behalf of Garrard County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45023	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Grant (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Grant County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45961	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Green (Fiscal Court)	<i>Green County Fiscal Court, on Behalf of Green County, v. AmerisourceBergen, et al. / Hardin County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Hardin County; Breckinridge County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Breckinridge County; Green County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Green County; Meade County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Meade County; Ohio County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Ohio County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46272 / 1:20-op-45063	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Greenup (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Greenup County, on behalf of Greenup County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45088	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
KY	County of Hancock (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Hancock County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46027	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Harlan (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Harlan County, on behalf of Harlan County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45027	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Harrison (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Harrison County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46030	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Hart (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Hart County, Kentucky v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45994	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Henderson (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Henderson County, on behalf of Henderson County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45069	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Henry (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Henry County, on behalf of Henry County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45010	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Hickman (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Hickman County, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45254	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Hopkins (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Hopkins County, on behalf of Hopkins County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45010	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Jessamine (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Jessamine County, on behalf of Jessamine County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45090	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Kenton (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Kenton County, on behalf of Kenton County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al.</i>	1:17-op-45089	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Knott	<i>The County of Knott v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45370	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Knox (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Knox County, on behalf of Knox County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45028	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of LaRue (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of LaRue County, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45950	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Laurel (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Laurel County, on behalf of Laurel County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45105	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Lawrence	<i>Lawrence County, Kentucky v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-46184	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Lee (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Lee County, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46100	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Leslie (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Leslie County, on behalf of Leslie County, v.</i>	1:17-op-45029	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>		
KY	County of Letcher (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Letcher County, on behalf of Letcher County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46124	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Lewis (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Lewis County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45889	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Lincoln (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Lincoln County, on behalf of Lincoln County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45024	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Logan (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Logan County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45951	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Madison (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Madison County, on behalf of Madison County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45011	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Marshall (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Marshall County, on behalf of Marshall County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45071	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Martin (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Martin County, on behalf of Martin County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45388	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Mason (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Mason County, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al</i>	1:19-op-45868	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of McCracken	<i>The County of McCracken, Kentucky v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45611	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of McLean (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of McLean County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45200	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Meade (Fiscal Court)	<i>Meade County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Meade County v. AmerisourceBergen, et al. / Hardin County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Hardin County; Breckinridge County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Breckinridge County; Green County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Green County; Meade County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Meade County; Ohio County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Ohio County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46275 / 1:20-op-45063	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Mercer (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Mercer County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45952	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Monroe (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Monroe County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
KY	County of Montgomery (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Montgomery County, on behalf of Montgomery County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46144	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Morgan (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Morgan County, on behalf of Morgan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45571	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Muhlenberg (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46053	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Nicholas (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Nicholas County, on behalf of Nicholas County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45025	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Ohio (Fiscal Court)	<i>Hardin County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Hardin County; Breckinridge County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Breckinridge County; Green County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Green County; Meade County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Meade County; Ohio County Fiscal Court, on behalf of Ohio County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45063	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Oldham (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Oldham County, on behalf of Oldham County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45067	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Owen (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Owen County, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45534	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Owsley (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Owsley County on behalf of Owsley County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Company, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46235	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Pendleton (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Pendleton County, on behalf of Pendleton County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45021	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Perry (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Perry County, on behalf of Perry County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45110	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Pike	<i>County of Pike v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45368	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Powell (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Powell County, on behalf of Powell County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46145	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Pulaski (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Pulaski County, on behalf of Pulaski County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45109	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Rowan (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Rowan County, on behalf of Rowan County, v.</i>	1:18-op-45018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>		
KY	County of Russell (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Russell County, Kentucky and City of Jamestown v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46096	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Scott (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Scott County, on behalf of Scott County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Shelby (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Shelby County, on behalf of Shelby County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45009	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Spencer (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Spencer County, on behalf of Spencer County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al. / The Fiscal Court of Spencer County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45014 / 1:19-op-46029	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Taylor (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Taylor County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46007	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Todd (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Todd County, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45949	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Union (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Union County, on behalf of Union County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45015	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Warren	<i>Warren County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45075	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Wayne (Fiscal Court)	<i>Wayne County Fiscal Court v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45389	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Webster (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Webster County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46098	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Whitley (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Whitley County, on behalf of Whitley County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45030	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Wolfe (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Wolfe County, Kentucky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46099	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	County of Woodford (Fiscal Court)	<i>The Fiscal Court of Woodford County, on behalf of Woodford County, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45174	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	Estill County Emergency Medical Services	<i>Estill County Emergency Medical Services v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46237	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	Kentucky River District Health Department	<i>Kentucky River District Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45050	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
KY	Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government	<i>Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45092	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government	<i>Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45013	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
KY	Taylor County Hospital District Health Facilities Corporation	<i>Bowling Green-Warren County Community Hospital Corporation; The Medical Center at Clinton County, Inc.; The Medical Center at Franklin, Inc.; ARH Tug Valley Health Services, Inc. f/k/a Highlands Hospital Corporation; Baptist Healthcare System, Inc.; Baptist Health Madisonville, Inc.; Grayson County Hospital Foundation, Inc.; The Harrison Memorial Hospital, Inc.; Pikeville Medical Center, Inc.; Saint Elizabeth Medical Center, Inc.; St. Claire Medical Center, Inc.; and Taylor County Hospital District Health Facilities Corporation v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45060	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Amesbury	<i>City of Amesbury v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45678	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Beverly	<i>City of Beverly v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45219	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Brockton	<i>City of Brockton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46089	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Cambridge	<i>City of Cambridge v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-2854-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	City of Chelsea	<i>City of Chelsea v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45693	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Chicopee	<i>City of Chicopee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1621-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	City of Easthampton	<i>City of Easthampton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45336	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Everett	<i>City of Everett v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45596	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MA	City of Fall River	<i>City of Fall River v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46285	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Fitchburg	<i>The City of Fitchburg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45030	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Framingham	<i>City of Framingham v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1487-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	City of Gloucester	<i>City of Gloucester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1351-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	City of Greenfield a/k/a Town of Greenfield	<i>City of Greenfield, aka Town of Greenfield v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45017	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Haverhill	<i>City of Haverhill v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1311-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	City of Holyoke	<i>City of Holyoke v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45694	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Leominster	<i>City of Leominster v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45710	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Lowell	<i>City of Lowell v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45514	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Lynn	<i>City of Lynn v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45789	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Malden	<i>City of Malden v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45487	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Medford	<i>The City of Medford v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45110	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Melrose	<i>City of Melrose, Massachusetts v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45951	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Methuen	<i>City of Methuen, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45106	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MA	City of New Bedford	<i>City of New Bedford, Massachusetts v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45569	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Newburyport	<i>City of Newburyport v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45837	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of North Adams	<i>City of North Adams v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45702	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Northampton	<i>City of Northampton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45337	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Peabody	<i>City of Peabody v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45860	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Pittsfield	<i>City of Pittsfield v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Quincy	<i>The City of Quincy v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45008	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Revere	<i>City of Revere, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45155	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Salem	<i>City of Salem v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1355-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	City of Somerville	<i>City of Somerville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45319	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Springfield	<i>City of Springfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1733-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	City of Woburn	<i>City of Woburn, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45103	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	City of Worcester	<i>City of Worcester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-543-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	Town of Acushnet	<i>Town of Acushnet v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45676	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MA	Town of Agawam	<i>Town of Agawam v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45792	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Andover	<i>Town of Andover v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45996	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Aquinnah	<i>Town of Aquinnah v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46091	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Athol	<i>Town of Athol v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45058	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Auburn	<i>Town of Auburn v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45688	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Ayer	<i>Town of Ayer, Massachusetts v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45570	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Barnstable	<i>Town of Barnstable v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45862	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Belchertown	<i>Town of Belchertown v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45905	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Billerica	<i>Town of Billerica v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45560	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Braintree	<i>Town of Braintree v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45673	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Brewster	<i>Town of Brewster v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45556	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Bridgewater	<i>Town of Bridgewater v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45754	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Brookline	<i>Town of Brookline v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Canton	<i>Town of Canton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1615-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	Town of Carver	<i>Town of Carver v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45691	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Charlton	<i>Town of Charlton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45689	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Chelmsford	<i>Town of Chelmsford v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45952	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Clarksburg	<i>Town of Clarksburg v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45882	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Clinton	<i>Town of Clinton, Massachusetts v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46072	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Danvers	<i>Town of Danvers v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45760	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MA	Town of Dedham	<i>Town of Dedham v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45039	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Dennis	<i>Town of Dennis v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45124	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Douglas	<i>Town of Douglas v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45706	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Dudley	<i>Town of Dudley v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45707	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of East Bridgewater	<i>Town of East Bridgewater v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45721	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Eastham	<i>Town of Eastham v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45864	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Easton	<i>Town of Easton, Massachusetts v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45920	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Fairhaven	<i>Town of Fairhaven v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45060	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Falmouth	<i>Town of Falmouth v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46095	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Freetown	<i>Town of Freetown v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45705	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Georgetown	<i>Town of Georgetown v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45879	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Grafton	<i>Town of Grafton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45753	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Hanson	<i>Town of Hanson v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45704	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Holliston	<i>Town of Holliston, Massachusetts v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45874	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Hopedale	<i>Town of Hopedale v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45708	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Hull	<i>Town of Hull, Massachusetts v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46172	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Kingston	<i>Town of Kingston v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46090	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Lakeville	<i>Town of Lakeville v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45743	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Leicester	<i>Town of Leicester v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45709	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Leverett	<i>Town of Leverett v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45836	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Longmeadow	<i>Town of Longmeadow v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46097	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Ludlow	<i>Town of Ludlow v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45906	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Lunenburg	<i>Town of Lunenburg, Massachusetts v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46156	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Lynnfield	<i>Town of Lynnfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1330-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	Town of Marblehead	<i>Town of Marblehead v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45791	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Marshfield	<i>Town of Marshfield v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45752	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Mashpee	<i>Town of Mashpee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45755	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Mattapoissett	<i>Town of Mattapoissett v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45890	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Middleborough	<i>Town of Middleborough v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46200	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Milford	<i>Town of Milford v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45783	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Millbury	<i>Town of Millbury v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46123	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Millis	<i>Town of Millis, Massachusetts v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45275	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Nantucket	<i>Town of Nantucket v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45703	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Natick	<i>Town of Natick v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-2002-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	Town of North Andover	<i>Town of North Andover v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46159	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of North Attleborough	<i>Town of North Attleborough v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45744	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of North Reading	<i>Town of North Reading v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45856	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Northbridge	<i>Town of Northbridge v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45711	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Norton	<i>Town of Norton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45787	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MA	Town of Norwell	<i>Town of Norwell v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45815	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Norwood	<i>Town of Norwood v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45061	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Orange	<i>Town of Orange v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45070	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Oxford	<i>Town of Oxford, Massachusetts v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45568	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Palmer	<i>Town of Palmer v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45812	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Pembroke	<i>Town of Pembroke v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45823	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Plainville	<i>Town of Plainville v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45808	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Plymouth	<i>Town of Plymouth v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45675	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Provincetown	<i>Town of Provincetown v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45125	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Randolph	<i>Town of Randolph v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-2573-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	Town of Rehoboth	<i>Town of Rehoboth v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45059	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Rockland	<i>Town of Rockland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45824	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Salisbury	<i>Town of Salisbury v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45595	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Sandwich	<i>Town of Sandwich v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45891	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Scituate	<i>Town of Scituate v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45063	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Seekonk	<i>Town of Seekonk v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45881	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Sheffield	<i>Town of Sheffield v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46001	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Shirley	<i>Town of Shirley v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45880	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Somerset	<i>Town of Somerset v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45769	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of South Hadley	<i>Town of South Hadley v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46000	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Southbridge	<i>Town of Southbridge v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45686	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MA	Town of Spencer	<i>Town of Spencer v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45809	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Stoneham	<i>Town of Stoneham v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46164	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Stoughton	<i>Town of Stoughton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45023	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Sturbridge	<i>Town of Sturbridge v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45990	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Sudbury	<i>Town of Sudbury v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45877	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Sutton	<i>Town of Sutton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45810	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Swampscott	<i>Town of Swampscott v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45911	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Templeton	<i>Town of Templeton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45784	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Tewksbury	<i>Town of Tewksbury v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45077	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Truro	<i>Town of Truro v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45816	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Tyngsborough	<i>Town of Tyngsborough v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45770	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Upton	<i>Town of Upton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46160	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Wakefield	<i>Town of Wakefield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-1499-BLS2	MDL - In re Opioid Litigation (MA - Superior Court, County of Suffolk) (State MDL)
MA	Town of Walpole	<i>Town of Walpole v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46093	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Ware	<i>Town of Ware v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45907	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Warren	<i>Town of Warren v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45811	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Watertown	<i>Town of Watertown v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45674	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Wellfleet	<i>Town of Wellfleet, Massachusetts v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45556	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of West Boylston	<i>Town of West Boylston v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45858	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of West Bridgewater	<i>Town of West Bridgewater v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46102	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MA	Town of West Springfield	<i>Town of West Springfield v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45813	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of West Tisbury	<i>Town of West Tisbury v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45790	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Westborough	<i>Town of Westborough v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45859	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Westford	<i>Town of Westford v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46007	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Weymouth	<i>Town of Weymouth v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45672	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Williamsburg	<i>Town of Williamsburg v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45883	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Wilmington	<i>Town of Wilmington v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46158	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Winchendon	<i>Town of Winchendon v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45687	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MA	Town of Winthrop	<i>Town of Winthrop v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45814	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
MD	City of Aberdeen	<i>City of Aberdeen, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45772	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Bel Air	<i>City of Bel Air, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45669	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Berlin	<i>City of Berlin, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45676	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Bowie	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Cambridge	<i>City of Cambridge, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45611	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Charlestown	<i>City of Charlestown, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45677	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Cumberland	<i>City of Cumberland, Maryland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45624	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Frederick	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Frostburg	<i>City of Frostburg v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45617	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Grantsville	<i>City of Grantsville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45668	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Hagerstown	<i>City of Hagerstown, Maryland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45622	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Havre De Grace	<i>City of Havre De Grace v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45678	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Laurel	<i>City of Laurel, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45714	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MD	City of Mountain Lake Park	<i>City of Mountain Lake Park, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45666	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of North East	<i>City of North East, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45670	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Oakland	<i>City of Oakland, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45916	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Perryville	<i>City of Perryville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45679	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Seat Pleasant	<i>The City of Seat Pleasant, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45288	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	City of Vienna	<i>City of Vienna, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45680	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Allegany	<i>Allegany County, Maryland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45652	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Anne Arundel	<i>Anne Arundel County, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	C-02-CV-18-000021	MD - Circuit Court for Anne Arundel (State)
MD	County of Baltimore	<i>Baltimore County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45554	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Calvert (County Commissioners)	<i>County Commissioners of Calvert v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45609	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Caroline	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Carroll (County Commissioners)	<i>The County Commissioner of Carroll County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45052	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Cecil	<i>Cecil County, Maryland, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45100	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Charles (County Commissioners)	<i>County Commissioners of Charles County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Dorchester	<i>Dorchester County, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45610	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Frederick	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Garrett	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
MD	County of Harford	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Howard	<i>Howard County, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46169	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Montgomery	<i>Montgomery County, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45212	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Prince George's	<i>Prince George's County Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45501	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Somerset	<i>County of Somerset, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45911	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of St. Mary's (County Commissioners)	<i>Commissioners of St. Mary's County, Maryland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46334	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Talbot	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Washington (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Washington County, Maryland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46060	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	County of Wicomico	<i>County of Wicomico, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45681	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	Mayor and City Council of Baltimore	<i>Mayor & City Council of Baltimore v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	24C18000515	MD - Circuit Court for Baltimore City (State)
MD	Mayor and Common Council of Westminster	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	Mayor and Council of Rockville	<i>Harford County, Caroline County, Garrett County, Frederick County, Talbot County, City of Frederick, The Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, City of Bowie and the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45853	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MD	Town of Cottage City	<i>Towns of Cottage City, Forest Heights, North Brentwood and Upper Marlboro v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45235	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	Town of Forest Heights	<i>Towns of Cottage City, Forest Heights, North Brentwood and Upper Marlboro v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45235	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	Town of North Brentwood	<i>Towns of Cottage City, Forest Heights, North Brentwood and Upper Marlboro v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45235	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MD	Town of Upper Marlboro	<i>Towns of Cottage City, Forest Heights, North Brentwood and Upper Marlboro v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45235	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	Board of Education of Bangor School Department	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
ME	Board of Education of Cape Elizabeth School Department	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	Board of Education of Ellsworth School Department	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools,</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 10	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools,</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 13	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11,</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 25	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District,</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 26	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 29	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 34	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools,</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Penobscot County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 40	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 50	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 57	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 60	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 71	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools,</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine Regional School Unit 9	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 11	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35,</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 15	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District,</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 28 Five Town Central School District	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 35	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131,</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 44	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Meniffee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 53	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Meniffee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 55	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 6	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	Board of Education of Maine School	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
	Administrative District 61	<p><i>Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Maine School Administrative District 72	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Portland School Department	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>(“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of Scarborough School Department	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
ME	Board of Education of South Portland School Department	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
ME	Board of Education of St. George Municipal School District	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	Board of Education of Waterville School Department	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools,</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
ME	City of Auburn	<i>City of Auburn v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45188	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Augusta	<i>City of Augusta v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45182	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Bangor	<i>City of Bangor v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46314	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Biddeford	<i>City of Biddeford v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45258	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Calais	<i>The City of Calais, Maine v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Lewiston	<i>City of Lewiston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46315	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Portland	<i>City of Portland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46313	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Rockland	<i>City of Rockland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45823	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
ME	City of Saco	<i>City of Saco v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45310	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Sanford	<i>City of Sanford v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45311	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	City of Waterville	<i>City of Waterville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45193	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Androscoggin	<i>Androscoggin County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45205	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Aroostook	<i>Aroostook County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45183	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Cumberland	<i>Cumberland County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45259	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Kennebec	<i>Kennebec County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45257	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Knox	<i>Knox County, State of Maine v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45822	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45190	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Penobscot	<i>Penobscot County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45184	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Sagadahoc	<i>Sagadahoc County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45189	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Somerset	<i>Somerset County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45186	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Waldo	<i>Waldo County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45309	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of Washington	<i>Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45185	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ME	County of York	<i>York County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45191	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	Charter Township of Canton	<i>Charter Township of Canton, City of Livonia, Charter of Township of Northville, City of Romulus, Charter Township of Van Buren, City of Wayne and Charter Township of Huron, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	Charter Township of Clinton	<i>Charter Township of Clinton, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46135	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	Charter Township of Harrison	<i>Charter Township of Harrison v. The Pain Center USA, PLLC, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45863	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	Charter Township of Huron	<i>Charter Township of Canton, City of Livonia, Charter of Township of Northville, City of Romulus, Charter Township of Van Buren, City of Wayne and Charter Township of Huron, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	Charter Township of Northville	<i>Charter Township of Canton, City of Livonia, Charter of Township of Northville, City of Romulus, Charter Township of Van Buren, City of Wayne and Charter Township of Huron, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MI	Charter Township of Pittsfield	<i>Charter Township of Pittsfield, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45566	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	Charter Township of Van Buren	<i>Charter Township of Canton, City of Livonia, Charter of Township of Northville, City of Romulus, Charter Township of Van Buren, City of Wayne and Charter Township of Huron, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Detroit	<i>City of Detroit, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45084	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of East Lansing	<i>City of East Lansing, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45902	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Escanaba	<i>City of Escanaba, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45068	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Flint	<i>City of Flint v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Grand Rapids	<i>City of Grand Rapids, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45406	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Iron Mountain	<i>City of Iron Mountain, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45344	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Jackson	<i>City of Jackson, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45904	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Lansing	<i>City of Lansing, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45054	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Livonia	<i>Charter Township of Canton, City of Livonia, Charter of Township of Northville, City of Romulus, Charter Township of Van Buren, City of Wayne and Charter Township of Huron, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Pontiac	<i>City of Pontiac, Michigan v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-46183	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Romulus	<i>Charter Township of Canton, City of Livonia, Charter of Township of Northville, City of Romulus, Charter Township of Van Buren, City of Wayne and Charter Township of Huron, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Sault Sainte Marie	<i>City of Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45928	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Sterling Heights	<i>City of Sterling Heights v. The Pain Center USA, PLLC, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45864	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Traverse City	<i>City of Traverse City, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45901	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Warren	<i>City of Warren v. The Pain Center USA, PLLC, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45865	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	City of Wayne	<i>Charter Township of Canton, City of Livonia, Charter of Township of Northville, City of Romulus, Charter Township of Van Buren, City of Wayne and Charter Township of Huron, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MI	City of Westland	<i>City of Westland, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45903	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	Count of Saginaw	<i>Count of Saginaw, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45082	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Alcona	<i>County of Alcona, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45340	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Alger	<i>County of Alger, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45360	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Alpena	<i>County of Alpena, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45871	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Antrim	<i>County of Antrim, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45354	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Arenac	<i>County of Arenac, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45341	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Baraga	<i>County of Baraga, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45361	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Bay	<i>The County of Bay, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45228	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Benzie	<i>County of Benzie, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45356	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Berrien	<i>County of Berrien, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45887	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Branch	<i>Branch County, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46096	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Calhoun	<i>Calhoun County, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45560	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Cass	<i>County of Cass, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45868	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Charlevoix	<i>County of Charlevoix, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45897	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Cheboygan	<i>County of Cheboygan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45636	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Chippewa	<i>County of Chippewa, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45066	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Clinton	<i>County of Clinton, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45889	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Crawford	<i>County of Crawford, Michigan, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45105	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Delta	<i>County of Delta, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45067	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Dickinson	<i>County of Dickinson, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45342	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Eaton	<i>County of Eaton, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45971	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Genesee	<i>County of Genesee, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45083	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Grand Traverse	<i>County of Grand Traverse, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45056	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Gratiot	<i>County of Gratiot, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45339	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Hillsdale	<i>County of Hillsdale, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45355	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MI	County of Houghton	<i>County of Houghton, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45866	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Ingham	<i>County of Ingham, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46178	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Ionia	<i>County of Ionia, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Iosco	<i>County of Iosco, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45343	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Iron	<i>County of Iron, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45888	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Isabella	<i>County of Isabella, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45349	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Kalamazoo	<i>Kalamazoo County, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45561	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Kent	<i>County of Kent, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45000	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Lake	<i>County of Lake, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45366	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Leelanau	<i>County of Leelanau, Michigan, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45111	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Lenawee	<i>County of Lenawee, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45351	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Livingston	<i>County of Livingston, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45262	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Luce	<i>County of Luce, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45362	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Macomb	<i>Count of Macomb, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45085	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Manistee	<i>County of Manistee, Michigan, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45113	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Marquette	<i>County of Marquette, Michigan, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45104	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Mason	<i>County of Mason, Michigan, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45112	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Monroe	<i>County of Monroe v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45158	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Montcalm	<i>County of Montcalm, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45865	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Montmorency	<i>County of Montmorency v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45347	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Muskegon	<i>Muskegon County, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46199	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Newaygo	<i>County of Newaygo, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46187	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Oakland	<i>County of Wayne and County of Oakland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45102	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Oceana	<i>County of Oceana, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45359	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Ogemaw	<i>County of Ogemaw, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45348	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Ontonagon	<i>County of Ontonagon, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45893	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MI	County of Osceola	<i>County of Osceola, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45357	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Otsego	<i>County of Otsego, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45345	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Presque Isle	<i>County of Presque Isle, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45894	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Roscommon	<i>County of Roscommon, Michigan, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45102	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Sanilac	<i>County of Sanilac, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45352	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Shiawassee	<i>County of Shiawassee, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45350	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of St. Clair	<i>County of St. Clair, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45896	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Tuscola	<i>County of Tuscola v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45870	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Washtenaw	<i>County of Washtenaw, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45886	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Wayne	<i>County of Wayne and County of Oakland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45102	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	County of Wexford	<i>County of Wexford, Michigan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45364	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MI	Detroit Wayne Mental Health Authority	<i>Detroit Wayne Mental Health Authority v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46332	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	Board of Education of Minnetonka School District No. 276	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11,</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
MN	City of Coon Rapids	<i>City of Coon Rapids, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45835	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	City of Duluth	<i>City of Duluth, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45304	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	City of Minneapolis	<i>Minneapolis, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45850	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	City of North St. Paul	<i>City of North St. Paul, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46066	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	City of Proctor	<i>City of Proctor, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45748	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	City of Rochester	<i>City of Rochester, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45501	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	City of Saint Paul	<i>City of Saint Paul, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45424	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Anoka	<i>County of Anoka, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45101	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Beltrami	<i>Beltrami County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45776	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Big Stone	<i>Big Stone County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45102	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Carlton	<i>Carlton County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45608	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Carver	<i>Carver County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45798	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Dakota	<i>Dakota County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46112	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Douglas	<i>Douglas County, Minnesota v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45428	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Freeborn	<i>Freeborn County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45737	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Hennepin	<i>Hennepin County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45232	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Itasca	<i>Itasca County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45958	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of McLeod	<i>McLeod County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45332	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MN	County of Meeker	<i>Meeker County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45343	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Morrison	<i>Morrison County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45429	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Mower	<i>Mower County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45072	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Olmsted	<i>Olmsted County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45547	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Pine	<i>Pine County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45738	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Ramsey	<i>Ramsey County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45073	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Roseau	<i>Roseau County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45344	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Sibley	<i>Sibley County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45333	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of St. Louis	<i>St. Louis County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45430	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Steele	<i>Steele County, Minnesota, Waseca County, Minnesota, Minnesota Prairie Health Alliance v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45800	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Waseca	<i>Steele County, Minnesota, Waseca County, Minnesota, Minnesota Prairie Health Alliance v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45800	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Washington	<i>Washington County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45074	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Winona	<i>Winona County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45271	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Wright	<i>Wright County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45661	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	County of Yellow Medicine	<i>Yellow Medicine County, Minnesota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45358	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MN	Minnesota Prairie Health Alliance	<i>Steele County, Minnesota, Waseca County, Minnesota, Minnesota Prairie Health Alliance v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45800	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	City of Independence	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	City of Joplin	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve,</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
MO	City of Kansas City	<i>City of Kansas City, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46029	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	City of Sedalia	<i>The City of Sedalia, Pettis County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45152	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	City of Springfield	<i>The City of Springfield, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45899	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	City of St. Joseph	<i>City of St. Joseph, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45798	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	City of St. Louis	<i>City of St. Louis v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46267	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Adair	<i>Adair County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45297	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Andrew	<i>Andrew County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45298	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Atchison	<i>Atchison County, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45797	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Audrain	<i>Audrain County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Barry	<i>Barry County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Barton	<i>Barton County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45171	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Boone	<i>Boone County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45375	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Buchanan	<i>Buchanan County, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45028	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Butler	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Callaway	<i>Callaway County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45378	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Camden	<i>Camden County v. Dannie E. Williams, M.D., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45068	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Cape Girardeau	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
MO	County of Cass	<i>Cass County, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45841	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Chariton	<i>Chariton County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45790	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Christian	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Clinton	<i>Clinton County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45130	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Cole	<i>Cole County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46189	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Crawford	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Dade	<i>Dade County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45224	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of DeKalb	<i>Dekalb County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45299	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Dent	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Douglas	<i>Douglas County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45386	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Dunklin	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MO	County of Franklin	<i>Franklin County v. Dannie E. Williams M.D., et al.</i>	20AB-CC00006	MO - Circuit Court of Franklin County (State)
MO	County of Gasconade	<i>Gasconade County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46190	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Greene	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Grundy	<i>Grundy County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45300	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Henry	<i>Henry County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45135	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Hickory	<i>Hickory County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45295	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Iron	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Jackson	<i>Jackson County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45965	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Jasper	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Jefferson	<i>Jefferson County v. Dannie E. Williams M.D., et al.</i>	20JE-CC00029	MO - Circuit Court of Jefferson County (State)
MO	County of Knox	<i>Knox County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45406	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Lafayette	<i>Lafayette County, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45840	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MO	County of Lawrence	<i>Lawrence County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Lewis	<i>Lewis County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46263	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45069	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Livingston	<i>Livingston County, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46168	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Madison	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Maries	<i>Maries County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46194	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of McDonald	<i>McDonald County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45225	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Miller	<i>Miller County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45274	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Moniteau	<i>Moniteau County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46352	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Montgomery	<i>Montgomery County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46197	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of New Madrid	<i>New Madrid County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45296	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Nodaway	<i>Nodaway County, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45795	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Osage	<i>Osage County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46191	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Ozark	<i>Ozark County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46198	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Pemiscot	<i>Pemiscot County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45733	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Perry	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Pettis	<i>Pettis County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. / The City of Sedalia, Pettis County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45416 / 1:20-op-45152	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MO	County of Phelps	<i>Phelps County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46195	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Pike	<i>Pike County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45131	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Polk	<i>Polk County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45082	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Pulaski	<i>Pulaski County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46192	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Ralls	<i>Ralls County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45292	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Randolph	<i>Randolph County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45409	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Ray	<i>Ray County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45132	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Reynolds	<i>Reynolds County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46193	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Ripley	<i>Ripley County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46262	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Schuyler	<i>Schuyler County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45408	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Scott	<i>Scott County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46174	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Shannon	<i>Shannon County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45401	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Shelby	<i>Shelby County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46264	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of St. Charles	<i>St. Charles County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46059	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of St. Clair	<i>St. Clair County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45044	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of St. Francois	<i>St. Francois County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45847	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of St. Louis	<i>St. Louis County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45083	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Ste. Genevieve	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Stone	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MO	County of Taney	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Texas	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Vernon	<i>Vernon County, Missouri v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45133	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Warren	<i>Warren County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46196	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Washington	<i>Butler County, Cape Girardeau County, Christian County, City of Independence, City of Joplin, Crawford County, Dent County, Dunklin County, Greene County, Iron County, Jasper County, Madison County, Perry County, Ste. Genevieve, Stone County, Taney County, Texas County and Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Webster	<i>Webster County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46350	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Worth	<i>Worth County, Missouri v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45777	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	County of Wright	<i>Wright County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45383	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	Kinloch Fire Protection District of St. Louis County	<i>Kinloch Fire Protection District of St. Louis County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45665	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MO	Northeast Ambulance and Fire Protection District of St. Louis County	<i>Northeast Ambulance and Fire Protection District of St. Louis County, Missouri v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45664	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Amory	<i>City of Amory, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45549	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Brookhaven	<i>City of Brookhaven, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Charleston	<i>City of Charleston, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45398	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MS	City of Clarksdale	<i>City of Clarksdale v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45620	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Cleveland	<i>City of Cleveland, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45879	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Columbia	<i>City of Columbia, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45048	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Columbus	<i>City of Columbus, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46286	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Diamondhead	<i>City of Diamondhead, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45749	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Gautier	<i>City of Gautier, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45871	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Greenwood	<i>City of Greenwood v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45950	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Grenada	<i>City of Grenada v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45622	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Gulfport	<i>The City of Gulfport, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45291	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Hattiesburg	<i>City of Hattiesburg, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45512	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Holly Springs	<i>City of Holly Springs v. Johnson & Johnson, et al.</i>	CV2020-141	MS - Circuit Court of Marshall County (State)
MS	City of Indianola	<i>City of Indianola v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45624	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Iuka	<i>City of Iuka, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46172	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Jackson	<i>City of Jackson, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45806	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Jonestown	<i>City of Jonestown v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45623	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Kosciusko	<i>City of Kosciusko, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45872	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Laurel	<i>City of Laurel, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46161	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Long Beach	<i>The City of Long Beach, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45517	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Lumberton	<i>City of Lumberton, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46236	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Meridian	<i>City of Meridian, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45969	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Morton	<i>City of Morton, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45882	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MS	City of Moss Point	<i>City of Moss Point, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45880	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Mound Bayou	<i>City of Mound Bayou v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45422	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Nettleton	<i>City of Nettleton, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45151	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of New Albany	<i>City of New Albany, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45949	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Ocean Springs	<i>City of Ocean Springs, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45878	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Pascagoula	<i>The City of Pascagoula, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45934	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Philadelphia	<i>City of Philadelphia, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45279	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Quitman	<i>City of Quitman, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45873	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Shannon	<i>City of Shannon, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45149	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Starkville	<i>City of Starkville, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45148	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Tupelo	<i>City of Tupelo, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45491	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Verona	<i>City of Verona, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45150	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Vicksburg	<i>City of Vicksburg, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45881	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Waynesboro	<i>City of Waynesboro v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45050	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Webb	<i>City of Webb, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45015	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	City of Wiggins	<i>City of Wiggins, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45576	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Adams	<i>Adams County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45831	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Amite	<i>Amite County, Mississippi, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45097	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Attala	<i>Attala County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45869	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Benton	<i>Benton County, Mississippi, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45119	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Bolivar	<i>Bolivar County, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45214	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MS	County of Carroll	<i>Carroll County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45156	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Chickasaw	<i>Chickasaw County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45158	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Claiborne	<i>Claiborne County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45035	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Clarke	<i>Clarke County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45278	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Covington	<i>Covington County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45417	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Desoto	<i>Desoto County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45551	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Forrest	<i>Forrest County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45147	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Franklin	<i>Franklin County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45577	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of George	<i>George County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45157	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Greene	<i>Greene County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45965	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Grenada	<i>County of Grenada v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46279	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Hancock	<i>Hancock County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45762	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Harrison	<i>Harrison County v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45113	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Hinds	<i>Hinds County, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45190	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Holmes	<i>Holmes County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45793	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Humphreys	<i>Humphreys County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45021	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Issaquena	<i>Issaquena County, Mississippi v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45764	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Itawamba	<i>Itawamba County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45396	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Jackson	<i>Jackson County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45876	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Jefferson	<i>Jefferson County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45839	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Jefferson Davis	<i>Jefferson Davis County, Mississippi, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45070	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MS	County of Jones	<i>Jones County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45875	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Kemper	<i>Kemper County, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45870	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of LaFayette	<i>LaFayette County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45341	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Lauderdale	<i>Lauderdale County, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46060	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Lawrence	<i>Lawrence County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Lee	<i>Lee County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45160	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of LeFlore	<i>LeFlore County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45552	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45722	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Madison	<i>County of Madison, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45106	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Marion	<i>Marion County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45075	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Marshall	<i>Marshall County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45397	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Monroe	<i>Monroe County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Neshoba	<i>Neshoba County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45843	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Panola	<i>Panola County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45154	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Pearl River	<i>Pearl River County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45548	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Perry	<i>Perry County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45778	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Prentiss	<i>Prentiss County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45723	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Scott	<i>Scott County, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45238	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Stone	<i>Stone County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al. / Stone County, Mississippi v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45775 / 1:20-op-45168	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
MS	County of Sunflower	<i>Sunflower County, Mississippi v Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45020	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Tallahatchie	<i>Tallahatchie County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45399	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Tate	<i>Tate County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45153	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Tippah	<i>Tippah County, Mississippi, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45118	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Tishomingo	<i>Tishomingo County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45039	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Tunica	<i>Tunica County, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45213	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Union	<i>Union County, Mississippi, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45120	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Walthall	<i>Walthall County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45411	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Washington	<i>Washington County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45022	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Wayne	<i>Wayne County, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45877	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	County of Yalobusha	<i>Yalobusha County, Mississippi v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45152	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Greenwood LeFlore Hospital	<i>Greenwood LeFlore Hospital v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45551	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Monroe County Healthcare Authority d/b/a Monroe County Hospital	<i>Southwest Mississippi Regional Medical Center; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority d/b/a Monroe County Hospital v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45175	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Pearl River County Hospital & Nursing Home	<i>Pearl River County Hospital & Nursing Home v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45659	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Sharkey-Issaquena Community Hospital	<i>Sharkey-Issaquena Community Hospital v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45765	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	South Sunflower County Hospital	<i>Mississippi Baptist Medical Center Inc.; Baptist Medical Center- Attala, LLC; Baptist Medical Center-Yazoo, Inc.; Baptist Medical Center-Leake, Inc.; Baptist Memorial Hospital- Calhoun, Inc.; Baptist Memorial Hospital -North Mississippi, Inc.; Baptist Memorial Hospital-Golden Triangle, Inc.; Baptist Memorial Hospital-Union County, Inc.; Baptist Memorial Hospital-Booneville, Inc.; Quitman County Hospital, LLC; and</i>	25CI1:20-cv-00291	MS - Circuit Court of Hinds County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>South Sunflower County Hospital v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, et al.</i>		
MS	Southwest Mississippi Regional Medical Center	<i>Southwest Mississippi Regional Medical Center; Infirmary Health Hospitals, Inc.; Monroe County Healthcare Authority d/b/a Monroe County Hospital v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45175	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Town of Arcola	<i>Town of Arcola v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45419	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Town of Caledonia	<i>Town of Caledonia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45057	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Town of Leakesville	<i>Town of Leakesville, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45008	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Town of McLain	<i>Town of McLain, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45009	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Town of Shubuta	<i>Town of Shubuta, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al. / Town of Shubuta, Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45283 / 1:21-op-45007	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MS	Town of Summit	<i>Town of Summit, Mississippi v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45418	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MT	City of Great Falls	<i>City of Great Falls, County of Anaconda-Deer Lodge, County of Lake and City of Missoula v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45083	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MT	City of Missoula	<i>City of Great Falls, County of Anaconda-Deer Lodge, County of Lake and City of Missoula v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45083	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MT	County of Anaconda-Deer Lodge	<i>City of Great Falls, County of Anaconda-Deer Lodge, County of Lake and City of Missoula v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45083	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MT	County of Cascade	<i>County of Cascade v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45033	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MT	County of Lake	<i>City of Great Falls, County of Anaconda-Deer Lodge, County of Lake and City of Missoula v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45083	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
MT	County of Missoula	<i>Missoula County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45112	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	City of Canton	<i>City of Canton, Chatham County, North Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45462	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	City of Fayetteville	<i>City of Fayetteville v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45726	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	City of Greensboro	<i>City of Greensboro v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45289	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	City of Henderson	<i>City of Henderson v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45768	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	City of Hickory	<i>City of Hickory v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46307	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	City of Jacksonville	<i>City of Jacksonville v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45115	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	City of Wilmington	<i>City of Wilmington v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45684	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
NC	City of Winston-Salem	<i>City of Winston-Salem v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al</i>	1:18-op-45658	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Alamance	<i>Alamance County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45615	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Alexander	<i>Alexander County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46205	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Alleghany	<i>Alleghany County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46019	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Anson	<i>Anson County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46364	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Ashe County	<i>Ashe County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46185	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Beaufort	<i>Beaufort County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45261	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Bertie	<i>Bertie County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45759	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Bladen	<i>Bladen County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45557	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Brunswick	<i>Brunswick County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45222	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Buncombe	<i>Buncombe County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45153	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Burke	<i>Burke County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45184	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Cabarrus	<i>Cabarrus County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45747	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Caldwell	<i>Caldwell County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45263	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Camden	<i>Camden County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45001	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Carteret	<i>Carteret County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45587	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Caswell	<i>Caswell County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45875	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Catawba	<i>Catawba County, North Carolina, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45145	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Chatham	<i>City of Canton, Chatham County, North Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45462	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Cherokee	<i>Cherokee County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45979	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Chowan	<i>Chowan County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46175	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Cleveland	<i>Cleveland County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45304	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Columbus	<i>Columbus County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45847	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Craven	<i>Craven County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45660	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Cumberland	<i>Cumberland County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46031	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
NC	County of Currituck	<i>Currituck County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46174	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Dare	<i>Dare County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45683	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Davidson	<i>Davidson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46330	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Davie	<i>Davie County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46207	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Duplin	<i>Duplin County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45040	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Durham	<i>Durham County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45346	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Forsyth	<i>Forsyth County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45605	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Franklin	<i>Franklin County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46216	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Gaston	<i>Gaston County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45166	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Granville	<i>Granville County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45342	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Greene	<i>Greene County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45584	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Guilford	<i>Guilford County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45340	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Halifax	<i>Halifax County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45376	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Haywood	<i>Haywood County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45014	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Iredell	<i>Iredell County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45774	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Jones	<i>Jones County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45142	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Lee	<i>Lee County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45290	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Lenoir	<i>Lenoir County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45991	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45719	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Madison	<i>Madison County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46067	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Martin	<i>Martin County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45522	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of McDowell	<i>McDowell County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45524	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Mecklenburg	<i>Mecklenburg County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45221	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Mitchell	<i>Mitchell County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45550	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Moore	<i>Moore County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46028	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of New Hanover	<i>New Hanover County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45006	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
NC	County of Onslow	<i>Onslow County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45114	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Orange	<i>Orange County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45308	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Pamlico	<i>Pamlico County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45049	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Pasquotank	<i>Pasquotank County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45986	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Person	<i>Person County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45276	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Pitt	<i>Pitt County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45208	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Polk	<i>Polk County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45900	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Randolph	<i>Randolph County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45275	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Richmond	<i>Richmond County, North Carolina v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45586	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Robeson	<i>Robeson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46141	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Rockingham	<i>Rockingham County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45015	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Rowan	<i>Rowan County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45799	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Rutherford	<i>Rutherford County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45243	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Sampson	<i>Sampson County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45583	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Scotland	<i>Scotland County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45336	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Stokes	<i>Stokes County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45185	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Surry	<i>Surry County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45086	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Tyrrell	<i>Tyrrell County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45725	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Vance	<i>Vance County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45759	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Warren	<i>Warren County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45536	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Washington	<i>Washington County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45002	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Watauga	<i>Watauga County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45525	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Wayne	<i>Wayne County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45585	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Wilkes	<i>Wilkes County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45239	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
NC	County of Yadkin	<i>Yadkin County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45014	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NC	County of Yancey	<i>Yancey County v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46071	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	City of Bismarck	<i>City of Bismarck v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45629	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	City of Devils Lake	<i>City of Devils Lake v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45637	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	City of Fargo	<i>The City of Fargo v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45675	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	City of Grand Forks	<i>Cass County, North Dakota and City of Grand Forks, North Dakota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45276	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	City of Lisbon	<i>City of Lisbon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45761	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Barnes	<i>Barnes County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45640	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Benson	<i>Benson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45643	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Burleigh	<i>Burleigh County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45630	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Cass	<i>Cass County, North Dakota and City of Grand Forks, North Dakota v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45276	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Dickey	<i>Dickey County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45919	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Dunn	<i>Dunn County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45631	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Eddy	<i>Eddy County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45917	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Foster	<i>Foster County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45918	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Grand Forks	<i>Grand Forks County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45647	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of LaMoure	<i>LaMoure County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45760	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of McKenzie	<i>McKenzie County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of McLean	<i>McLean County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45632	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Mercer	<i>Mercer County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45635	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Mountrail	<i>Mountrail County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45634	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Pembina	<i>Pembina County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45674	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Pierce	<i>Pierce County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45683	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Ramsey	<i>Ramsey County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45641	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Ransom	<i>Ransom County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45645	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
ND	County of Richland	<i>Richland County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45644	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Rolette	<i>Rolette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45646	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Sargent	<i>Sargent County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45642	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Stark	<i>Stark County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45763	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Towner	<i>Towner County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45639	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Walsh	<i>Walsh County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45638	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Ward	<i>Ward County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45762	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Wells	<i>Wells County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45682	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
ND	County of Williams	<i>Williams County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45633	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NE	City of South Sioux City	<i>City of South Sioux City, Nebraska v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45553	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NE	County of Douglas	<i>County of Douglas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45068	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NE	County of Keith	<i>Keith County, Nebraska v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45263	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NE	County of Knox	<i>County of Knox, State of Nebraska v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45555	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NE	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45099	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NE	County of Sarpy	<i>Sarpy County, Nebraska v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46038	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	Board of Education of Goshen School District	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
NH	Board of Education of Kearsarge Regional School Unit - School Administrative Unit 65	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit (“RSU”) 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District (“SAD”) 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i></p>		
NH	Board of Education of Lebanon School District	<p><i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth</i></p>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
NH	Board of Education of Pittsfield School District	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools, District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	Board of Education of Tamworth School District	<i>Board of Education of Thornton Township High Schools, District 205, 1 Rochester Public School District, Minnetonka Public School District, Mason County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, East Aurora Public Schools, District 131, Thornton Fractional High Schools,</i>	1:20-op-45281	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>District 215, Joliet Public Schools, District 86, Fayette County Public Schools, Larue County Public Schools, Bullitt County Public Schools, Breathitt County Public Schools, Estill County Public Schools, Harrison County Public Schools, Hart County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools, Johnson County Public Schools, Lawrence County Public Schools, Martin County Public Schools, Menifee County Public Schools, Owsley County Public Schools, Wolfe County Public Schools, Bangor School Department, Cape Elizabeth School District, Maine Regional School Unit ("RSU") 10, Maine RSU 13, Maine RSU 25, Maine RSU 26, Maine RSU 29, Maine RSU 34, Maine RSU 40, Maine RSU 50, Maine RSU 57, Maine RSU 60, Maine RSU 71, Maine RSU 9, Maine School Administrative District ("SAD") 11, Maine Sad 15, Maine Sad 28/Five Town Central School District, Maine Sad 35, Maine Sad 44, Maine Sad 53, Maine Sad 55, Maine Sad 6, Maine Sad 61, Maine Sad 72, Portland School District, Scarborough School District, South Portland School District, St. George Municipal School District, Waterville School District, Ellsworth School Department; Goshen School District, Kearsarge RSU School Administrative Unit 65, Lebanon School District, Pittsfield School District, Tamworth School District, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>		
NH	City of Belmont	<i>City of Belmont v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45707	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Berlin	<i>Berlin, New Hampshire v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46040	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Claremont	<i>City of Claremont v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45690	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Concord	<i>City of Concord, New Hampshire and City of Dover, New Hampshire v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45573	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Dover	<i>City of Concord, New Hampshire and City of Dover, New Hampshire v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45573	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Franklin	<i>City of Franklin, New Hampshire v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45728	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
NH	City of Keene	<i>The City of Keene v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45511	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Laconia	<i>City of Laconia, New Hampshire v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45583	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Manchester	<i>City of Manchester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45163	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Nashua	<i>The City of Nashua v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45062	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	City of Rochester	<i>City of Rochester, NH and County of Merrimack, NH v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46106	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Belknap	<i>Belknap County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45705	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Carroll	<i>Carroll County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46137	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Cheshire	<i>Cheshire County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45706	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Coos	<i>Coos County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46136	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Grafton	<i>Grafton County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45691	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Hillsborough	<i>Hillsborough County, New Hampshire v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46353	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Merrimack	<i>City of Rochester, NH and County of Merrimack, NH v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46106	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Rockingham	<i>Rockingham County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45703	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Strafford	<i>Strafford County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45689	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	County of Sullivan	<i>Sullivan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45704	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	Town of Derry	<i>Town of Derry, New Hampshire v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45582	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NH	Town of Londonderry	<i>Town of Londonderry, New Hampshire v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45727	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	Borough of Paramus	<i>Borough of Paramus, New Jersey v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46046	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	Borough of Ridgefield	<i>The Borough of Ridgefield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	City of Bayonne	<i>City of Bayonne, New Jersey v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46044	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	City of Clifton	<i>City of Clifton, New Jersey v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46076	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	City of Elizabeth	<i>City of Elizabeth, New Jersey v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46045	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	City of Newark	<i>The City of Newark, New Jersey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45761	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	City of Paterson	<i>City of Paterson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45371	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
NJ	City of Trenton	<i>City of Trenton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46158	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	City of Vineland	<i>City of Vineland v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., et al.</i>	CUM-L-000422-22	NJ - Superior Court of Cumberland County (State)
NJ	County of Atlantic	<i>Atlantic County, New Jersey v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46071	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	County of Burlington	<i>County of Burlington, New Jersey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45928	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	County of Cumberland	<i>Cumberland County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46016	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	County of Hudson	<i>County of Hudson, New Jersey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45937	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	County of Monmouth	<i>Monmouth County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46118	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	County of Ocean	<i>County of Ocean, New Jersey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46157	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	County of Union	<i>Union County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45374	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	Town of Clinton	<i>Town of Clinton, New Jersey v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46085	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	Township of Barnegat	<i>Township of Barnegat v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45925	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	Township of Bloomfield	<i>The Township of Bloomfield, New Jersey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45053	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	Township of Brick	<i>Township of Brick, New Jersey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45924	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	Township of Irvington	<i>Township of Irvington v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45156	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NJ	Township of Saddle Brook	<i>Township of Saddle Brook, New Jersey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45431	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	City of Alamogordo	<i>City of Alamogordo, New Mexico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46067	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	City of Espanola	<i>City of Espanola, New Mexico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46142	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	City of Hobbs	<i>City of Hobbs, New Mexico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46068	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	City of Las Cruces	<i>City of Las Cruces v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45059	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	City of Santa Fe	<i>City of Santa Fe v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	D-101-CV-2019-01809	NM - County of Santa Fe, 1st Judicial District (State)
NM	County of Bernalillo (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Bernalillo, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45301	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Catron (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Catron, New Mexico v.</i>	1:19-op-45320	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>		
NM	County of Cibola (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Cibola, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45321	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Colfax (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of The County of Colfax v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45055	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Curry (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Curry, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45347	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Dona Ana (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Dona Ana, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al.</i>	1:18-op-46206	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Eddy	<i>County of Eddy v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45015	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Grant	<i>Grant County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45108	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Hidalgo (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board Of County Commissioners of The County of Hidalgo, New Mexico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46069	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Lea (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Lea v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45266	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Lincoln (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Lincoln, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45513	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Luna (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Luna v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45056	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of McKinley (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of McKinley, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45033	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Mora	<i>County of Mora v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45080	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Otero (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Otero v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45216	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Rio Arriba	<i>The County of Rio Arriba v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45054	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Roosevelt	<i>The County of Roosevelt v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46343	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of San Juan	<i>San Juan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45829	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of San Miguel (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners for San Miguel County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45354	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
NM	County of Sandoval	<i>Sandoval County, New Mexico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45421	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Santa Fe (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Santa Fe v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45776	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Sierra (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Sierra, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45322	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Socorro (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Socorro, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45323	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Taos (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Taos v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45051	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Torrance (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Torrance v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:22-op-45004	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Union (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Union v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45057	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NM	County of Valencia (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of the County of Valencia, New Mexico v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45324	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NV	Central Lyon County Fire Protection District	<i>Lyon County, The North Lyon County Fire Protection District and the Central Lyon County Fire Protection District v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	20-CV-00795	NV - 3rd Judicial District Court, Lyon County (State)
NV	City of Boulder	<i>Boulder City v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45648	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NV	City of Carson	<i>Carson City v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	20 TRT 000471B	NV - 1st Judicial District Court, Carson City County (State)
NV	City of Ely	<i>City of Ely v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	CV2007077	NV - 7th Judicial District Court, White Pine County (State)
NV	City of Fernley	<i>The City of Fernley v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	20-CV-00796	NV - 3rd Judicial District Court, Lyon County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
NV	City of Henderson	<i>City of Henderson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	A-19-800695-B	NV - 8th Judicial District Court, Clark County (State)
NV	City of Las Vegas	<i>City of Las Vegas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	A-19-800697-B	NV - 8th Judicial District Court, Clark County (State)
NV	City of Mesquite	<i>City of Mesquite v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45649	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NV	City of North Las Vegas	<i>City of North Las Vegas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	A-19-800699-B	NV - 8th Judicial District Court, Clark County (State)
NV	City of Sparks	<i>City of Sparks v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	CV20-01152	NV - 2nd Judicial District Court, Washoe County (State)
NV	City of West Wendover	<i>City of West Wendover v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	DC-CV-20-70	NV - 4th Judicial District Court, Elko County (State)
NV	County of Churchill	<i>Churchill County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	20-100C-0805	NV - 10th Judicial District Court, Churchill County (State)
NV	County of Clark	<i>Clark County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46168	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NV	County of Douglas	<i>Douglas County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020 CV 00139	NV - 9th Judicial District Court, Douglas County (State)
NV	County of Esmeralda	<i>Esmeralda County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	CV20-5117	NV - 5th Judicial District Court,

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Esmeralda County (State)
NV	County of Humboldt	<i>Humboldt County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	CV2022306	NV - 6th Judicial District Court, Humboldt County (State)
NV	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	CV0702620	NV - 7th Judicial District Court, Lincoln County (State)
NV	County of Lyon	<i>Lyon County, The North Lyon County Fire Protection District and the Central Lyon County Fire Protection District v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	20-CV-00795	NV - 3rd Judicial District Court, Lyon County (State)
NV	County of Mineral	<i>Mineral County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	21CV-TT12-2020-0104	NV - 11th Judicial District Court, Mineral County (State)
NV	County of Nye	<i>Nye County, Nevada v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46238	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
NV	County of Washoe	<i>Washoe County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	CV20-01142	NV - 2nd Judicial District Court, Washoe County (State)
NV	County of White Pine	<i>White Pine County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	CV2007076	NV - 7th Judicial District Court, White Pine County (State)
NV	North Lyon County Fire Protection District	<i>Lyon County, The North Lyon County Fire Protection District and the Central Lyon County Fire Protection District v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	20-CV-00795	NV - 3rd Judicial District Court, Lyon County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	Board of Education of Boardman Local Schools	<i>Board of Education of Boardman Local Schools and Board of Education of Liberty Local Schools v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45023-DAP	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Board of Education of Liberty Local Schools	<i>Board of Education of Boardman Local Schools and Board of Education of Liberty Local Schools v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45023-DAP	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Ashland	<i>City of Ashland, Ohio v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46203	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Aurora (Law Director Dean E. DePiero)	<i>The County of Portage, Ohio; and City of Ravenna, Ohio and City of Kent, Ohio and City of Aurora, Ohio, And The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Portage County, Victor V. Vigluicci; Frank J. Cimino, Law Director, City of Ravenna, Ohio; Hope L. Jones, Law Director, City of Kent, Ohio; and Dean E. Depiero, Law Director, City of Aurora, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45993	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Barberton	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	City of Broadview Heights	<i>The City of Broadview Heights v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45330	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Brunswick	<i>The City of Brunswick, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45199	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Cincinnati	<i>City of Cincinnati, Ohio v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45041	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Cleveland	<i>City of Cleveland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45132	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Columbus	<i>The City of Columbus v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45048	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Cuyahoga Falls	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	City of Dayton	<i>City of Dayton, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45032	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of East Cleveland	<i>City of East Cleveland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45448	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Elyria	<i>The City of Elyria v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45080	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Euclid	<i>The City of Euclid v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46013	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Fairfield	<i>City of Fairfield, Ohio v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45742	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Fairlawn	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris,</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	City of Findlay	<i>The City of Findlay v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46339	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Fostoria	<i>City of Fostoria v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45433	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Garfield Heights	<i>The City of Garfield Heights v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45999	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Green	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	City of Hamilton	<i>City of Hamilton, Ohio v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46024	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Huron	<i>City of Huron v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45431	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Ironton	<i>City of Ironton, Ohio v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46025	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Kent (Law Director Hope L. Jones)	<i>The County of Portage, Ohio; and City of Ravenna, Ohio and City of Kent, Ohio and City of Aurora, Ohio, And The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Portage County, Victor V. Vigluicci; Frank J. Cimino, Law Director, City of Ravenna, Ohio; Hope L. Jones, Law Director, City of Kent, Ohio; and Dean E. Depiero, Law Director, City of Aurora, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45993	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Lakewood	<i>City of Lakewood, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45240	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Lebanon	<i>The City of Lebanon, Ohio v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45163	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Lima	<i>City of Lima v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45333	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Lorain	<i>City of Lorain, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45000	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Lyndhurst	<i>City of Lyndhurst v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45636	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	City of Macedonia	<i>City of Macedonia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45447	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Mansfield	<i>City of Mansfield v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45380	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Marietta	<i>Washington County and City of Marietta, Ohio v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Mayfield Heights	<i>City of Mayfield Heights v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45635	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Middletown	<i>City of Middletown, Ohio v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46133	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Munroe Falls	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	City of New Franklin	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of North Olmsted	<i>The City of North Olmsted v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46012	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	City of North Ridgeville	<i>The City of North Ridgeville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46015	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of North Royalton	<i>City of North Royalton v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45427	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Norton	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Norwalk	<i>City of Norwalk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46351	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	City of Olmsted Falls	<i>The City of Olmsted Falls v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46014	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Parma	<i>City of Parma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45001	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Parma Heights	<i>The City of Parma Heights v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45773	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Portsmouth	<i>City of Portsmouth v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al.</i>	1:17-op-45042	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Ravenna (Law Director Frank J. Cimino)	<i>The County of Portage, Ohio; and City of Ravenna, Ohio and City of Kent, Ohio and City of Aurora, Ohio, And The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Portage County, Victor V. Vigluicci; Frank J. Cimino, Law Director, City of Ravenna, Ohio; Hope L. Jones, Law Director, City of Kent, Ohio; and Dean E. Depiero, Law Director, City of Aurora, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45993	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Sandusky	<i>City of Sandusky v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45788	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Seven Hills	<i>City of Seven Hills, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45413	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of St. Marys	<i>City of St. Marys v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45638	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Stow	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	City of Strongsville	<i>The City of Strongsville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46111	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Tallmadge	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	City of Toledo	<i>The City of Toledo v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45005	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Van Wert	<i>City of Van Wert v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46345	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Warren	<i>The City of Warren v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al</i>	1:18-op-45434	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Warrensville Heights	<i>Warrensville Heights, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46299	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Wickliffe	<i>City of Wickliffe v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45637	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	City of Youngstown	<i>City of Youngstown, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45722	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Adams (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Adams County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45042	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Allen (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Allen County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45401	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Ashland (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Ashland County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al.</i>	1:18-op-45012	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Ashtabula	<i>The County of Ashtabula v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45050	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Athens (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Athens County Board of Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45326	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Auglaize (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Auglaize County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45570	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Belmont (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Belmont County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45034	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Brown (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Brown County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45035	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Butler (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Butler County Board of Commissioners v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45037	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	County of Carroll (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Carroll County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46079	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Champaign (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Champaign County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45065	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Clermont (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Clermont County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45033	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Clinton (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Clinton County Board of Commissioners v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45060	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Columbiana (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Columbiana County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45289	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Coshocton (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Coshocton County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al.</i>	1:18-op-45027	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Crawford (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Crawford County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45288	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Darke (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Darke County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45046	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Delaware (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Delaware County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45266	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Erie (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Erie County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45291	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Fairfield (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Fairfield County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45038	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Franklin (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Franklin County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al.</i>	1:18-op-45162	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Fulton (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of Commissioners of Fulton County, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45440	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Gallia (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Gallia County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45043	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Geauga (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Geauga County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45256	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Guernsey (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Guernsey County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45044	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	County of Hamilton (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Hamilton County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45272	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Hancock (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Hancock County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45572	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Harrison (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Harrison County Board of Commissioners v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45547	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Hocking (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Hocking County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45044	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Huron (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Huron County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45292	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Jackson (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Jackson County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45037	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Jefferson	<i>The County of Jefferson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45365	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Knox (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Knox County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45665	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Lake	<i>The County of Lake v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45032	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Lawrence (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Lawrence County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45045	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Licking (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Licking County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45041	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Logan (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Logan County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45047	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Lorain	<i>The County of Lorain, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45078	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Lucas (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of Commissioners of Lucas County, Ohio, Mental Health & Recovery Services Board of Lucas County, and Lucas County Children Services Board of Trustees v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46177	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Marion (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Marion County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45529	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Medina (Prosecuting Attorney S. Forrest Thompson)	<i>County of Medina, Ohio and The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Medina County, S. Forrest Thompson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45839	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Meigs	<i>Meigs County, Ohio v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45229	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Mercer (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Mercer County Board of County Commissioners, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46094	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	County of Miami (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of Miami County Commissioners, on behalf of Miami County, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45335	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Monroe (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Monroe County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45597	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Montgomery (Board of County Commissioners and Prosecuting Attorney Mathias H. Heck, Jr.)	<i>Montgomery County Board of County Commissioners and State of Ohio ex rel. Mathias H. Heck, Jr., Prosecuting Attorney v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46080	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Morrow (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Morrow County Board of Commissioners v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45059	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Muskingum (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Muskingum County Board of County Commissioners, v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45137	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Noble (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Noble County, Ohio by the Noble County Commissioners v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45096	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Ottawa (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Ottawa County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45031	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Perry (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Perry County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45245	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Pike (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Pike County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45039	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Portage (Board of County Commissioners and County Prosecutor Victor Vigluicci)	<i>The County of Portage, Ohio; and City of Ravenna, Ohio and City of Kent, Ohio and City of Aurora, Ohio, And The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Portage County, Victor V. Vigluicci; Frank J. Cimino, Law Director, City of Ravenna, Ohio; Hope L. Jones, Law Director, City of Kent, Ohio; and Dean E. Depiero, Law Director, City of Aurora, Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45993	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Ross (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Ross County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45040	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Sandusky (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Sandusky County Board of Commissioners v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45254	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Scioto (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Scioto County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45038	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	County of Seneca (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Seneca County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45290	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Shelby (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Shelby County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45668	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Stark (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Stark County, Ohio Board of County Commissioners v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46340	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Trumbull	<i>The County of Trumbull, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45079	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Tuscarawas (Prosecuting Attorney Ryan Styer)	<i>The County of Tuscarawas; The State of Ohio ex rel. Prosecuting Attorney of Tuscarawas County, Ryan Styer v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45098	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Van Wert (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Van Wert County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45571	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Vinton (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Vinton County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Washington	<i>Washington County and City of Marietta, Ohio v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45230	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Wayne (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Wayne County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45150	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Williams (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Williams County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45257	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	County of Wyandot (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Wyandot County Board of County Commissioners v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46078	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Lucas County Children Services Board of Trustees	<i>Board of Commissioners of Lucas County, Ohio, Mental Health & Recovery Services Board of Lucas County, and Lucas County Children Services Board of Trustees v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46177	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Mental Health and Recovery Services Board of Allen, Auglaize and Hardin Counties	<i>Mental Health & Recovery Services Board of Allen, Auglaize and Hardin Counties v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46344	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Mental Health and Recovery Services Board of Lucas County	<i>Board of Commissioners of Lucas County, Ohio, Mental Health & Recovery Services Board of Lucas County, and Lucas County Children Services Board of Trustees v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46177	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Richland County Children's Services	<i>Richland County Children's Services v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45003	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Township of Boston	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township;</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i></p>		
OH	Township of Copley	<p><i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield;</i></p>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i></p>		
OH	Township of Coventry	<p><i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan</i></p>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i></p>		
OH	Township of Painesville	<i>The Township of Painesville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46035	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Township of Springfield	<p><i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris,</i></p>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i></p>		
OH	Valley Fire District	<p><i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law</i></p>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i></p>		
OH	Village of Boston Heights	<p><i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township,</i></p>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	Village of Brooklyn Heights	<i>Village of Brooklyn Heights v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45450	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Village of Clinton	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OH	Village of Lakemore	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pulekins, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OH	Village of Lexington	<i>Village of Lexington v. Actavis LLC, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45109	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Village of Mogadore	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Village of Newburgh Heights	<i>Village of Newburgh Heights v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45449	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OH	Village of Peninsula	<i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The</i>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i></p>		
OH	Village of Richfield	<p><i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village</i></p>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i></p>		
OH	Village of Silver Lake	<p><i>The City of Barberton; The Village of Boston Heights; Boston Township; The Village of Clinton; Copley Township; Coventry Township; The City of Cuyahoga Falls; The City of Fairlawn; The City of Green; The Village of Lakemore; The Village of Mogadore; The City of Munroe Falls; The City of New Franklin; The City of Norton; The Village of Peninsula; The Village of Richfield; The Village of Silver Lake; Springfield Township; The City of Stow; The City of Tallmadge; Summit County Public Health; Valley Fire District; State of Ohio Ex Rel., The Director of Law for The City of Barberton, Lisa Miller, The Director of</i></p>	1:18-op-45767	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Law for The City of Tallmadge, Megan Raber; The Law Director for The City of Cuyahoga Falls, Russ Balthis, The Law Director for The City of Fairlawn, Bryan Nace, The Law Director for The City of Green, Interim Law Director Bill Chris, The Law Director for The City of Mogadore, Marshal M. Pitchford, The Law Director for The City of Munroe Falls, Tom Kostoff, The Law Director for The City of New Franklin, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for The City of Norton, Justin Markey; The Law Director for The City of Stow, Amber Zibritosky; The Village Solicitor for The Village of Boston Heights, Marshal Pitchford, The Solicitor for Boston Township, Ed Pullekens, Solicitor for The Village of Clinton, Marshal Pitchford, The Law Director for Copley Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Law Director for Coventry Township, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Lakemore, Irving B. Sugerman, The Solicitor for The Village of Peninsula, Brad Bryan, The Law Solicitor for The Village of Richfield, William Hanna, The Solicitor The Village of Silver Lake, Bob Heydorn, and The Administrator & Legal Counsel for Springfield Township, Warren Price v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
OK	City of Ada	<i>City of Ada v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45400	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Altus	<i>City of Altus v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45046	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Anadarko	<i>City of Anadarko v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45022	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Bethany	<i>City of Bethany v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46148	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Broken Arrow	<i>City of Broken Arrow v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45415	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Edmond	<i>City of Edmond v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45496	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of El Reno	<i>City of El Reno v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45252	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Elk City	<i>City of Elk City v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45017	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Enid	<i>City of Enid v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45717	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Guthrie	<i>City of Guthrie v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45497	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Jenks	<i>City of Jenks v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45858	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OK	City of Lawton	<i>City of Lawton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45500	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Midwest City	<i>City of Midwest City v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45709	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Muskogee	<i>City of Muskogee v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45162	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Mustang	<i>City of Mustang v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45708	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Oklahoma City	<i>City of Oklahoma City v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45498	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Owasso	<i>City of Owasso v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45718	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Ponca City	<i>City of Ponca City v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45495	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Seminole	<i>City of Seminole v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45004	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Shawnee	<i>City of Shawnee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46155	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Stillwater	<i>City of Stillwater v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45045	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Tulsa	<i>City of Tulsa v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45024	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	City of Yukon	<i>City of Yukon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45716	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Atoka (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Atoka County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45001	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Beckham (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Beckham County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45146	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Caddo (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Caddo County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46156	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Choctaw (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Choctaw County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45257	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Cimarron (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Cimarron County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45021	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Cleveland (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45009	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Coal (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Coal County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45149	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Comanche (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45180	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Craig (County Commission)	<i>The County Commission of Craig County, Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45652	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OK	County of Creek (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Creek County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45226	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Custer (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Custer County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45182	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Delaware (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46321	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Dewey (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Dewey County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45801	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Garvin (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of Garvin County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46304	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Grady (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Grady County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46167	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Greer (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Greer County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45256	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Harmon (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Harmon County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45388	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Harper (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Harper County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45757	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Haskell (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Haskell County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45002	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Hughes (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Hughes County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45258	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Jackson (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45126	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Jefferson (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46170	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Johnston (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Johnston County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45765	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Kay (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Kay County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45989	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Kiowa (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Kiowa County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45755	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Latimer (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Latimer County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45003	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OK	County of Le Flore (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Le Flore County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45067	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Lincoln (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Lincoln County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45128	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Logan (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Logan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45058	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Love (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Love County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45000	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Major (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Major County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45990	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Mayes (County Commission)	<i>The County Commission of Mayes County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45227	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of McClain (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of McClain County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46303	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of McCurtain (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of McCurtain County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45259	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Muskogee (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Muskogee County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45155	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Noble (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Noble County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45129	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Nowata (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Nowata County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45225	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Okfuskee (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of Okfuskee County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45005	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Oklahoma (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45057	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Okmulgee (County Commission)	<i>The County Commission of Okmulgee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45223	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Osage (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46322	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Ottawa (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46323	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OK	County of Pawnee (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of Pawnee County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46320	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Payne (County Commission)	<i>The County Commission of Payne County, Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45653	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Pittsburg (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Pittsburg County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45711	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Pottawatomie (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Pottawatomie County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45988	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Roger Mills (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Roger Mills County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45183	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Rogers (County Commission)	<i>The County Commission of Rogers County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45224	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Seminole (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>The Board of County Commissioners of Seminole County, State of Oklahoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45260	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Stephens (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Stephens County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45756	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Texas (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Texas County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45061	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Tillman (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Tillman County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45185	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Tulsa (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Tulsa County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45352	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Washington (County Commission)	<i>The County Commission of Washington County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45222	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Woods (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Woods County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45987	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OK	County of Woodward (Board of County Commissioners)	<i>Board of County Commissioners of Woodward County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45141	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OR	City of Portland	<i>City of Portland v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45633	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OR	County of Clackamas	<i>County of Clackamas, County of Lane, County of Washington v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45442	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OR	County of Coos	<i>Coos County, Oregon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46300	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
OR	County of Curry	<i>County of Curry v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45512	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OR	County of Lane	<i>County of Clackamas, County of Lane, County of Washington v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45442	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OR	County of Multnomah	<i>County of Multnomah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45377	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
OR	County of Washington	<i>County of Clackamas, County of Lane, County of Washington v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45442	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Borough of Edwardsville	<i>Borough of Edwardsville, Pennsylvania v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46176	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Borough of Exeter	<i>Borough of Exeter, Pennsylvania v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45019	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Borough of Forty Fort	<i>Forty Fort Borough, Pennsylvania v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46177	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Borough of Kingston	<i>Kingston Borough, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45585	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Borough of Morrisville	<i>Morrisville Borough, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45435	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Borough of Sugar Notch	<i>Sugar Notch Borough, Pennsylvania v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45090	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Borough of Wampum	<i>Wampum Borough v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180701963 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Borough of West Pittston	<i>West Pittston, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45997	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Borough of Wyoming	<i>Wyoming, Pennsylvania v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45087	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	City of Aliquippa	<i>City of New Castle, City of Aliquippa and Union Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45939	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	City of Allentown	<i>City of Allentown, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45824	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	City of Coatesville	<i>City of Coatesville, Pennsylvania v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45396	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	City of Hazelton	<i>City of Hazelton, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45724	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	City of Lock Haven	<i>City of Lock Haven v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017-007778 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				County) (State MDL)
PA	City of Nanticoke	<i>City of Nanticoke, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45081	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	City of New Castle	<i>City of New Castle, City of Aliquippa and Union Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45939	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	City of Philadelphia	<i>City of Philadelphia v. Allergan Limited, et al. / City of Philadelphia v. Allergan plc, et al.</i>	2021-007975 / 18002718 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	City of Wilkes-Barre	<i>City of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45545	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Adams	<i>Adams County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45140	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Armstrong	<i>County of Armstrong v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017-1570-GV / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Beaver	<i>County of Beaver v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	11326-2017 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Bedford	<i>Bedford County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45184	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Bradford	<i>County of Bradford v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018 CV 0059 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
PA	County of Bucks	<i>Bucks County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-03144 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Cambria	<i>County of Cambria v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017-4131 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Carbon	<i>County of Carbon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-000990 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Chester	<i>Chester County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45233	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Clarion	<i>County of Clarion v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	285 CD 2018 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Clinton	<i>County of Clinton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	752-18 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
PA	County of Columbia	<i>Columbia County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45068	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Cumberland	<i>County of Cumberland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-02147 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Fayette	<i>County of Fayette v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017-2676 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Franklin	<i>Franklin County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-02445 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Greene	<i>County of Greene v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	791-2017 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Huntingdon	<i>County of Huntingdon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-0784 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
PA	County of Indiana	<i>Indiana County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45249	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Lackawanna	<i>County of Lackawanna v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017 CV 5156 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Lawrence	<i>County of Lawrence v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	11180-17 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Lehigh	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, The People of Lehigh County, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-C-716 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Luzerne	<i>Luzerne County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45100	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Lycoming	<i>County of Lycoming, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45655	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Mercer	<i>County of Mercer v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-1596 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Monroe	<i>County of Monroe v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	3972CV18 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Northampton	<i>The People of Northampton County and Northampton County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	C48-CV-2017-11557 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Northumberland	<i>County of Northumberland, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45555	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of Washington	<i>County of Washington v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017-6268 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Westmoreland	<i>County of Westmoreland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	5975-2017 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	County of Wyoming	<i>Wyoming County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45488	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	County of York	<i>County of York v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017-SU-003372 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Delaware County	<i>Delaware County, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	District Attorney of Allegheny County (District Attorney Stephen A. Zappala, Jr.)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through Allegheny County District Attorney Stephen A. Zappala, Jr. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	21-947 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	District Attorney of Berks County (District Attorney John T. Adams)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through John T. Adams, the District Attorney of Berks County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-18232 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	PA - Court of Common Pleas of Berks County (State)
PA	District Attorney of Bucks County (District Attorney Matthew D. Weintraub)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through Matthew D. Weintraub, the District Attorney of Bucks County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-00639 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	District Attorney of Chester County (District Attorney Deborah S. Ryan)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through Deborah S. Ryan, the District Attorney of Chester County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-04553 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	District Attorney of Clearfield County	<i>District Attorney of Clearfield County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45022	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	District Attorney of Dauphin County (District Attorney Francis T. Chardo)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through Francis T. Chardo, the District Attorney of Dauphin County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CV-7795 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	PA - Court of Common Pleas of Dauphin County (State)
PA	District Attorney of Delaware County (District Attorney Jack Stollsteimer)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through Jack Stollsteimer, the District Attorney of Delaware County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	CV-2020-002026 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	District Attorney of Northampton County (District Attorney Terence P. Houck)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through Terence P. Houck, the District Attorney of Northampton County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	C-48-CV-2020-3440 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	PA - Court of Common Pleas of Northampton County (State)
PA	District Attorney of Philadelphia (District Attorney Lawrence S. Krasner)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through Philadelphia District Attorney Lawrence S. Krasner v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	18005594 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	District Attorney of Westmoreland County (District Attorney John W. Peck)	<i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, acting by and through John W. Peck, the District Attorney of Westmoreland County v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	20CI02561 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Municipality of Norristown	<i>The Municipality of Norristown and the Township of West Norriton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-12178 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	PA - Court of Common Pleas of Montgomery County (State)
PA	Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority	<i>Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority v. Endo Pharmaceuticals, Inc. et al.</i>	180302923	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Township of Bensalem	<i>Township of Bensalem v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-03119 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Township of Bristol	<i>Bristol Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45434	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Fairview	<i>Fairview Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45355	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Hanover	<i>Hanover Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45654	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Lower Makefield	<i>Lower Makefield Township v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45284	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Lower Southampton	<i>Lower Southampton, Pennsylvania v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45181	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Mahoning	<i>Mahoning Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180603466 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Township of Middletown	<i>Middletown Township v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45030	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Newtown	<i>Newtown Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-03043-0 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Township of Plains	<i>Plains Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46215	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Union	<i>City of New Castle, City of Aliquippa and Union Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45939	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Warminster	<i>Warminster Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-01469-0 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Township of Warrington	<i>Warrington Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	CV-2019- 007269 / 2017-	MDL - Pennsylvania Opioid

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
			008095 (coordinated)	Litigation (PA - Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County) (State MDL)
PA	Township of West Norriton	<i>The Municipality of Norristown and the Township of West Norriton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-12178 / 2017-008095 (coordinated)	PA - Court of Common Pleas of Montgomery County (State)
PA	Township of Wilkes-Barre	<i>Wilkes-Barre Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45325	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PA	Township of Wright	<i>Wright Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45574	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Adjuntas	<i>Municipality of Adjuntas, Puerto Rico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45245	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Aguada	<i>Municipality of Aguada, Puerto Rico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	3:22-cv-01532	D. Puerto Rico (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Aguadilla	<i>Municipality of Aguadilla, Puerto Rico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	3:22-cv-01533	D. Puerto Rico (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Arroyo	<i>Municipality of Arroyo, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45817	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Barceloneta	<i>Municipality of Barceloneta, Puerto Rico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45267	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Bayamon	<i>Municipality of Bayamon, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45818	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Caguas	<i>Municipality of Caguas, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45814	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Canovanas	<i>Municipality of Canovanas, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46018	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Catano	<i>Municipality of Catano, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45816	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Cayey	<i>Municipality of Sabana Grande and Municipality of Cayey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45197	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Ceiba	<i>Municipality of Ceiba, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45819	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Cidra	<i>Municipality of Cidra, Puerto Rico v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45244	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Coamo	<i>Municipality of Coamo, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45820	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Guayanilla	<i>Municipality of Guayanilla, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45176	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Isla de Vieques	<i>Municipality of Isla de Vieques, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45752	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Juncos	<i>Municipality of Juncos, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45994	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
PR	Municipality of Loiza	<i>Municipality of Loiza, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45177	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Rio Grande	<i>Municipality of Rio Grande, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45895	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Sabana Grande	<i>Municipality of Sabana Grande and Municipality of Cayey v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45197	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of San Juan	<i>Municipality of San Juan, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico v. Johnson & Johnson, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45082	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Vega Alta	<i>Municipality of Vega Alta, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46011	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Villalba	<i>Municipality of Villalba, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45815	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
PR	Municipality of Yabucoa	<i>Municipality of Yabucoa, Puerto Rico v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45731	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	City of Charleston	<i>City of Charleston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-CP-104294 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	City of Chester	<i>City of Chester, South Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45606	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	City of Columbia	<i>City of Columbia, South Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45979	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	City of Georgetown	<i>Georgetown City, South Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45613	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	City of Myrtle Beach	<i>City of Myrtle Beach v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP-2605556 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	City of North Charleston	<i>City of North Charleston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-CP-103978 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	City of Orangeburg	<i>City of Orangeburg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45607	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	County of Abbeville	<i>County of Abbeville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-CP-0100154 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Aiken	<i>County of Aiken v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP-0201086 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Allendale	<i>County of Allendale v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-0300125 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Anderson	<i>County of Anderson v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-04-01108 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Bamberg	<i>County of Bamberg v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018CP0500189 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				(SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Barnwell	<i>County of Barnwell v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018CP0600329 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Beaufort	<i>County of Beaufort v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-0701245 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Berkeley	<i>County of Berkeley, South Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45436	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	County of Calhoun	<i>County of Calhoun v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP-0900065 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Charleston	<i>Charleston County, South Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45803	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	County of Cherokee	<i>County of Cherokee v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-1100503 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Chester	<i>County of Chester v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-CP-1200373 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Chesterfield	<i>County of Chesterfield v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-1300410 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Clarendon	<i>County of Clarendon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-CP-1400236 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Colleton	<i>County of Colleton v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-15-00438 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Dillon	<i>County of Dillon v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019CP1700213 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit,

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Dorchester	<i>County of Dorchester v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-1801122 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Edgefield	<i>County of Edgefield v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP-1900120 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Fairfield	<i>County of Fairfield v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-2000272 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Florence	<i>County of Florence v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP-2101213 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Georgetown	<i>Georgetown County, South Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45612	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	County of Greenville	<i>County of Greenville v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Greenwood	<i>County of Greenwood v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-2400775 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Hampton	<i>County of Hampton v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-2500258 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Horry	<i>County of Horry v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP-2602684 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Jasper	<i>County of Jasper v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-2700332 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Kershaw	<i>County of Kershaw v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-2800553 / 2018-	MDL - In re South Carolina

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
			CP-2301294 (master)	Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Lancaster	<i>County of Lancaster v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019CP2900540 / 2018-CP- 2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Laurens	<i>County of Laurens v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP- 3000606 / 2018- CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Lee	<i>County of Lee v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP- 3100207 / 2018- CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Lexington	<i>County of Lexington v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP- 3202207 / 2018- CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Marion	<i>County of Marion v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP- 3300299 / 2018-	MDL - In re South

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
			CP-2301294 (master)	Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Marlboro	<i>County of Marlboro v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-CP- 3400184 / 2018- CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of McCormick	<i>County of McCormick v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP- 3500031 / 2018- CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Newberry	<i>County of Newberry v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP- 3600636 / 2018- CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Oconee	<i>County of Oconee v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP- 3700458 / 2018- CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
SC	County of Orangeburg	<i>County of Orangeburg v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-3800841 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Pickens	<i>County of Pickens v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-3900675 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Richland	<i>Richland County, South Carolina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45327	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	County of Saluda	<i>County of Saluda v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-CP-4100111 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Spartanburg	<i>County of Spartanburg v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-4200760 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Sumter	<i>County of Sumter v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2019-CP-4300891 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit,

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Union	<i>County of Union v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-4400288 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of Williamsburg	<i>County of Williamsburg v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-4500276 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	County of York	<i>County of York v. Rite Aid of South Carolina, Inc., et al.</i>	2018-CP-4602446 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	Medical University Hospital Authority	<i>Medical University Hospital Authority, Medical University of South Carolina and University Medical Associates of The Medical University Of South Carolina v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45197	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	Medical University of South Carolina	<i>Medical University Hospital Authority, Medical University of South Carolina and University Medical Associates of The Medical University Of South Carolina v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45197	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
SC	Town of Mount Pleasant	<i>Town of Mount Pleasant v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-CP-104302 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	Town of Summerville	<i>Town of Summerville v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-CP-1801602 / 2018-CP-2301294 (master)	MDL - In re South Carolina Opioid Litigation (SC - 13th Judicial Circuit, County of Greenville) (State MDL)
SC	University Medical Associates of the Medical University of South Carolina	<i>Medical University Hospital Authority, Medical University of South Carolina and University Medical Associates of The Medical University Of South Carolina v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45197	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Clarksville	<i>The City of Clarksville, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45517	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Gatlinburg	<i>City of Gatlinburg, Tennessee v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45071	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Germantown	<i>The Cities of Maryville, Pigeon Forge, Ripley and Germantown, Tennessee, and the Town of Decatur, Tennessee v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45199	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Lexington	<i>Lexington, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45458	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Maryville	<i>The Cities of Maryville, Pigeon Forge, Ripley and Germantown, Tennessee, and the Town of Decatur, Tennessee v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45199	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Memphis	<i>City of Memphis v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45220	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Millington	<i>City of Millington, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45474	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Pigeon Forge	<i>The Cities of Maryville, Pigeon Forge, Ripley and Germantown, Tennessee, and the Town of Decatur, Tennessee v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45199	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	City of Ripley	<i>The Cities of Maryville, Pigeon Forge, Ripley and Germantown, Tennessee, and the Town of Decatur, Tennessee v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45199	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Blount	<i>Blount County and Jefferson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45132	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Campbell	<i>Campbell County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45133	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
TN	County of Cannon	<i>Cannon County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45924	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Claiborne	<i>Claiborne County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45658	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Crockett	<i>Crockett County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45215	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Decatur	<i>Decatur County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45789	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Fentress	<i>Fentress County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45419	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Greene	<i>Greene County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45136	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Hamilton	<i>Hamilton County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45507	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Hancock	<i>Hancock County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45153	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Hawkins	<i>Hawkins County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45299	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Haywood	<i>Haywood County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45107	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Henderson	<i>Henderson County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45404	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Jefferson	<i>Blount County and Jefferson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45132	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Johnson	<i>Johnson County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation et al.</i>	1:18-op-45164	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Lauderdale	<i>Lauderdale County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46324	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Madison	<i>Madison County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45403	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Montgomery	<i>Montgomery County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45418	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Morgan	<i>Morgan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45075	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Obion	<i>Obion County, Tennessee v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46115	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Overton	<i>Overton County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45568	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Pickett	<i>Pickett County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45242	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
TN	County of Rutherford	<i>Rutherford County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45258	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Scott	<i>Scott County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45273	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Shelby	<i>Shelby County Government v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	CT-004500-17	TN - Circuit Court for Shelby County (State)
TN	County of Smith	<i>Smith County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45029	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Sumner	<i>Sumner County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45255	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Washington	<i>Washington County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46317	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	County of Williamson	<i>Williamson County, Tennessee v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	Hamblen County Board of Education	<i>Hancock County Board of Education and Hamblen County Board of Education v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45027	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	Hancock County Board of Education	<i>Hancock County Board of Education and Hamblen County Board of Education v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45027	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County	<i>Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45088	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	Town of Arlington	<i>Town of Arlington, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45471	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	Town of Centerville	<i>Town of Centerville, Tennessee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45425	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	Town of Dandridge	<i>The Town of Dandridge, Tennessee v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45216	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TN	Town of Decatur	<i>The Cities of Maryville, Pigeon Forge, Ripley and Germantown, Tennessee, and the Town of Decatur, Tennessee v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45199	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	Bexar County Hospital District d/b/a University Health System	<i>Bexar County Hospital District d/b/a University Health System v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., et al.</i>	2020-17501 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	Burleson County Hospital District	<i>Burleson County Hospital District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	29740	TX - 21st Judicial District Court of Burleson

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				County (State)
TX	City of Eagle Pass	<i>The City of Eagle Pass, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46033	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	City of Houston	<i>City of Houston, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-43219 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	City of Laredo	<i>The City of Laredo, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46026	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	City of Leon Valley	<i>City of Leon Valley v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-39837 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	City of San Antonio	<i>City of San Antonio, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45833	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Angelina	<i>County of Angelina v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45053	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Bailey	<i>County of Bailey, Texas v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45264	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Bastrop	<i>County of Bastrop v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-17434 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Bexar	<i>County of Bexar v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77066 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Bowie	<i>County of Bowie v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45159	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Brazos	<i>Brazos County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45863	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
TX	County of Brooks	<i>County of Brooks v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-17509 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Caldwell	<i>County of Caldwell v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-17563 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Calhoun	<i>County of Calhoun v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-17536 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Cameron	<i>County of Cameron v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77093 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Camp	<i>County of Camp v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45301	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Castro	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Cherokee	<i>County of Cherokee v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45155	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Childress	<i>County of Childress v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45229	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Clay	<i>County of Clay v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45169	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
TX	County of Colorado	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Coryell	<i>County of Coryell v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45009	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Dallas	<i>County of Dallas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77098 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Delta	<i>County of Delta v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77104 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Duval	<i>County of Duval v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-87879 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of El Paso	<i>County of El Paso v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-76970 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Ellis	<i>Ellis County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-41572 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Falls	<i>County of Falls v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77106 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Fort Bend	<i>County of Fort Bend, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-DCV-263509	TX - 400th Judicial District Court of Fort Bend County (State)
TX	County of Franklin	<i>County of Franklin v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45302	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Freestone	<i>County of Freestone v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45985	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Galveston	<i>County of Galveston v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45239	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Guadalupe	<i>County of Guadalupe v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-16457 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Harris	<i>County of Harris v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2017-82618 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 133rd Judicial District Court of Harris County (State)
TX	County of Harrison	<i>County of Harrison v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. / County of Harrison v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45087 / 2018-77108 / 2018-63587 (master)	N.D. Ohio (Federal) / MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Haskell	<i>County of Haskell v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45223	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
TX	County of Hays	<i>County of Hays v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-16529 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Henderson	<i>County of Henderson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45684	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Hidalgo	<i>County of Hidalgo v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77109 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Hopkins	<i>County of Hopkins v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77111 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Jefferson	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Jim Hogg	<i>County of Jim Hogg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-49060 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 229th Judicial District Court of Jim Hogg County (State)
TX	County of Jim Wells	<i>County of Jim Wells v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-06-59579-CV / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 79th Judicial District Court of Jim Wells County (State)
TX	County of Johnson	<i>Johnson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-87346 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				(TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Jones	<i>County of Jones v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45139	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Kaufman	<i>Kaufman County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46081	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Kendall	<i>County of Kendall v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:22-op-45010	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Kerr	<i>County of Kerr v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77114 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Kinney	<i>County of Kinney v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45241	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Kleberg	<i>County of Kleberg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2019-49074 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 105th Judicial District Court of Kleberg County (State)
TX	County of La Salle	<i>County of La Salle v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45234	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Lamar	<i>County of Lamar v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45162	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Leon	<i>County of Leon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45240	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Liberty	<i>County of Liberty v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77116 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Lubbock	<i>County of Lubbock v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-16529 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
TX	County of Madison	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Maverick	<i>Maverick County, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al. / Maverick County, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77026 / 1:19-op-45426 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Mitchell	<i>County of Mitchell v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45063	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Montgomery	<i>County of Montgomery v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45030	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Morris	<i>County of Morris v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45086	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Nolan	<i>County of Nolan v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45061	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Nueces	<i>County of Nueces and Nueces County Hospital District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77083 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Polk	<i>County of Polk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45077	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Red River	<i>County of Red River v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45160	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Roberts	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Rockwall	<i>Rockwall County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1-19-0503 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 439th Judicial District Court

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				of Rockwall County (State)
TX	County of Rusk	<i>County of Rusk v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45154	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of San Patricio	<i>County of San Patricio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77075 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of San Saba	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Shackelford	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Smith	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-70878 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Stephens	<i>Stephens County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45804	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Tarrant	<i>County of Tarrant v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45274	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Terrell	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell,</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Throckmorton	<i>County of Throckmorton v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45141	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Titus	<i>County of Titus v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45161	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Travis	<i>County of Travis v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77144 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Upshur	<i>County of Upshur v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45085	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Uvalde	<i>County of Uvalde v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-16427 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Van Zandt	<i>County of Van Zandt v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77150 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Walker	<i>County of Walker v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>	2019-29777 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 12th Judicial District Court of Walker County (State)
TX	County of Waller	<i>County of Waller v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77153 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
TX	County of Webb	<i>County of Webb, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45175	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Wichita	<i>County of Wichita v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45064	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	County of Williamson	<i>County of Williamson v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	19-0850-C368 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 368th Judicial District Court of Williamson County (State)
TX	County of Wilson	<i>County of Wilson and Wilson County Memorial Hospital District v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-39831 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	County of Zavala	<i>The County of Zavala, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46036	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health and Hospital System	<i>Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health & Hospital System; Palo Pinto County Hospital District a/k/a Palo Pinto General Hospital; Guadalupe Valley Hospital a/k/a Guadalupe Regional Medical Center; VHS San Antonio Partners, LLC d/b/a Baptist Medical Center, Mission Trail Baptist Hospital, North Central Baptist Hospital, Northeast Baptist Hospital, and St. Luke's Baptist Hospital; Nacogdoches Medical Center; Resolute Hospital Comp Any, LLC d/b/a Resolute Health; The Hospitals of Providence East Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Memorial Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Sierra Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Transmountain Campus; VHS Brownsville Hospital Company, LLC d/b/a Valley Baptist Medical Center - Brownsville; VHS Harlingen Hospital Company, LLC d/b/a Valley Baptist Medical Center; ARMC, L.P. d/b/a Abilene Regional Medical Center; College Station Hospital, LP; Granbury Hospital Corporation d/b/a Lake Granbury Medical Center; Navarro Hospital, L.P. d/b/a Navarro Regional Hospital; Brownwood Hospital, L.P. d/b/a Brownwood Regional Medical Center; Victoria of Texas, L.P. d/b/a Detar Hospital Navarro and Detar Hospital</i>	DC-19-18635 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 162nd Judicial District Court of Dallas County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<p><i>North; Laredo Texas Hospital Company, L.P. d/b/a Laredo Medical Center; San Angelo Hospital, L.P. d/b/a San Angelo Community Medical Center; Cedar Park Health System, L.P. d/b/a Cedar Park Regional Medical Center; NHCI of Hillsboro, Inc. d/b/a Hill Regional Hospital; Longview Medical Center, L.P. d/b/a Longview Regional Medical Center; and Piney Woods Healthcare System, L.P. d/b/a Woodland Heights Medical Center v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, et al.</i></p>		
TX	Guadalupe Valley Hospital a/k/a Guadalupe Regional Medical Center	<p><i>Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health & Hospital System; Palo Pinto County Hospital District a/k/a Palo Pinto General Hospital; Guadalupe Valley Hospital a/k/a Guadalupe Regional Medical Center; VHS San Antonio Partners, LLC d/b/a Baptist Medical Center, Mission Trail Baptist Hospital, North Central Baptist Hospital, Northeast Baptist Hospital, and St. Luke's Baptist Hospital; Nacogdoches Medical Center; Resolute Hospital Comp Any, LLC d/b/a Resolute Health; The Hospitals of Providence East Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Memorial Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Sierra Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Transmountain Campus; VHS Brownsville Hospital Company, LLC d/b/a Valley Baptist Medical Center - Brownsville; VHS Harlingen Hospital Company, LLC d/b/a Valley Baptist Medical Center; ARMC, L.P. d/b/a Abilene Regional Medical Center; College Station Hospital, LP; Granbury Hospital Corporation d/b/a Lake Granbury Medical Center; Navarro Hospital, L.P. d/b/a Navarro Regional Hospital; Brownwood Hospital, L.P. d/b/a Brownwood Regional Medical Center; Victoria of Texas, L.P. d/b/a Detar Hospital Navarro and Detar Hospital North; Laredo Texas Hospital Company, L.P. d/b/a Laredo Medical Center; San Angelo Hospital, L.P. d/b/a San Angelo Community Medical Center; Cedar Park Health System, L.P. d/b/a Cedar Park Regional Medical Center; NHCI of Hillsboro, Inc. d/b/a Hill Regional Hospital; Longview Medical Center, L.P. d/b/a Longview Regional Medical Center; and Piney Woods Healthcare System, L.P.</i></p>	DC-19-18635 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 162nd Judicial District Court of Dallas County (State)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>d/b/a Woodland Heights Medical Center v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, et al.</i>		
TX	Harris County Hospital District d/b/a Harris Health System	<i>Harris County Hospital District d/b/a Harris Health System v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	2021-23217 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	Irving Independent School District	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	Maverick County Hospital District	<i>Maverick County Hospital District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	17-10-34909-MCVAJA	TX - 365th Judicial District Court of Maverick County (State)
TX	Nueces County Hospital District	<i>County of Nueces and Nueces County Hospital District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	2018-77083 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)
TX	Ochiltree County Hospital District	<i>Ochiltree County Hospital District v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45869	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
TX	Palo Pinto County Hospital District a/k/a Palo Pinto General Hospital	<i>Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health & Hospital System; Palo Pinto County Hospital District a/k/a Palo Pinto General Hospital; Guadalupe Valley Hospital a/k/a Guadalupe Regional Medical Center; VHS San Antonio Partners, LLC d/b/a Baptist Medical Center, Mission Trail Baptist Hospital, North Central Baptist Hospital, Northeast Baptist Hospital, and St. Luke's Baptist Hospital; Nacogdoches Medical Center; Resolute Hospital Comp Any, LLC d/b/a Resolute Health; The Hospitals of Providence East Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Memorial Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Sierra Campus; The Hospitals of Providence Transmountain Campus; VHS Brownsville Hospital Company, LLC d/b/a Valley Baptist Medical Center - Brownsville; VHS Harlingen Hospital Company, LLC d/b/a Valley Baptist Medical Center; ARMC, L.P. d/b/a Abilene Regional Medical Center; College Station Hospital, LP; Granbury Hospital Corporation d/b/a Lake Granbury Medical Center; Navarro Hospital, L.P. d/b/a Navarro Regional Hospital; Brownwood Hospital, L.P. d/b/a Brownwood Regional Medical Center; Victoria of Texas, L.P. d/b/a Detar Hospital Navarro and Detar Hospital North; Laredo Texas Hospital Company, L.P. d/b/a Laredo Medical Center; San Angelo Hospital, L.P. d/b/a San Angelo Community Medical Center; Cedar Park Health System, L.P. d/b/a Cedar Park Regional Medical Center; NHCI of Hillsboro, Inc. d/b/a Hill Regional Hospital; Longview Medical Center, L.P. d/b/a Longview Regional Medical Center; and Piney Woods Healthcare System, L.P. d/b/a Woodland Heights Medical Center v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, et al.</i>	DC-19-18635 / 2018-63587 (master)	TX - 162nd Judicial District Court of Dallas County (State)
TX	Socorro Independent School District	<i>Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School District, Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City</i>	202070878 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, and City of Mt. Washington, KY v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>		/ N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	Tarrant County Hospital District d/b/a JPS Health Network	<i>Tarrant County Hospital District d/b/a JPS Health Network v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:21-op-45077	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	Texarkana Independent School District	<i>County of Castro, County of Colorado, County of Jefferson, County of Madison, County of Roberts, County of San Saba, County of Shackelford, County of Terrell, Irving Independent School District and Texarkana Independent School District v. AbbVie Inc., et al. / Texarkana Independent School Dist., Irving Independent School District, Socorro Independent School District, Downey Unified School District, Kern High School District, Waukegan Community Unit School District, Bibb County School District, South Bend Community School Corp., Mesa County Valley School District 51, Elk Grove Unified School Dist., Smith-Green Community Schools, School City of Mishawaka, City of Mishawaka, IN, City of Hillview, KY, City of Shepherdsville, KY, City of Mt. Washington, KY, Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., and Fort Wayne Community Schools v. AbbVie Inc., et al.</i>	2020-37584 / 2018-63587 (master) / 1:21-op-45080	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris County) (State MDL) / N.D. Ohio (Federal)
TX	Wilson County Memorial Hospital District	<i>County of Wilson and Wilson County Memorial Hospital District v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	2020-39831 / 2018-63587 (master)	MDL - In re Texas Opioid Litigation (TX - 152nd Judicial District of Harris

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				County) (State MDL)
UT	County of Beaver	<i>Washington County, Kane County, Beaver County and Garfield County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500179 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Cache	<i>Cache County, Utah and Rich County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500360 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Carbon	<i>Carbon County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46270	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
UT	County of Daggett	<i>Uintah County, Utah; Duchesne County, Utah; Daggett County, Utah and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500359 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Davis	<i>Davis County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180700870 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Duchesne	<i>Uintah County, Utah; Duchesne County, Utah; Daggett County, Utah and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500359 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT -

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Emery	<i>Sevier County, Juab County, Emery County, Wayne County and Piute County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500430 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Garfield	<i>Washington County, Kane County, Beaver County and Garfield County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500361 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Grand	<i>Grand County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180700040 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Iron	<i>Iron County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180500149 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Juab	<i>Sevier County, Juab County, Emery County, Wayne County and Piute County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500430 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				(UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Kane	<i>Washington County, Kane County, Beaver County and Garfield County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500361 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Millard	<i>Millard County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180700044 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Piute	<i>Sevier County, Juab County, Emery County, Wayne County and Piute County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500430 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Rich	<i>Cache County, Utah and Rich County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500360 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Salt Lake	<i>Salt Lake County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180902421 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of San Juan	<i>San Juan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180700011 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Sanpete	<i>Sanpete County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	180600095 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Sevier	<i>Sevier County, Juab County, Emery County, Wayne County and Piute County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500430 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Summit	<i>Summit County Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500354 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
UT	County of Tooele	<i>Tooele County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500355 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Uintah	<i>Uintah County, Utah; Duchesne County, Utah; Daggett County, Utah and Tri-County Health Department v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500359 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Utah	<i>Utah County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46184	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
UT	County of Wasatch	<i>Wasatch County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500357 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Washington	<i>Washington County, Kane County, Beaver County and Garfield County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500361 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Wayne	<i>Sevier County, Juab County, Emery County, Wayne County and Piute County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500430 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				Summit Division) (State MDL)
UT	County of Weber	<i>Weber County, Utah v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	190500358 / 180500119 (coordinated)	MDL - In the Matter of the Utah Opioid Litigation I (UT - Summit County, Silver Summit Division) (State MDL)
VA	City of Alexandria	<i>City of Alexandria v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45246	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Bristol	<i>City of Bristol, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45719	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Buena Vista	<i>City of Buena Vista, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45159	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Chesapeake	<i>City of Chesapeake, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.,</i>	1:19-op-45712	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Covington	<i>City of Covington, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45799	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Danville	<i>City of Danville, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45730	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Emporia	<i>City of Emporia, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46850	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Fairfax	<i>City of Fairfax, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45177	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Fredericksburg	<i>City of Fredericksburg, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45898	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Galax	<i>City of Galax, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45243	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Hopewell	<i>City of Hopewell, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45433	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Lexington	<i>City of Lexington, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45693	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Martinsville	<i>City of Martinsville, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	CL18000240	VA - Circuit Court for the City of Martinsville (State)
VA	City of Norfolk	<i>City of Norfolk, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45926	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Norton	<i>City of Norton, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45249	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Portsmouth	<i>City of Portsmouth v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45856	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Radford	<i>City of Radford, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46154	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
VA	City of Richmond	<i>City of Richmond v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45546	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Roanoke	<i>City of Roanoke, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45696	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Salem	<i>City of Salem, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45697	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Virginia Beach	<i>City of Virginia Beach and Sheriff of the City of Virginia Beach v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46137	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Waynesboro	<i>The City of Waynesboro, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46152	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	City of Winchester	<i>City of Winchester, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45176	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Accomack	<i>Accomack County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45715	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Alleghany	<i>Alleghany County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45700	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Amherst	<i>Amherst County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45046	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Arlington (County Board)	<i>The County Board of Arlington County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45078	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Bland	<i>Bland County, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46065	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Botetourt	<i>Botetourt County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45064	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Buchanan	<i>Buchanan County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45253	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Carroll	<i>Carroll County, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46068	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Charlotte	<i>Charlotte County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45851	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Chesterfield	<i>Chesterfield County, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Culpeper	<i>Culpeper County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45849	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Cumberland	<i>Cumberland County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46153	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Dickenson	<i>Dickenson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45252	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Dinwiddie	<i>Dinwiddie County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45291	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Fairfax (Board of Supervisors)	<i>Fairfax County, Virginia, by its Board of Supervisors v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45766	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Fauquier	<i>Fauquier County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45686	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Floyd	<i>Floyd County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45698	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Franklin	<i>Franklin County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45701	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
VA	County of Frederick	<i>Frederick County, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45233	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Giles	<i>Giles County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45236	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Goochland	<i>Goochland County, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45175	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Grayson	<i>Grayson County, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46069	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Greensville	<i>Greensville County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45848	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Halifax	<i>Halifax County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45692	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Henrico	<i>Henrico County, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45172	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Henry	<i>Henry County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45245	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Isle of Wight	<i>Isle of Wight County, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45145	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of King and Queen	<i>King and Queen County, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45138	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Lee	<i>Lee County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45251	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Loudoun	<i>Loudoun County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45842	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Louisa	<i>Louisa County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45720	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Madison	<i>Madison County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45702	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Mecklenburg	<i>Mecklenburg County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45174	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Montgomery	<i>Montgomery County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45234	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Northampton	<i>Northampton County, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45144	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Northumberland	<i>Northumberland County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45688	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Page	<i>Page County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45275	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Patrick	<i>Patrick County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46149	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Pittsylvania	<i>Pittsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45247	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Prince George	<i>Prince George County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45929	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Prince William (Board of County Supervisors)	<i>The Board of County Supervisor of Prince William County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45687	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Pulaski	<i>Pulaski County, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46076	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Richmond	<i>City of Richmond v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45546	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
VA	County of Roanoke	<i>Roanoke County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45695	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Rockbridge	<i>Rockbridge County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45694	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Russell	<i>Russell County, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46073	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Scott (Board of Supervisors)	<i>Scott County Board of Supervisors v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46074	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Shenandoah	<i>Shenandoah County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46150	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Smyth	<i>Smyth County, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46077	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Stafford	<i>Stafford County, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45178	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Tazewell	<i>Tazewell County, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46167	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Warren	<i>Westmoreland County, Virginia; Richmond County, Virginia; Warren County, Virginia v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45993	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Washington	<i>Washington County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45254	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Westmoreland	<i>Westmoreland County, Virginia; Richmond County, Virginia; Warren County, Virginia v. McKesson Corporation, et al.</i>	1:19-op-45993	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Wise (Board of Supervisors)	<i>Wise County Board of Supervisors v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45907	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	County of Wythe	<i>Wythe County, Virginia v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46072	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	Sheriff of Virginia Beach City	<i>City of Virginia Beach and Sheriff of the City of Virginia Beach v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-46137	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VA	Town of Richlands	<i>The Town of Richlands, Virginia v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45193	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
VT	City of St. Albans	<i>City of St. Albans, Vermont v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45721	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Anacortes	<i>City of Anacortes and Sedro-Woolley School District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45029	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Bainbridge Island	<i>City of Bainbridge Island v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45981	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Burlington	<i>Skagit County, City of Mount Vernon, City of Sedro-Woolley, City of Burlington, LA Conner School District and Mount</i>	1:18-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
		<i>Vernon School District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>		
WA	City of Everett	<i>City of Everett v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45046	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Kent	<i>City of Kent v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45590	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Kirkland	<i>City of Kirkland v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45121	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Lakewood	<i>City of Lakewood v. Purdue Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45221	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Mount Vernon	<i>Skagit County, City of Mount Vernon, City of Sedro-Woolley, City of Burlington, LA Conner School District and Mount Vernon School District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Olympia	<i>City of Olympia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46021	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Seattle	<i>City of Seattle v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	17-2-25504-1SEA	WA - King County Superior Court (State)
WA	City of Sedro-Woolley	<i>Skagit County, City of Mount Vernon, City of Sedro-Woolley, City of Burlington, LA Conner School District and Mount Vernon School District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Spokane	<i>City of Spokane v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46092	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Tacoma	<i>City of Tacoma v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45047	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	City of Vancouver	<i>City of Vancouver v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45908	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Chelan	<i>Chelan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46139	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Clallam	<i>Clallam County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45612	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Clark	<i>Clark County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45410	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Franklin	<i>Franklin County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45944	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Island	<i>Island County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45982	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Jefferson	<i>Jefferson County v. Purdue Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46023	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of King	<i>King County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45231	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Kitsap	<i>Kitsap County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45956	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Kittitas	<i>Kittitas County v. Purdue Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46008	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Lewis	<i>Lewis County, Washington v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46301	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
WA	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45962	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Pierce	<i>Pierce County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45195	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of San Juan	<i>San Juan County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46291	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Skagit	<i>Skagit County, City of Mount Vernon, City of Sedro-Woolley, City of Burlington, LA Conner School District and Mount Vernon School District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Snohomish	<i>Snohomish County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45370	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Spokane	<i>Spokane County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45943	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Thurston	<i>Thurston County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45409	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Walla Walla	<i>Walla Walla County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46010	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Whatcom	<i>Whatcom County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45954	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	County of Whitman	<i>Whitman County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-46009	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	La Conner School District	<i>Skagit County, City of Mount Vernon, City of Sedro-Woolley, City of Burlington, La Conner School District and Mount Vernon School District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	Mount Vernon School District	<i>Skagit County, City of Mount Vernon, City of Sedro-Woolley, City of Burlington, La Conner School District and Mount Vernon School District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45173	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WA	Sedro-Woolley School District	<i>City of Anacortes and Sedro-Woolley School District v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45029	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of Cudahy	<i>The City of Cudahy v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45097	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of Franklin	<i>The City of Franklin v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45101	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of Greenfield	<i>The City of Greenfield v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45102	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of Kenosha	<i>City of Kenosha, Wisconsin v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45011	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of Marinette	<i>City of Marinette v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:19-op-46181	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of Milwaukee	<i>City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45044	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of Oak Creek	<i>The City of Oak Creek v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45103	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of South Milwaukee	<i>City of South Milwaukee v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	2021CV002934	WI - Circuit Court of Milwaukee

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
				County (State)
WI	City of Superior	<i>City of Superior v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45331	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of Wauwatosa	<i>The City of Wauwatosa v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45104	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	City of West Allis	<i>The City of West Allis v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	1:21-op-45105	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Adams	<i>Adams County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45093	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Ashland	<i>Ashland County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45130	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Barron	<i>Barron County, La Crosse County, Lafayette County and Menominee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45277	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Bayfield	<i>Bayfield County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45168	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Brown	<i>Brown County, Crawford County, Iron County, Juneau County, Kewaunee County, Outagamie County, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Buffalo	<i>Buffalo County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45141	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Burnett	<i>Burnett County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45131	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Calumet	<i>Calumet County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45142	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Chippewa	<i>Chippewa County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45132	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Clark	<i>Clark County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45150	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Columbia	<i>Columbia County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45118	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Crawford	<i>Brown County, Crawford County, Iron County, Juneau County, Kewaunee County, Outagamie County, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Dane	<i>Dane County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45802	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Dodge	<i>Dodge County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45143	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Door	<i>Door County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45104	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Douglas	<i>Douglas County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45107	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Dunn	<i>Dunn County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45133	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Eau Claire	<i>Eau Claire County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45112	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Florence	<i>Florence County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45125	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
WI	County of Fond du Lac	<i>Fond du Lac County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45106	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Forest	<i>Forest County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45134	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Grant	<i>Grant County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45115	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Green	<i>Green County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45096	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Green Lake	<i>Green Lake County, Taylor County and Vilas County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45832	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Iowa	<i>Iowa County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45099	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Iron	<i>Brown County, Crawford County, Iron County, Juneau County, Kewaunee County, Outagamie County, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Jackson	<i>Jackson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45121	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Jefferson	<i>Jefferson County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45122	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Juneau	<i>Brown County, Crawford County, Iron County, Juneau County, Kewaunee County, Outagamie County, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Kenosha	<i>Kenosha County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45144	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Kewaunee	<i>Brown County, Crawford County, Iron County, Juneau County, Kewaunee County, Outagamie County, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of La Crosse	<i>Barron County, La Crosse County, Lafayette County and Menominee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45277	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Lafayette	<i>Barron County, La Crosse County, Lafayette County and Menominee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45277	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Langlade	<i>Langlade County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45124	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Lincoln	<i>Lincoln County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45167	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Manitowoc	<i>Manitowoc County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45135	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Marathon	<i>Marathon County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45095	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Marinette	<i>Marinette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45145	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Marquette	<i>Marquette County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45136	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Menominee	<i>Barron County, La Crosse County, Lafayette County and Menominee County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45277	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
WI	County of Milwaukee	<i>Milwaukee County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45402	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Monroe	<i>Monroe County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45146	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Oconto	<i>Oconto County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45120	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Oneida	<i>Oneida County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45129	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Outagamie	<i>Brown County, Crawford County, Iron County, Juneau County, Kewaunee County, Outagamie County, v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45117	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Pierce	<i>Pierce County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45165	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Price	<i>Price County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45126	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Rock	<i>Rock County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45108	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Rusk	<i>Rusk County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45116	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Sauk	<i>Sauk County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45098	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Sawyer	<i>Sawyer County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45137	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Shawano	<i>Shawano County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45119	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Sheboygan	<i>Sheboygan County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45128	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of St. Croix	<i>St. Croix County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45147	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Taylor	<i>Green Lake County, Taylor County and Vilas County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45832	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Trempealeau	<i>Trempealeau County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:17-op-45138	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Vernon	<i>Vernon County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45148	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Vilas	<i>Green Lake County, Taylor County and Vilas County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45832	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

State	Subdivision/Special District	Case Caption	Case No.	Jurisdiction
WI	County of Walworth	<i>Walworth County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45988	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Washburn	<i>Washburn County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45123	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Washington	<i>Washington County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45114	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Waukesha	<i>Waukesha County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:18-op-45978	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Waupaca	<i>Waupaca County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45166	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Waushara	<i>Waushara County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45139	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	County of Wood	<i>Wood County, Wisconsin v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.</i>	1:17-op-45127	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	Village of Pleasant Prairie	<i>Village of Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>	1:20-op-45010	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WI	Village of Sturtevant	<i>The Village of Sturtevant v. Actavis Pharma, Inc. f/k/a Watson Pharma, Inc., et al.</i>	2021CV000999	WI - Circuit Court of Racine County (State)
WY	City of Casper	<i>City of Casper, Wyoming v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45079	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WY	City of Cheyenne	<i>City of Cheyenne v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45280	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WY	City of Green River	<i>City of Green River, Wyoming v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45764	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WY	City of Riverton	<i>City of Riverton, Wyoming v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45558	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WY	City of Rock Springs	<i>City of Rock Springs, Wyoming v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45265	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WY	County of Carbon	<i>County of Carbon v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:18-op-45625	N.D. Ohio (Federal)
WY	County of Sweetwater	<i>Sweetwater County, Wyoming v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.</i>	1:19-op-45031	N.D. Ohio (Federal)

EXHIBIT D
[Intentionally Omitted]

EXHIBIT E
List of Opioid Remediation Uses

Schedule A

Core Strategies

Settling States and **Exhibit G** Participants may choose from among the abatement strategies listed in Schedule B. However, priority may be given to the following core abatement strategies (“*Core Strategies*”).¹

A. NALOXONE OR OTHER FDA-APPROVED DRUG TO REVERSE OPIOID OVERDOSES

1. Expand training for first responders, schools, community support groups and families; and
2. Increase distribution to individuals who are uninsured or whose insurance does not cover the needed service.

B. MEDICATION-ASSISTED TREATMENT (“MAT”) DISTRIBUTION AND OTHER OPIOID-RELATED TREATMENT

1. Increase distribution of MAT to individuals who are uninsured or whose insurance does not cover the needed service;
2. Provide education to school-based and youth-focused programs that discourage or prevent misuse;
3. Provide MAT education and awareness training to healthcare providers, EMTs, law enforcement, and other first responders; and
4. Provide treatment and recovery support services such as residential and inpatient treatment, intensive outpatient treatment, outpatient therapy or counseling, and recovery housing that allow or integrate medication and with other support services.

C. PREGNANT & POSTPARTUM WOMEN

1. Expand Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (“*SBIRT*”) services to non-Medicaid eligible or uninsured pregnant women;
2. Expand comprehensive evidence-based treatment and recovery services, including MAT, for women with co-occurring Opioid Use Disorder (“*OUD*”) and other

¹ As used in this Schedule A, words like “expand,” “fund,” “provide” or the like shall not indicate a preference for new or existing programs.

Substance Use Disorder (“SUD”)/Mental Health disorders for uninsured individuals for up to 12 months postpartum; and

3. Provide comprehensive wrap-around services to individuals with OUD, including housing, transportation, job placement/training, and childcare.

D. EXPANDING TREATMENT FOR NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME (“NAS”)

1. Expand comprehensive evidence-based and recovery support for NAS babies;
2. Expand services for better continuum of care with infant-need dyad; and
3. Expand long-term treatment and services for medical monitoring of NAS babies and their families.

E. EXPANSION OF WARM HAND-OFF PROGRAMS AND RECOVERY SERVICES

1. Expand services such as navigators and on-call teams to begin MAT in hospital emergency departments;
2. Expand warm hand-off services to transition to recovery services;
3. Broaden scope of recovery services to include co-occurring SUD or mental health conditions;
4. Provide comprehensive wrap-around services to individuals in recovery, including housing, transportation, job placement/training, and childcare; and
5. Hire additional social workers or other behavioral health workers to facilitate expansions above.

F. TREATMENT FOR INCARCERATED POPULATION

1. Provide evidence-based treatment and recovery support, including MAT for persons with OUD and co-occurring SUD/MH disorders within and transitioning out of the criminal justice system; and
2. Increase funding for jails to provide treatment to inmates with OUD.

G. PREVENTION PROGRAMS

1. Funding for media campaigns to prevent opioid use (similar to the FDA’s “Real Cost” campaign to prevent youth from misusing tobacco);

2. Funding for evidence-based prevention programs in schools;
3. Funding for medical provider education and outreach regarding best prescribing practices for opioids consistent with ~~the 2016~~ CDC guidelines, including providers at hospitals (academic detailing);
4. Funding for community drug disposal programs; and
5. Funding and training for first responders to participate in pre-arrest diversion programs, post-overdose response teams, or similar strategies that connect at-risk individuals to behavioral health services and supports.

H. EXPANDING SYRINGE SERVICE PROGRAMS

1. Provide comprehensive syringe services programs with more wrap-around services, including linkage to OUD treatment, access to sterile syringes and linkage to care and treatment of infectious diseases.

I. EVIDENCE-BASED DATA COLLECTION AND RESEARCH ANALYZING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ABATEMENT STRATEGIES WITHIN THE STATE

Schedule B

Approved Uses

Support treatment of Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) and any co-occurring Substance Use Disorder or Mental Health (SUD/MH) conditions through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

PART ONE: TREATMENT

A. TREAT OPIOID USE DISORDER (OUD)

Support treatment of Opioid Use Disorder (“OUD”) and any co-occurring Substance Use Disorder or Mental Health (“SUD/MH”) conditions through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, those that:²

1. Expand availability of treatment for OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, including all forms of Medication-Assisted Treatment (“MAT”) approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.
2. Support and reimburse evidence-based services that adhere to the American Society of Addiction Medicine (“ASAM”) continuum of care for OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
3. Expand telehealth to increase access to treatment for OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, including MAT, as well as counseling, psychiatric support, and other treatment and recovery support services.
4. Improve oversight of Opioid Treatment Programs (“OTPs”) to assure evidence-based or evidence-informed practices such as adequate methadone dosing and low threshold approaches to treatment.
5. Support mobile intervention, treatment, and recovery services, offered by qualified professionals and service providers, such as peer recovery coaches, for persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions and for persons who have experienced an opioid overdose.
6. Provide treatment of trauma for individuals with OUD (*e.g.*, violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, or adverse childhood experiences) and family members (*e.g.*, surviving family members after an overdose or overdose fatality), and training of health care personnel to identify and address such trauma.

² As used in this Schedule B, words like “expand,” “fund,” “provide” or the like shall not indicate a preference for new or existing programs.

7. Support evidence-based withdrawal management services for people with OUD and any co-occurring mental health conditions.
8. Provide training on MAT for health care providers, first responders, students, or other supporting professionals, such as peer recovery coaches or recovery outreach specialists, including telementoring to assist community-based providers in rural or underserved areas.
9. Support workforce development for addiction professionals who work with persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
10. Offer fellowships for addiction medicine specialists for direct patient care, instructors, and clinical research for treatments.
11. Offer scholarships and supports for behavioral health practitioners or workers involved in addressing OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH or mental health conditions, including, but not limited to, training, scholarships, fellowships, loan repayment programs, or other incentives for providers to work in rural or underserved areas.
12. Provide funding and training for clinicians to obtain a waiver under the federal Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000 (“*DATA 2000*”) to prescribe MAT for OUD, and provide technical assistance and professional support to clinicians who have obtained a DATA 2000 waiver.
13. Disseminate web-based training curricula, such as the American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry’s Provider Clinical Support Service–Opioids web-based training curriculum and motivational interviewing.
14. Develop and disseminate new curricula, such as the American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry’s Provider Clinical Support Service for Medication–Assisted Treatment.

B. SUPPORT PEOPLE IN TREATMENT AND RECOVERY

Support people in recovery from OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, the programs or strategies that:

1. Provide comprehensive wrap-around services to individuals with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, including housing, transportation, education, job placement, job training, or childcare.
2. Provide the full continuum of care of treatment and recovery services for OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, including supportive housing, peer support services and counseling, community navigators, case management, and connections to community-based services.

3. Provide counseling, peer-support, recovery case management and residential treatment with access to medications for those who need it to persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
4. Provide access to housing for people with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, including supportive housing, recovery housing, housing assistance programs, training for housing providers, or recovery housing programs that allow or integrate FDA-approved medication with other support services.
5. Provide community support services, including social and legal services, to assist in deinstitutionalizing persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
6. Support or expand peer-recovery centers, which may include support groups, social events, computer access, or other services for persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
7. Provide or support transportation to treatment or recovery programs or services for persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
8. Provide employment training or educational services for persons in treatment for or recovery from OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
9. Identify successful recovery programs such as physician, pilot, and college recovery programs, and provide support and technical assistance to increase the number and capacity of high-quality programs to help those in recovery.
10. Engage non-profits, faith-based communities, and community coalitions to support people in treatment and recovery and to support family members in their efforts to support the person with OUD in the family.
11. Provide training and development of procedures for government staff to appropriately interact and provide social and other services to individuals with or in recovery from OUD, including reducing stigma.
12. Support stigma reduction efforts regarding treatment and support for persons with OUD, including reducing the stigma on effective treatment.
13. Create or support culturally appropriate services and programs for persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, including new Americans.
14. Create and/or support recovery high schools.
15. Hire or train behavioral health workers to provide or expand any of the services or supports listed above.

**C. CONNECT PEOPLE WHO NEED HELP TO THE HELP THEY NEED
(CONNECTIONS TO CARE)**

Provide connections to care for people who have—or are at risk of developing—OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, those that:

1. Ensure that health care providers are screening for OUD and other risk factors and know how to appropriately counsel and treat (or refer if necessary) a patient for OUD treatment.
2. Fund SBIRT programs to reduce the transition from use to disorders, including SBIRT services to pregnant women who are uninsured or not eligible for Medicaid.
3. Provide training and long-term implementation of SBIRT in key systems (health, schools, colleges, criminal justice, and probation), with a focus on youth and young adults when transition from misuse to opioid disorder is common.
4. Purchase automated versions of SBIRT and support ongoing costs of the technology.
5. Expand services such as navigators and on-call teams to begin MAT in hospital emergency departments.
6. Provide training for emergency room personnel treating opioid overdose patients on post-discharge planning, including community referrals for MAT, recovery case management or support services.
7. Support hospital programs that transition persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, or persons who have experienced an opioid overdose, into clinically appropriate follow-up care through a bridge clinic or similar approach.
8. Support crisis stabilization centers that serve as an alternative to hospital emergency departments for persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions or persons that have experienced an opioid overdose.
9. Support the work of Emergency Medical Systems, including peer support specialists, to connect individuals to treatment or other appropriate services following an opioid overdose or other opioid-related adverse event.
10. Provide funding for peer support specialists or recovery coaches in emergency departments, detox facilities, recovery centers, recovery housing, or similar settings; offer services, supports, or connections to care to persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions or to persons who have experienced an opioid overdose.

11. Expand warm hand-off services to transition to recovery services.
12. Create or support school-based contacts that parents can engage with to seek immediate treatment services for their child; and support prevention, intervention, treatment, and recovery programs focused on young people.
13. Develop and support best practices on addressing OUD in the workplace.
14. Support assistance programs for health care providers with OUD.
15. Engage non-profits and the faith community as a system to support outreach for treatment.
16. Support centralized call centers that provide information and connections to appropriate services and supports for persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.

D. ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE-INVOLVED PERSONS

Address the needs of persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions who are involved in, are at risk of becoming involved in, or are transitioning out of the criminal justice system through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, those that:

1. Support pre-arrest or pre-arraignment diversion and deflection strategies for persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, including established strategies such as:
 - a. Self-referral strategies such as the Angel Programs or the Police Assisted Addiction Recovery Initiative (“*PAAR*”);
 - b. Active outreach strategies such as the Drug Abuse Response Team (“*DART*”) model;
 - c. “Naloxone Plus” strategies, which work to ensure that individuals who have received naloxone to reverse the effects of an overdose are then linked to treatment programs or other appropriate services;
 - d. Officer prevention strategies, such as the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (“*LEAD*”) model;
 - e. Officer intervention strategies such as the Leon County, Florida Adult Civil Citation Network or the Chicago Westside Narcotics Diversion to Treatment Initiative; or
 - f. Co-responder and/or alternative responder models to address OUD-related 911 calls with greater SUD expertise.

2. Support pre-trial services that connect individuals with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions to evidence-informed treatment, including MAT, and related services.
3. Support treatment and recovery courts that provide evidence-based options for persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
4. Provide evidence-informed treatment, including MAT, recovery support, harm reduction, or other appropriate services to individuals with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions who are incarcerated in jail or prison.
5. Provide evidence-informed treatment, including MAT, recovery support, harm reduction, or other appropriate services to individuals with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions who are leaving jail or prison or have recently left jail or prison, are on probation or parole, are under community corrections supervision, or are in re-entry programs or facilities.
6. Support critical time interventions (“CTP”), particularly for individuals living with dual-diagnosis OUD/serious mental illness, and services for individuals who face immediate risks and service needs and risks upon release from correctional settings.
7. Provide training on best practices for addressing the needs of criminal justice-involved persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions to law enforcement, correctional, or judicial personnel or to providers of treatment, recovery, harm reduction, case management, or other services offered in connection with any of the strategies described in this section.

E. ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF PREGNANT OR PARENTING WOMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES, INCLUDING BABIES WITH NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME

Address the needs of pregnant or parenting women with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, and the needs of their families, including babies with neonatal abstinence syndrome (“NAS”), through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, those that:

1. Support evidence-based or evidence-informed treatment, including MAT, recovery services and supports, and prevention services for pregnant women—or women who could become pregnant—who have OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, and other measures to educate and provide support to families affected by Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome.
2. Expand comprehensive evidence-based treatment and recovery services, including MAT, for uninsured women with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions for up to 12 months postpartum.

3. Provide training for obstetricians or other healthcare personnel who work with pregnant women and their families regarding treatment of OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
4. Expand comprehensive evidence-based treatment and recovery support for NAS babies; expand services for better continuum of care with infant-need dyad; and expand long-term treatment and services for medical monitoring of NAS babies and their families.
5. Provide training to health care providers who work with pregnant or parenting women on best practices for compliance with federal requirements that children born with NAS get referred to appropriate services and receive a plan of safe care.
6. Provide child and family supports for parenting women with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
7. Provide enhanced family support and child care services for parents with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
8. Provide enhanced support for children and family members suffering trauma as a result of addiction in the family; and offer trauma-informed behavioral health treatment for adverse childhood events.
9. Offer home-based wrap-around services to persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, including, but not limited to, parent skills training.
10. Provide support for Children’s Services—Fund additional positions and services, including supportive housing and other residential services, relating to children being removed from the home and/or placed in foster care due to custodial opioid use.

PART TWO: PREVENTION

A. PREVENT OVER-PRESCRIBING AND ENSURE APPROPRIATE PRESCRIBING AND DISPENSING OF OPIOIDS

Support efforts to prevent over-prescribing and ensure appropriate prescribing and dispensing of opioids through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Funding medical provider education and outreach regarding best prescribing practices for opioids consistent with the Guidelines for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, including providers at hospitals (academic detailing).

2. Training for health care providers regarding safe and responsible opioid prescribing, dosing, and tapering patients off opioids.
3. Continuing Medical Education (CME) on appropriate prescribing of opioids.
4. Providing Support for non-opioid pain treatment alternatives, including training providers to offer or refer to multi-modal, evidence-informed treatment of pain.
5. Supporting enhancements or improvements to Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs (“*PDMPs*”), including, but not limited to, improvements that:
 - a. Increase the number of prescribers using *PDMPs*;
 - b. Improve point-of-care decision-making by increasing the quantity, quality, or format of data available to prescribers using *PDMPs*, by improving the interface that prescribers use to access *PDMP* data, or both; or
 - c. Enable states to use *PDMP* data in support of surveillance or intervention strategies, including MAT referrals and follow-up for individuals identified within *PDMP* data as likely to experience OUD in a manner that complies with all relevant privacy and security laws and rules.
6. Ensuring *PDMPs* incorporate available overdose/naloxone deployment data, including the United States Department of Transportation’s Emergency Medical Technician overdose database in a manner that complies with all relevant privacy and security laws and rules.
7. Increasing electronic prescribing to prevent diversion or forgery.
8. Educating dispensers on appropriate opioid dispensing.

B. PREVENT MISUSE OF OPIOIDS

Support efforts to discourage or prevent misuse of opioids through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Funding media campaigns to prevent opioid misuse.
2. Corrective advertising or affirmative public education campaigns based on evidence.
3. Public education relating to drug disposal.
4. Drug take-back disposal or destruction programs.

5. Funding community anti-drug coalitions that engage in drug prevention efforts.
6. Supporting community coalitions in implementing evidence-informed prevention, such as reduced social access and physical access, stigma reduction—including staffing, educational campaigns, support for people in treatment or recovery, or training of coalitions in evidence-informed implementation, including the Strategic Prevention Framework developed by the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (“SAMHSA”).
7. Engaging non-profits and faith-based communities as systems to support prevention.
8. Funding evidence-based prevention programs in schools or evidence-informed school and community education programs and campaigns for students, families, school employees, school athletic programs, parent-teacher and student associations, and others.
9. School-based or youth-focused programs or strategies that have demonstrated effectiveness in preventing drug misuse and seem likely to be effective in preventing the uptake and use of opioids.
10. Create or support community-based education or intervention services for families, youth, and adolescents at risk for OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
11. Support evidence-informed programs or curricula to address mental health needs of young people who may be at risk of misusing opioids or other drugs, including emotional modulation and resilience skills.
12. Support greater access to mental health services and supports for young people, including services and supports provided by school nurses, behavioral health workers or other school staff, to address mental health needs in young people that (when not properly addressed) increase the risk of opioid or another drug misuse.

C. PREVENT OVERDOSE DEATHS AND OTHER HARMS (HARM REDUCTION)

Support efforts to prevent or reduce overdose deaths or other opioid-related harms through evidence-based or evidence-informed programs or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Increased availability and distribution of naloxone and other drugs that treat overdoses for first responders, overdose patients, individuals with OUD and their friends and family members, schools, community navigators and outreach workers, persons being released from jail or prison, or other members of the general public.
2. Public health entities providing free naloxone to anyone in the community.

3. Training and education regarding naloxone and other drugs that treat overdoses for first responders, overdose patients, patients taking opioids, families, schools, community support groups, and other members of the general public.
4. Enabling school nurses and other school staff to respond to opioid overdoses, and provide them with naloxone, training, and support.
5. Expanding, improving, or developing data tracking software and applications for overdoses/naloxone revivals.
6. Public education relating to emergency responses to overdoses.
7. Public education relating to immunity and Good Samaritan laws.
8. Educating first responders regarding the existence and operation of immunity and Good Samaritan laws.
9. Syringe service programs and other evidence-informed programs to reduce harms associated with intravenous drug use, including supplies, staffing, space, peer support services, referrals to treatment, fentanyl checking, connections to care, and the full range of harm reduction and treatment services provided by these programs.
10. Expanding access to testing and treatment for infectious diseases such as HIV and Hepatitis C resulting from intravenous opioid use.
11. Supporting mobile units that offer or provide referrals to harm reduction services, treatment, recovery supports, health care, or other appropriate services to persons that use opioids or persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
12. Providing training in harm reduction strategies to health care providers, students, peer recovery coaches, recovery outreach specialists, or other professionals that provide care to persons who use opioids or persons with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions.
13. Supporting screening for fentanyl in routine clinical toxicology testing.

PART THREE: OTHER STRATEGIES

A. FIRST RESPONDERS

In addition to items in section C, D and H relating to first responders, support the following:

1. Education of law enforcement or other first responders regarding appropriate practices and precautions when dealing with fentanyl or other drugs.

2. Provision of wellness and support services for first responders and others who experience secondary trauma associated with opioid-related emergency events.

B. LEADERSHIP, PLANNING AND COORDINATION

Support efforts to provide leadership, planning, coordination, facilitations, training and technical assistance to abate the opioid epidemic through activities, programs, or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Statewide, regional, local or community regional planning to identify root causes of addiction and overdose, goals for reducing harms related to the opioid epidemic, and areas and populations with the greatest needs for treatment intervention services, and to support training and technical assistance and other strategies to abate the opioid epidemic described in this opioid abatement strategy list.
2. A dashboard to (a) share reports, recommendations, or plans to spend opioid settlement funds; (b) to show how opioid settlement funds have been spent; (c) to report program or strategy outcomes; or (d) to track, share or visualize key opioid- or health-related indicators and supports as identified through collaborative statewide, regional, local or community processes.
3. Invest in infrastructure or staffing at government or not-for-profit agencies to support collaborative, cross-system coordination with the purpose of preventing overprescribing, opioid misuse, or opioid overdoses, treating those with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, supporting them in treatment or recovery, connecting them to care, or implementing other strategies to abate the opioid epidemic described in this opioid abatement strategy list.
4. Provide resources to staff government oversight and management of opioid abatement programs.

C. TRAINING

In addition to the training referred to throughout this document, support training to abate the opioid epidemic through activities, programs, or strategies that may include, but are not limited to, those that:

1. Provide funding for staff training or networking programs and services to improve the capability of government, community, and not-for-profit entities to abate the opioid crisis.
2. Support infrastructure and staffing for collaborative cross-system coordination to prevent opioid misuse, prevent overdoses, and treat those with OUD and any co-occurring SUD/MH conditions, or implement other strategies to abate the opioid epidemic described in this opioid abatement strategy list (*e.g.*, health care, primary care, pharmacies, PDMPs, etc.).

D. RESEARCH

Support opioid abatement research that may include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Monitoring, surveillance, data collection and evaluation of programs and strategies described in this opioid abatement strategy list.
2. Research non-opioid treatment of chronic pain.
3. Research on improved service delivery for modalities such as SBIRT that demonstrate promising but mixed results in populations vulnerable to opioid use disorders.
4. Research on novel harm reduction and prevention efforts such as the provision of fentanyl test strips.
5. Research on innovative supply-side enforcement efforts such as improved detection of mail-based delivery of synthetic opioids.
6. Expanded research on swift/certain/fair models to reduce and deter opioid misuse within criminal justice populations that build upon promising approaches used to address other substances (*e.g.*, Hawaii HOPE and Dakota 24/7).
7. Epidemiological surveillance of OUD-related behaviors in critical populations, including individuals entering the criminal justice system, including, but not limited to approaches modeled on the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (“ADAM”) system.
8. Qualitative and quantitative research regarding public health risks and harm reduction opportunities within illicit drug markets, including surveys of market participants who sell or distribute illicit opioids.
9. Geospatial analysis of access barriers to MAT and their association with treatment engagement and treatment outcomes.

EXHIBIT F-1
List of States and Pre-Credit Overall Allocation Percentages

Alabama	1.5958653635%
Alaska	0.2283101787%
American Samoa	0.0171221696%
Arizona	2.3755949882%
Arkansas	0.9322152924%
California	9.9213830698%
Colorado	1.6616291219%
Connecticut	1.2938102647%
Delaware	0.4420285052%
District of Columbia	0.1799774824%
Florida	7.0259134409%
Georgia	2.7882080114%
Guam	0.0480366565%
Hawaii	0.3246488040%
Idaho	0.4919080117%
Illinois	3.3263363702%
Indiana	2.2168933059%
Iowa	0.7419256132%
Kansas	0.7840793410%
Kentucky	1.9963344879%
Louisiana	1.4650905059%
Maine	0.5293231313%
Maryland	2.1106090494%
Massachusetts	2.3035761083%
Michigan	3.4020234989%
Minnesota	1.2972597706%
Mississippi	0.8624327860%
Missouri	2.0056475170%
Montana	0.3125481816%
N. Mariana Islands	0.0167059202%
Nebraska	0.4171546352%
Nevada	1.2017657135%
New Hampshire	0.5784834777%
New Jersey	2.7551354545%
New Mexico	0.7989379794%
New York	5.3903813405%
North Carolina	3.2502525994%

North Dakota	0.1700251989%
Ohio	4.3567051408%
Oklahoma	1.5322312508%
Oregon	1.3741405009%
Pennsylvania	4.5882419559%
Puerto Rico	0.7101195950%
Rhode Island	0.4465429178%
South Carolina	1.5393083548%
South Dakota	0.1982071487%
Tennessee	2.6881474977%
Texas	6.2932157196%
Utah	1.1466798699%
Vermont	0.2544890561%
Virgin Islands	0.0315673573%
Virginia	2.2801150757%
Washington	2.3189040182%
West Virginia	1.0567416533%
Wisconsin	1.7582560561%
Wyoming	0.1668134842%

EXHIBIT F-2
List of Eligible Settling States and Overall Allocation Percentages

Alabama	1.89200243102%
Alaska	0.27067660158%
American Samoa	0.02029944832%
Arizona	2.81642273552%
Arkansas	1.10520200495%
California	11.44545606988%
Colorado	1.96996965401%
Connecticut	1.53389641887%
Delaware	0.52405361097%
District of Columbia	0.21337503900%
Georgia	3.30560237492%
Guam	0.05695058797%
Hawaii	0.38489232262%
Idaho	0.58318901784%
Illinois	3.94358862758%
Indiana	2.62827154459%
Iowa	0.87960118435%
Kansas	0.92957717690%
Kentucky	2.36678468650%
Maine	0.62754708146%
Maryland	2.50226462938%
Massachusetts	2.73103965821%
Michigan	4.03332065304%
Minnesota	1.53798603302%
Mississippi	1.02247029410%
Missouri	2.37782588971%
Montana	0.37054624593%
N. Mariana Islands	0.01980595749%
Nebraska	0.49456401641%
Nevada	1.42477160259%
New Hampshire	0.68582987703%
New Jersey	3.26639270254%
New Mexico	0.94719306138%
North Carolina	3.85338635698%
North Dakota	0.20157595806%
Ohio	5.16515798008%
Oklahoma	1.81656004174%

Oregon	1.62913315104%
Pennsylvania	5.43965996948%
Puerto Rico	0.84189307619%
South Carolina	1.82495040990%
South Dakota	0.23498749685%
Tennessee	3.18697411246%
Texas	7.46101752221%
Utah	1.35946374363%
Vermont	0.30171336741%
Virgin Islands	0.03742516012%
Virginia	2.70322507443%
Washington	2.74921189468%
Wisconsin	2.08452718413%
Wyoming	0.19776826088%

EXHIBIT G
Subdivisions and Special Districts Eligible to Receive Direct Allocations from the
Subdivision Fund and Subdivision Fund Allocation Percentages

The Subdivisions and Special Districts set forth on this **Exhibit G** are eligible to receive direct allocations from the Subdivision Fund, if such Subdivisions and Special Districts are otherwise eligible to receive such funds under this Agreement. By default, the Subdivisions and Special Districts set forth on this **Exhibit G** shall include all Subdivisions and Special Districts set forth on **Exhibit G** of the national opioid settlement agreement dated July 21, 2021 with Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al., including all amendments up to the Preliminary Agreement Date of this agreement. A State may elect to add any additional Subdivisions and Special Districts to this **Exhibit G** at any time prior to the Initial Participation Date.

Immediately upon the effectiveness of any State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution allowed by **subsection VIII.E.3** (or upon the effectiveness of an amendment to any State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution allowed by **subsection VIII.E.3**) that addresses allocation from the Subdivision Fund, whether before or after the Initial Participation Date, this **Exhibit G** will automatically be amended to reflect the allocation from the Subdivision Fund pursuant to the State-Subdivision Agreement, Allocation Statute, Statutory Trust, or voluntary redistribution allowed by **subsection VIII.E.3**.

For the avoidance of doubt, inclusion on this **Exhibit G** shall not create any claim for any amount of the Settlement Fund, and no such amounts shall be allocated or distributed to any Subdivision or Special District included herein if such Subdivision or Special District does not otherwise meet all requirements to receive any such funds pursuant to the Agreement.

(List Forthcoming)

EXHIBIT H
[Intentionally Omitted]

EXHIBIT I
Subdivisions with a Population Greater than 10,000¹

(See Distributors' Exhibit I)

¹ Entities denoted with an asterisk (*) are Primary Subdivisions with a population greater than 30,000. All other entities listed have populations greater than 10,000 but less than 30,000.

EXHIBIT J-1
AbbVie Entities

EXHIBIT J-2
Allergan Entities

EXHIBIT J-3
Divested Entities

EXHIBIT K
Subdivision and Special District Settlement Participation Form

Governmental Entity:	State:
Authorized Official:	
Address 1:	
Address 2:	
City, State, Zip:	
Phone:	
Email:	

The governmental entity identified above (“*Governmental Entity*”), in order to obtain and in consideration for the benefits provided to the Governmental Entity pursuant to the Agreement dated November 22, 2022 (“*Allergan Settlement*”), and acting through the undersigned authorized official, hereby elects to participate in the Allergan Settlement, release all Released Claims against all Released Entities, and agrees as follows.

1. The Governmental Entity is aware of and has reviewed the Allergan Settlement, understands that all terms in this Election and Release have the meanings defined therein, and agrees that by this Election, the Governmental Entity elects to participate in the Allergan Settlement as provided therein.
2. Following the execution of this Settlement Participation Form, the Governmental Entity shall comply with Section III.B of the Allergan Settlement regarding Cessation of Litigation Activities.
3. The Governmental Entity shall, within fourteen (14) days of the Reference Date and prior to the filing of the Consent Judgment, file a request to dismiss with prejudice any Released Claims that it has filed. With respect to any Released Claims pending in *In re National Prescription Opiate Litigation*, MDL No. 2804, the Governmental Entity authorizes the MDL Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee to execute and file on behalf of the Governmental Entity a Stipulation of Dismissal With Prejudice substantially in the form found at [link to national settlement website page to be provided].
4. The Governmental Entity agrees to the terms of the Allergan Settlement pertaining to Subdivisions and Special Districts as defined therein.
5. By agreeing to the terms of the Allergan Settlement and becoming a Releasor, the Governmental Entity is entitled to the benefits provided therein, including, if applicable, monetary payments beginning after the Effective Date.
6. The Governmental Entity agrees to use any monies it receives through the Allergan Settlement solely for the purposes provided therein.

7. The Governmental Entity submits to the jurisdiction of the court in the Governmental Entity's state where the Consent Judgment is filed for purposes limited to that court's role as provided in, and for resolving disputes to the extent provided in, the Allergan Settlement.
8. The Governmental Entity has the right to enforce the Allergan Settlement as provided therein.
9. The Governmental Entity, as a Participating Subdivision or Participating Special District, hereby becomes a Releasor for all purposes in the Allergan Settlement, including, but not limited to, all provisions of **Section V (Release)**, and along with all departments, agencies, divisions, boards, commissions, Subdivisions, districts, instrumentalities of any kind and attorneys, and any person in their official capacity whether elected or appointed to serve any of the foregoing and any agency, person, or other entity claiming by or through any of the foregoing, and any other entity identified in the definition of Releasor, provides for a release to the fullest extent of its authority. As a Releasor, the Governmental Entity hereby absolutely, unconditionally, and irrevocably covenants not to bring, file, or claim, or to cause, assist in bringing, or permit to be brought, filed, or claimed, or to otherwise seek to establish liability for any Released Claims against any Released Entity in any forum whatsoever. The releases provided for in the Allergan Settlement are intended to be broad and shall be interpreted so as to give the Released Entities the broadest possible bar against any liability relating in any way to Released Claims and extend to the full extent of the power of the Governmental Entity to release claims. The Allergan Settlement shall be a complete bar to any Released Claim.
10. The Governmental Entity hereby takes on all rights and obligations of a Participating Subdivision or Participating Special District as set forth in the Allergan Settlement.
11. In connection with the releases provided for in the Allergan Settlement, each Governmental Entity expressly waives, releases, and forever discharges any and all provisions, rights, and benefits conferred by any law of any state or territory of the United States or other jurisdiction, or principle of common law, which is similar, comparable, or equivalent to § 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

General Release; extent. A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release that, if known by him or her, would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party.

A Releasor may hereafter discover facts other than or different from those which it knows, believes, or assumes to be true with respect to the Released Claims, but each Governmental Entity hereby expressly waives and fully, finally, and forever settles, releases and discharges, upon the Effective Date, any and all Released Claims that may exist as of such date but which Releasors do not know or suspect to exist, whether through ignorance, oversight, error, negligence or through no fault whatsoever, and which, if known, would

materially affect the Governmental Entities' decision to participate in the Allergan Settlement.

12. Nothing herein is intended to modify in any way the terms of the Allergan Settlement, to which the Governmental Entity hereby agrees. To the extent this Settlement Participation Form is interpreted differently from the Allergan Settlement in any respect, the Allergan Settlement controls.

I have all necessary power and authorization to execute this Settlement Participation Form on behalf of the Governmental Entity.

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

EXHIBIT L
Settlement Fund Administrator

(Plaintiffs to Add)

EXHIBIT M-1
Payment Schedule

EXHIBIT M-1: PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Payment Year	Additional Restitution Amount & All Attorneys' Fees & Costs Funds	Base Payments (45%)	Incentives A, B, & C (maximum) (48%)	Incentive D Part 1 (maximum) (3.5%)	Incentive D Part 2 (maximum) (3.5%)	Total Abatement	Overall Total
Year 1 2023: Effective Date + 30 days	\$55,774,789.29	\$257,026,678.71	---	---	---	\$257,026,678.71	\$312,801,468.00
Year 2 July 15, 2024	\$55,774,789.29	\$113,091,738.63	\$143,934,940.08	---	---	\$257,026,678.71	\$312,801,468.00
Year 3 July 15, 2025	\$55,774,789.27	\$113,091,738.63	\$143,934,940.08	---	---	\$257,026,678.71	\$312,801,467.98
Year 4 July 15, 2026	\$55,774,789.27	\$81,605,970.49	\$143,934,940.08	\$31,485,768.14	---	\$257,026,678.71	\$312,801,467.98
Year 5 July 15, 2027	---	\$81,605,970.50	\$143,934,940.08	\$31,485,768.14	---	\$257,026,678.72	\$257,026,678.72
Year 6 July 15, 2028	---	\$81,605,970.50	\$143,934,940.08	---	\$31,485,768.14	\$257,026,678.72	\$257,026,678.72
Year 7 July 15, 2029	---	\$81,605,970.49	\$143,934,940.08	---	\$31,485,768.15	\$257,026,678.72	\$257,026,678.72
Total	\$223,099,157.12	\$809,634,037.95	\$863,609,640.48	\$62,971,536.28	\$62,971,536.29	\$1,799,186,751.00	\$2,022,285,908.12

NOTES:

1. All figures for the base and incentive payments are maximum figures that reflect the following:
 - The credits amount of \$350,686,276 for prior settlements, including San Francisco, have already been applied.
 - An assumption that all Eligible States are Settling States.
 - An assumption that all incentives are earned.

2. The Additional Restitution Amount and the state and subdivision fees and costs amounts are broken out into separate columns in Exhibit M-2.

3. Any offsets under Section VII.C for Non-Settling States would be deducted from the base payments and the maximum incentive payments (A, B & C and D) by subtracting from all payments the amount of the payment times the State Allocation Percentage assigned to each Non-Settling State in Exhibit F-2.

**EXHIBIT M-2: PAYMENT SCHEDULE FOR FEE FUNDS, COST FUNDS AND ADDITIONAL RESTITUTION
(Breakdown of Second Column in Exhibit M-1)**

Payment Year	Attorney Fee and Cost Fund (Subdivisions)	State Cost Fund	State Outside Counsel Fee Fund	Additional Restitution Amount	Total (Shown in Ex. M-1, 2nd Column)
Year 1 2023: Effective Date + 30 days	\$46,778,855.53	\$3,598,373.50	\$2,698,780.13	\$2,698,780.13	\$55,774,789.29
Year 2 July 15, 2024	\$46,778,855.53	---	\$4,497,966.88	\$4,497,966.88	\$55,774,789.29
Year 3 July 15, 2025	\$46,778,855.52	---	\$4,497,966.88	\$4,497,966.87	\$55,774,789.27
Year 4 July 15, 2026	\$46,778,855.52	---	\$4,497,966.87	\$4,497,966.88	\$55,774,789.27
Total	\$187,115,422.10	\$3,598,373.50	\$16,192,680.76	\$16,192,680.76	\$223,099,157.12

EXHIBIT N
Additional Restitution Amount Allocation

Alabama	2.3235064275%
American Samoa	0.0249290899%
Arizona	3.4587568289%
Arkansas	1.3572625067%
California	14.4450765453%
Colorado	2.4192554291%
Connecticut	1.8837281232%
District of Columbia	0.2620389205%
Guam	0.0699391581%
Illinois	4.8429924684%
Indiana	3.2276944929%
Iowa	1.0802095029%
Kansas	1.1415833881%
Maine	0.7706700866%
Maryland	3.0729495134%
Massachusetts	3.3539006587%
Michigan	4.9531894399%
Minnesota	1.8887504448%
Missouri	2.9201303591%
Montana	0.4550557494%
N. Mariana Islands	0.0243230499%
Nebraska	0.6073579252%
New Hampshire	0.8422452854%
New Jersey	4.0113502576%
North Carolina	4.7322180042%
North Dakota	0.2475488543%
Oregon	2.0006852452%
Pennsylvania	6.6802688492%
South Carolina	2.2411620291%
Tennessee	3.9138188795%
Texas	9.1626320793%
Utah	1.6695130485%
Vermont	0.3705243381%
Virgin Islands	0.0459606175%
Virginia	3.3197424763%
Washington	3.3762173891%
Wisconsin	2.5599397925%
Wyoming	0.2428727457%

EXHIBIT O
Adoption of a State-Subdivision Agreement

A State-Subdivision Agreement shall be applied if it meets the requirements of **Section VIII** and is approved by the State and by the State's Subdivisions as follows:

1. *Requirements for Approval.* A State-Subdivision Agreement shall be deemed as agreed to when it has been approved by the State and either (a) Subdivisions whose aggregate "Population Percentages," determined as set forth below, total more than sixty percent (60%), or (b) Subdivisions whose aggregate Population Percentages total more than fifty percent (50%) provided that these Participating Subdivisions also represent fifteen percent (15%) or more of the State's counties or parishes (or, in the case of Settling States whose counties and parishes do not function as local governments, 15% of or more of the Settling State's non-county Subdivisions), by number.
2. *Approval Authority.* Approval by the State shall be by the Attorney General. Approval by a Subdivision shall be by the appropriate official or legislative body pursuant to the required procedures for that Subdivision to agree to a legally binding settlement.
3. *Population Percentage Calculation.* For purposes of this **Exhibit O** only, Population Percentages shall be determined as follows: For States with functional counties or parishes¹, the Population Percentage of each county or parish shall be deemed to be equal to (a) (1) two hundred percent (200%) of the population of such county or parish, minus (2) the aggregate population of all Primary Incorporated Municipalities located in such county or parish, divided by (b) two hundred percent (200%) of the State's population. A "Primary Incorporated Municipality" means a city, town, village or other municipality incorporated under applicable state law with a population of at least 25,000 that is not located within another incorporated municipality. The Population Percentage of each Primary Incorporated Municipality shall be equal to its population (including the population of any incorporated or unincorporated municipality located therein) divided by two hundred percent (200%) of the State's population; *provided* that the Population Percentage of a Primary Incorporated Municipality that is not located within a county shall be equal to two hundred percent (200%) of its population (including the population of any incorporated or unincorporated municipality located therein) divided by two hundred percent (200%) of the State's population. For all States that do not have functional counties or parishes, the Population Percentage of each non-county Subdivision

¹ Certain states do not have counties or parishes that have functional governments, including Alaska, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

(including any incorporated or unincorporated municipality located therein), shall be equal to its population divided by the State's population.

4. *Preexisting Agreements and Statutory Provisions.* A State may include with the notice to its Subdivisions an existing agreement, a proposed agreement, or statutory provisions regarding the distribution and use of settlement funds and have the acceptance of such an agreement or statutory provision be part of the requirements to be an Initial Participating Subdivision.
5. *Revised Agreements.* A State-Subdivision Agreement that has been revised, supplemented, or refined shall be applied if it meets the requirements of **Section VIII** and is approved by the State and by the State's Subdivisions pursuant to the terms above.

EXHIBIT P
Injunctive Relief

I. DEFINITIONS

- A. “*Health Care Provider(s)*” means any physician or other health care practitioner who is licensed to provide health care services or to prescribe pharmaceutical medications and any medical facility, practice, hospital, clinic, pharmacy, or any other health facility that provides health care services or prescribes or dispenses pharmaceutical medications.
- B. “*In-Kind Support*” means payment or assistance in the form of goods, commodities, services, or anything else of value.
- C. “*Lobby*” and “*Lobbying*” shall have the same meaning as “lobbying activities” and “lobbying contacts” under the federal lobbying disclosure act, 2 U.S.C. § 1602 *et seq.*, and any analogous state or local provisions governing the person or entity being lobbied. As used in this document, “Lobby” and “Lobbying” include Lobbying directly or indirectly, through grantees or Third Parties.
- D. “*Opioid(s)*” means all naturally occurring, synthetic, or semisynthetic substances that interact with mu-opioid receptors primarily in the central nervous system and have demonstrated addictive properties.
- E. “*Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Product(s)*” shall mean any pharmaceutical product that has been approved by the U.S. Food & Drug Administration (“FDA”) and expressly indicated for the treatment of a specified “Opioid-induced” side effect (such as Movantik® which is “an opioid antagonist indicated for the treatment of opioid-induced constipation”). The term “Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Product(s)” shall not include pharmaceutical products that may treat medical conditions that may also be side effects of Opioids or Opioid Products or that may treat someone who uses or has a history of using Opioids or Opioid Products and was diagnosed with certain medical conditions (e.g., anxiety, depression, and Hepatitis C), unless the FDA approved indication states that it is approved to treat a specific “Opioid-induced” side effect by expressly referencing that the side effect was caused by an Opioid or Opioid Product (e.g., “Opioid-induced”). Also, by way of example, the term “Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Product(s)” shall not include the following pharmaceutical medications: BOTOX®, CELEXA®, FETIZMA®, HUMIRA®, LEXAPRO®, LINZESS®, NIMBEX®, ORIAHNN®, ORILISSA®, QULIPTA®, RINVOQ®, SAVELLA®, UBRELVY®, ULTANE®, ULTANE NOVAPLUS®, VIBERZI®, or VIEKIRA PAK®.
- F. “*Opioid Product(s)*” means all past, current, and future medications containing Opioids approved by the FDA and listed by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (“DEA”) as Schedule II, III, or IV drugs pursuant to the federal Controlled

Substances Act (including but not limited to buprenorphine, codeine, fentanyl, hydrocodone, hydromorphone, meperidine, methadone, morphine, oxycodone, oxymorphone, tapentadol, and tramadol). The term “Opioid Product(s)” shall not include (1) methadone, buprenorphine, and other substances when used exclusively to treat opioid abuse, addiction, OUD, or overdose; or (2) raw materials, immediate precursors, and/or active pharmaceutical ingredients (“APIs”) used in the manufacture or study of Opioids or Opioid Products, but only when such materials, immediate precursors, and/or APIs are sold or marketed exclusively to DEA-licensed manufacturers or DEA-licensed researchers. Also, by way of example, the terms “Opioid(s)” and “Opioid Product(s)” shall not include pharmaceutical medications that may relieve pain but not by interacting with mu-opioid receptors primarily in the central nervous system, such as BOTOX®, CELEXA®, FETIZMA®, HUMIRA®, LEXAPRO®, LINZESS®, NIMBEX®, ORIAHNN®, ORILISSA®, QULIPTA®, RINVOQ®, SAVELLA®, UBRELVY®, ULTANE®, ULTANE NOVAPLUS®, VIBERZI®, or VIEKIRA PAK®.

- G. “*OUD*” means opioid use disorder defined in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM–5)*, as updated or amended.
- H. “*Settling State*” shall mean each State or United States territory that meets the participation requirements for becoming a Settling State under **Section II** of the Allergan Public Global Settlement Agreement and then participates in the Allergan Public Global Settlement Agreement.
- I. “*Promote*,” “*Promoting*,” “*Promotion*,” and “*Promotional*” shall mean dissemination of information or other practices intended or that could reasonably be anticipated to increase the sale, prescription, or utilization of prescription products or that attempt to influence prescribing practices or formulary decisions in the Settling States.
- J. “*Third Party(ies)*” means any person or entity other than Allergan or a Releasor.
- K. “*Treatment of Pain*” means the provision of therapeutic modalities to alleviate or reduce pain.
- L. “*Unbranded Information*” means any information that does not identify a specific branded or generic product.

II. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Allergan does not currently manufacture, sell, Promote, or Lobby for any Opioids or Opioid Products. As provided below, Allergan shall not manufacture, sell, Promote, or Lobby for any Opioids or Opioid Products in or for distribution in the Settling States or in a manner that directly affects the Settling States. However, the Parties acknowledge that certain Opioids or Opioid Products sold by Allergan prior to 2021 may still be circulating in the marketplace outside the possession and control of Allergan and the same is not a breach of any terms within this **Exhibit P**. Further, Allergan does not currently manufacture, sell, Promote, or Lobby for any Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Products, and does not have any current intentions to do so in the

future. For the avoidance of doubt, only the Settling States shall have the ability to enforce the terms of this Agreement.

For purposes of this **Exhibit P** only, *Allergan* means Allergan Finance, LLC (f/k/a Actavis, Inc., which, in turn, was f/k/a Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.), Allergan Limited (f/k/a Allergan plc which, in turn, was f/k/a Actavis plc), and AbbVie Inc., and each of their respective parents (as applicable), subsidiaries, successors, affiliates, and officers, directors, employees, representatives, and agents under the control of the foregoing.

A. Compliance Duration

1. Unless addressed in Section II.A.2 below, each term of Section II of this **Exhibit P** shall be effective for ten (10) years from the Effective Date and is limited to conduct that involves or affects the Settling States.
2. The provisions of Section II.H.1, Section II.H.2, and Section II.I shall not be subject to any term.
3. Nothing in this **Exhibit P** shall relieve Allergan of its independent obligation to fully comply with the laws of the Settling States before or after expiration of the injunction period specified in this subsection.

B. Ban on Selling and Manufacturing Opioids

1. Allergan shall not manufacture or sell any Opioids or Opioid Products for distribution in the Settling States. Allergan represents that Kadian® and Norco® were voluntarily discontinued by the end of 2020 and that the last inventory shipped will expire on or before June 30, 2023.

C. Ban on Promotion

1. Allergan shall not engage in Promotion of Opioids or Opioid Products, including but not limited to, by:
 - a. Employing or contracting with sales representatives, Health Care Providers, any Third Party, or other persons to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products to (i) Health Care Providers, (ii) patients, (iii) third-party payors (e.g., any entity, other than an individual, that pays or reimburses for the dispensing of prescription medicines, including but not limited to managed care organizations and pharmacy benefit managers), or (iv) persons involved in determining formulary access or treatment guidelines to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products;
 - b. Using speakers, key opinion leaders, thought leaders, lecturers, and/or speaking events for Promotion of Opioids or Opioid Products;

- c. Creating or distributing (directly or indirectly through Third Parties) Promotional materials (such as advertisements) that Promote Opioids or Opioid Products, including but not limited to brochures, newsletters, pamphlets, journals, books, guides, websites or internet advertisements, social media accounts or networks, and providing hyperlinks, engaging in internet search engine optimization, or otherwise directing internet traffic by improving rankings or making content appear among the top results in an internet search or otherwise be more visible or more accessible to the public on the internet to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products; and
 - d. Disseminating Unbranded Information (such as about a medical condition or disease state) that contains links to branded Promotional information about Opioids or Opioid Products or that generates data that Allergan uses to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products.
- 2. Allergan shall not engage in the following specific Promotion of Treatment of Pain to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products.
 - a. Allergan shall not Promote the Treatment of Pain to Promote Opioids, except that Allergan may continue to Promote the Treatment of Pain with non-Opioids.
 - b. Allergan shall not knowingly Promote the Treatment of Pain to Promote Opioids through Third Parties, except that Allergan may continue to Promote the Treatment of Pain with non-Opioids.
 - c. Allergan shall not Promote the concept that pain is undertreated to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products.
 - d. Allergan shall not knowingly Promote the concept that pain is undertreated through Third Parties to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products.
- 3. Allergan shall not engage in the following specific Promotion of Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Products to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products.
 - a. Allergan shall not Promote Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Products with or by referring directly to Opioids or Opioid Products (including with Unbranded Information).
 - b. Allergan shall not knowingly Promote Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Products with or by referring directly to Opioids or Opioid Products through Third Parties.

- c. Nothing in this section shall prevent Allergan from conveying the information contained in an FDA-approved label in the course of Promotion of Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Products.
4. Section II.C.1-3 is not intended and shall not be interpreted to prohibit or restrict any and all discussions or references to Opioids or Opioid Products or any Allergan conduct (including Promotion) related to non-Opioid Products (including those that are approved for the Treatment of Pain or Opioid-Induced Side Effects Treatment Products) when doing so is not to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products, including, for example, (a) if certain patient populations, such as those with a history of abuse of Opioids or Opioid Products, are identified as having a higher prevalence of other conditions, such as Hepatitis C, or being appropriate candidates for treatment of those other conditions, (b) if such discussions or references relate to products that may treat medical conditions that may also be side effects of Opioids or Opioid Products (e.g., anxiety, depression, and Hepatitis C), and/or (c) if such discussions or references relate to the Promotion of BOTOX®, CELEXA®, FETIZMA®, HUMIRA®, LEXAPRO®, LINZESS®, NIMBEX®, ORIAHNN®, ORILISSA®, QULIPTA®, RINVOQ®, SAVELLA®, UBRELVY®, ULTANE®, ULTANE NOVAPLUS®, VIBERZI®, or VIEKIRA PAK®.
5. Notwithstanding Sections II.C.1-3 directly above, Allergan may engage in non-Promotional conduct, including but not limited to the following:
 - a. Maintain a corporate website that includes Opioid Products on company's list of products that contains principally the following content: the FDA-approved package insert, medication guide, and labeling;
 - b. Maintain a product website for any Opioid Product that contains principally the following content: the FDA-approved package insert, medication guide, and labeling, and a statement directing patients or caregivers to speak with a licensed Health Care Provider;
 - c. Provide the following factual information about Opioid Products sold by Allergan prior to 2021 which may still be circulating in the marketplace outside the possession and control of Allergan: an Opioid Product's NDC, SKU, or other relevant information such as formulation, package size, dosage, or pricing;
 - d. Provide or collect information or support the provision or collection of information as expressly required by law or any state or federal government agency with jurisdiction in the Settling State where the information is provided (including but not limited to collecting and/or reporting adverse events related to Opioid Products);

- e. Provide the following by mail, electronic mail, on or through Allergan's corporate or product websites, or through other electronic or digital methods: FDA-approved package insert, medication guide, and labeling for Opioid Products, or other prescribing information for Opioid Products that are published or approved by a state or federal government agency with jurisdiction in the Settling State where the information is provided;
 - f. Provide scientific and/or medical information in response to an unsolicited request by a Health Care Provider consistent with FDA standards, rules, regulations, and/or guidance, including, but not limited to, *Responding to Unsolicited Requests for Off-Label Information About Prescription Drugs and Medical Devices* (Dec. 2011) as updated or amended by the FDA, and Guidance for Industry, *Good Reprint Practices for the Distribution of Medical Journal Articles and Medical or Scientific Reference Publications on Unapproved New Uses of Approved Drugs and Approved or Cleared Medical Devices* (Jan. 2009) as updated or amended by the FDA;
 - g. Provide a response to any unsolicited question or request from a patient or caregiver, directing the patient or caregiver to the FDA-approved package insert, medication guide, and labeling for Opioid Products, to speak with a licensed Health Care Provider without describing the safety or effectiveness of any Opioid Product or naming any specific Health Care Provider, or to speak with their health insurance carrier regarding coverage of an Opioid Product;
 - h. Provide Health Care Economic Information, as defined at 21 U.S.C. § 352(a), to a payor, formulary committee, or other similar entity with knowledge and expertise in the area of health care economic analysis consistent with FDA standards, rules, regulations, and/or guidance, including, but not limited to, FDA's Draft Questions and Answers Guidance for Industry and Review Staff, *Drug and Device Manufacturer Communications With Payors, Formulary Committees, and Similar Entities* (Jan. 2018), as updated or amended by the FDA;
 - i. Conduct or provide financial support or In-Kind Support for bona fide scientific research; and
 - j. Draft, publish, or provide financial support or In-Kind Support for bona fide scientific publications.
6. To the extent that Allergan engages in conduct permitted by Section II.C.4 and 5 above, Allergan shall do so in a manner that is truthful, non-misleading, accurate, and non-deceptive.

D. No Financial Reward or Discipline Based on Volume of Opioid Product Sales

1. Allergan shall not provide financial incentives to its sales and marketing employees or discipline its sales and marketing employees based upon sales volume or sales quotas for Opioid Products.
2. Allergan shall not offer or pay any remuneration (including any compensation or rebate), directly or indirectly (e.g., through Third Parties), to any person in return for the prescribing, sale, use, or distribution of an Opioid Product (except to the extent a pre-existing contractual or legal requirement exists related to Opioid Products sold by Allergan before 2021).

E. Ban on Funding/Grants to Third Parties

1. Allergan shall not directly or indirectly provide financial support or In-Kind Support to any Third Party regarding conduct that Promotes Opioids or Opioid Products, including educational programs, brochures, newsletters, pamphlets, journals, books, guides, websites, or social media accounts or networks that Promote Opioids or Opioid Products, including Promoting Opioids or Opioid Products through the Promotion of Treatment of Pain, but excluding financial support otherwise required by this **Exhibit P**, a court order, a federal or state agency (e.g., FDA-approved Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMs)), or a federal or state law or regulation.
2. Allergan shall not directly or indirectly provide financial support or In-Kind Support to any Third Party for medical education programs to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products.
3. Allergan shall not create, sponsor, provide financial support or In-Kind Support to, or otherwise operate or control, any medical society or patient advocacy group related to conduct that Promotes Opioids or Opioid Products (including Promoting Opioids or Opioid Products through the Promotion of Treatment of Pain).
4. Allergan shall not provide links to any Third Party website or materials or otherwise distribute materials created by a Third Party for the purpose of Promoting Opioids or Opioid Products (including Promoting Opioids or Opioid Products through the Promotion of Treatment of Pain).
5. Allergan shall not use, assist, or employ any Third Party to engage in any activity that Allergan itself would be prohibited from engaging in pursuant to this **Exhibit P**. To the extent Allergan supports trade groups engaged in Lobbying, Allergan shall notify the trade groups at the time it makes its trade association payments that Allergan's support shall not be used to encourage the use of Opioids or Opioid Products or discourage the use of non-Opioids or Opioid Products for the purpose of indirectly encouraging

the use of Opioids or Opioid Products (but shall not be responsible for how the trade group ultimately uses the support provided because it is outside of Allergan's control).

6. Allergan shall not enter into any contract or agreement with any person or entity or otherwise attempt to influence any person or entity in such a manner that has the purpose or foreseeable effect of limiting the dissemination of information regarding the risks and side effects of using Opioids or Opioid Products.
7. No officer or Vice President-level employee of Allergan may concurrently serve as a director, board member, employee, agent, or officer of any entity that primarily engages in conduct that Promotes Opioids or Opioid Products. Nothing in this provision shall preclude an officer or Vice President-level employee of Allergan from concurrently serving on the board of a hospital.
8. Allergan shall play no role in appointing persons to the board, or hiring persons to the staff, of any Third Party that primarily engages in conduct that Promotes Opioids or Opioid Products. For avoidance of doubt, nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit Allergan from fully and accurately responding to unsolicited requests or inquiries about a person's fitness to serve as an employee or board member at any such Third Party.

F. Lobbying Restrictions

1. Allergan shall not Lobby for the enactment of any federal, state, or local legislative or regulatory provision that:
 - a. Encourages or requires Health Care Providers to prescribe Opioids or Opioid Products or sanctions Health Care Providers for failing to prescribe Opioids or failing to treat pain with Opioids;
 - b. Has the effect of limiting access to any non-Opioid alternative pain treatments; or
 - c. Pertains to the classification of any Opioid or Opioid Product as a scheduled drug under the Controlled Substances Act.
2. Allergan shall not Lobby against the enactment of any federal, state, or local legislative or regulatory provision that supports:
 - a. The use of non-pharmacologic therapy and/or non-Opioid pharmacologic therapy to treat chronic pain over or instead of Opioids or Opioid Products, including but not limited to Third Party payment or reimbursement for such therapies;

- b. The use and/or prescription of immediate release Opioids or Opioid Products instead of extended-release Opioids or Opioid Products when an Opioid or Opioid Product is initiated, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for such prescriptions;
 - c. The prescribing of the lowest effective dose of an Opioid or Opioid Product, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for such prescriptions;
 - d. The limitation of initial prescriptions of Opioids or Opioid Products to treat acute pain;
 - e. The prescribing and other means of distribution of naloxone to minimize the risk of overdose, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for naloxone;
 - f. The use of urine testing before starting use of Opioids or Opioid Products and annual urine testing when Opioids or Opioid Products are prescribed, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for such testing;
 - g. Evidence-based treatment (such as using medication-assisted treatment with buprenorphine or methadone in combination with behavioral therapies) for OUD, including but not limited to Third Party reimbursement or payment for such treatment; or
 - h. The implementation or use of disposal systems when solely related to Opioids or Opioid Products (versus of general applicability to all pharmaceutical medications, for example).
3. Allergan shall not Lobby against the enactment of any federal, state, or local legislative or regulatory provision expanding the operation or use of Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs (“PDMPs”), including but not limited to provisions requiring Health Care Providers to review PDMPs when Opioid Product use is initiated and with every prescription thereafter.
4. Notwithstanding the foregoing restrictions in Sections II.F.1-3, the following conduct is not restricted:
- a. Challenging the enforcement or interpretation of (including, but not limited to, suing for declaratory or injunctive relief) any laws, rules, or regulations;
 - b. Communications by Allergan in response to a law, rule, regulation, or order requiring such communication;

- c. Communications by an Allergan representative appearing before a federal or state legislative, administrative, or regulatory body, committee, or subcommittee as a result of a mandatory order or subpoena commanding that person or Allergan's designee to testify;
- d. Responding, in a manner consistent with this **Exhibit P**, to an unsolicited request for the input on the passage of legislation or the promulgation of any rule or regulation when such request is submitted in writing specifically to Allergan from a government entity directly involved in the passage of that legislation or promulgation of that rule or regulation; or
- e. Lobbying for or against provisions of legislation, rule, or regulation that address subjects other than those identified in Sections II.F.1-3, so long as Allergan does not support specific portions of such legislation, rule, or regulation covered by Section II.F.1 or oppose specific portions of such legislation, rule, or regulation covered by Sections II.F.2-3. Allergan may Lobby for or against any legislation, rule, or regulation that may be covered by Sections II.F.1-3, if such legislation, rule, or regulation has general or specific provisions that affect medications beyond Opioids or Opioid Products, so long as Allergan's intent and purpose of doing so is not to Promote Opioids or Opioid Products.

G. Ban on Prescription Savings Programs

- 1. Allergan shall not directly or indirectly offer any discounts, coupons, rebates, or other methods which have the effect of reducing or eliminating a patient's co-payments or the cost of prescriptions (e.g., free trial prescriptions) for any Opioid Product (except to the extent a pre-existing contractual or legal requirement exists related to Opioid Products sold by Allergan before 2021).
- 2. Allergan shall not directly or indirectly provide financial support to any Third Party for discounts, coupons, rebates, or other methods which have the effect of reducing or eliminating a patient's co-payments or the cost of prescriptions (e.g., free trial prescriptions) for any Opioid Product (except to the extent a pre-existing contractual or legal requirement exists related to Opioid Products sold by Allergan before 2021).
- 3. Allergan shall not directly or indirectly assist patients or Health Care Providers with the claims and/or prior authorization process required for third-party payors to approve payment for any Opioid Product.
- 4. Allergan may directly or indirectly provide financial support or In-Kind Support for non-Opioids to any Third Party that provides patient assistance

or support services for the purposes of helping patients afford and gain access to the medications prescribed to them.

H. General Terms

1. Allergan shall not make any written or oral statement about Opioids or any Opioid Product that is unfair, false, misleading, deceptive or unconscionable as defined under the law of the Settling States. For purposes of this paragraph, “Opioid Product” shall also include methadone, buprenorphine, and other substances when used exclusively to treat opioid abuse, addiction, or overdose.
2. Allergan shall not represent that Opioids or any Opioid Product(s) have approvals, characteristics, uses, benefits, or qualities that they do not have. For purposes of this paragraph, “Opioid Product” shall also include methadone, buprenorphine, and other substances when used exclusively to treat opioid abuse, addiction, or overdose.
3. This **Exhibit P** shall not be construed or used as a waiver or limitation of any defense otherwise available to Allergan or any Released Entity in any action, and nothing in this **Exhibit P** is intended to or shall be construed to prohibit Allergan or any Released Entity in any way whatsoever from taking legal or factual positions with regard to any Opioid Products in prosecution or defense of litigation or other legal proceedings.
4. Upon the request of the Attorney General of any Settling State, Allergan shall provide the Attorney General with copies of the following, within forty-five (45) days of the request:
 - a. Any litigation or civil or criminal law enforcement subpoenas or CID relating to Allergan’s Opioid Product(s) that Allergan received after the Effective Date of the Agreement; and
 - b. Warning or untitled letters issued by the FDA regarding Allergan’s Opioid Product(s) and all correspondence between Allergan and the FDA related to such letters that Allergan received after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
5. Nothing in this **Exhibit P** shall be construed to limit or impair Allergan’s ability to:
 - a. Communicate its positions and/or respond to media inquiries concerning litigation, investigations, or other proceedings or matters relating to Allergan or its Opioid Products.
 - b. Maintain a website explaining its litigation positions and responding to allegations concerning Allergan or its Opioid Products.

I. Compliance with All State Laws and Regulations Relating to the Sale, Promotion, and Distribution of Any Opioid Product

1. Allergan shall comply with all applicable State laws and regulations that relate to the sale, Promotion, distribution, and disposal of Opioids or Opioid Products in the Settling States, provided that nothing in this paragraph requires Allergan to violate federal law or regulations, including but not limited to:
 - a. State Controlled Substances Act, including all guidance issued by the applicable state regulator(s);
 - b. State Consumer Protection Laws; and
 - c. State laws, regulations, and guidelines related to the prescribing, distribution, and disposal of Opioid Products.

J. Clinical Data Transparency

1. Allergan agrees to make available to an independent Third-Party data center or platform owner (e.g., Vivli) anonymized clinical data generated from Allergan-sponsored Phase II-IV interventional clinical studies—regardless of whether that data was submitted to a regulatory authority (e.g., FDA)—for branded opioid drugs that are Opioids or Opioid Products that have received an initial marketing authorization from a regulatory authority to the extent Allergan conducts a reasonable, good faith investigation to locate any such data and it is in Allergan’s possession. Anonymized clinical data includes:
 - a. Full analyzable data set(s) (including individual participant-level data de-identified);
 - b. The clinical study report(s) redacted for commercial or personal identifying information;
 - c. The full protocol(s) (including the initial version, final version, and all amendments); and
2. Full statistical analysis plan(s) (including all amendments and documentation for additional work processes); and Dataset Specifications, which describe the available dataset variables (such as age, race, blood pressure, lab values, etc.).
3. The independent Third Party will facilitate the disclosure of such clinical data to qualified researchers with a bona fide scientific research proposal as reviewed and approved by an independent review panel for scientific merit consistent with the panel’s assessment criteria and pursuant to an agreed upon data use agreement.

4. Allergan shall not interfere with decisions made by the staff or reviewers associated with the independent Third-Party data center or platform owner.
5. Allergan shall bear all costs for making clinical data available pursuant to Section II.J.1 of this **Exhibit P**.

III. DOCUMENT DISCLOSURE

A. Documents Subject to Public Disclosure

The following documents must be provided to each Settling State and are subject to public disclosure in perpetuity, except for the redactions authorized by section B:

1. All Allergan-produced documents admitted as trial exhibits in *In re Opioid Litigation*, Index No. 400000/2017 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Suffolk County), *The City and County of San Francisco, California and the People of the State of California, acting by and through San Francisco City Attorney David Chiu v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-07591 (N.D. Cal.), *The State of West Virginia ex rel. Patrick Morrissey, Attorney General v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., et al.*, Civil Action No. 19-C-104 BNE (W. Va. Cir. Ct., Boone County), or *The People of the State of California, acting by and through Santa Clara County Counsel James R. Williams, Orange County District Attorney Tony Rackauckas, Los Angeles County Counsel Mary C. Wickham, and Oakland City Attorney Barbara J. Parker v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 30-2014-00725287-CU-BT-CXC (Cal. Super. Ct., Orange County), together with complete trial transcripts.
2. All Allergan deposition transcripts, and exhibits from or produced in the matters identified in subsection III.A.1, as well as in *In re Nat'l Prescription Opiate Litig.*, No. 1:17-md-02804 (N.D. Ohio).
3. All summary judgment filings, proposed findings of fact and law, and expert reports relating to the claims against Allergan that were filed in the matters identified in subsections III.A.1 and III.A.2, together with related exhibits.
4. All documents provided under this provision must be provided in an appropriate electronic format with appropriate metadata.
5. In addition, Allergan shall not object to public disclosure of the following documents, without further redaction: Acquired_Actavis_00000001-Acquired_Actavis_02689490.

B. Information That Allergan May Redact

1. The following categories of information are exempt from public disclosure:

- a. Information subject to trade secret protection. A “trade secret” is information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique or process, that (a) derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to the public or to other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure and use; and (b) is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy. Even if the information falls within the definition, “trade secret” does not include information reflecting sales or promotional strategies, tactics, targeting, or data, or internal communications related to sales or promotion or information in documents dated more than five (5) years before the disclosure required by this section.
- b. Confidential personal information. “Confidential personal information” means individual Social Security or tax identification numbers, personal financial account numbers, passport numbers, driver license numbers, home addresses, home telephone numbers, personal email addresses, and other personally identifiable information protected by law from disclosure. “Confidential personal information” does not include the names of Allergan’s officers, directors, employees, consultants, agents, or attorneys or of prescribers or of officials of a government agency.
- c. Information that is inappropriate for public disclosure because it is subject to personal privacy interests recognized by law (e.g., HIPAA), or contractual rights of third parties that Allergan may not abrogate.
- d. Information regarding Allergan employees’ personal matters unrelated to Allergan, including emails produced by Allergan custodians discussing vacation or sick leave, family, or other personal matters.
- e. Information that is protected by the attorney–client or attorney work product privilege.
- f. Financial documents designated as “Highly Confidential” or “Highly Confidential Information” under Case Management Order No. 2 in *In re Nat’l Prescription Opiate Litig.*, No. 1:17-md-02804 (N.D. Ohio) and produced in response to the April 3, 2019 Ruling Regarding Jurisdictional Discovery on Defendants Allergan, Teva, and Mallinckrodt, including tax returns including all schedules and attachments, policies regarding accounting, and annual reports.

C. Redaction of Documents Containing Protected Information

1. Whenever a document contains information subject to a claim of exemption pursuant to section B, Allergan will provide the document in redacted form. Such redactions must indicate that trade secret and/or private information, as appropriate, has been redacted. Redactions are limited to the minimum redactions possible, consistent with section B.
2. Allergan must provide to each Settling State a log noting each document redacted. The log must also provide fields stating the basis for redacting the document, with sufficient detail to allow an assessment of the merits of the assertion. The log is subject to public disclosure in perpetuity. The log shall be provided by the production deadline.
3. In addition to the redacted documents, Allergan shall, upon any Settling State's request, also produce all documents identified in subsection III.A above in unredacted form to such Settling State at the same time, but only to the extent the document was produced by Allergan in an unredacted form in the underlying litigation, and only for the purpose of permitting a merits assessment and potential challenge of the redaction pursuant to Section IV herein.

D. Public Disclosure Through a Document Repository

1. Each Settling State may publicly disclose all documents covered by this section through a public repository maintained by a governmental, non-profit, or academic institution. Each Settling State may specify the terms of any such repository's use of those documents, including allowing the repository to index and make searchable all documents subject to public disclosure, including the metadata associated with those documents.

E. Timeline for Production

1. Allergan shall produce all documents required by Section A within nine months from the Effective Date.

F. Support Payment

1. Within thirty (30) calendar days of the Effective Date, Allergan will make one-time payments totaling \$1,375,000 to the University of California, San Francisco Foundation (UCSF Foundation) and The Johns Hopkins University, to be used to support a public repository of documents subject to this section.

IV. ENFORCEMENT

- A. For the purposes of resolving disputes with respect to compliance with **Exhibit P**, should any of the Settling States have reason to believe that Allergan has violated a provision of **Exhibit P**, then such Settling State shall notify Allergan in writing of the specific objection, identify with particularity the provisions of **Exhibit P** that

the practice appears to violate, and give Allergan thirty (30) days to respond to the notification (“Response Period”).

- B. Upon receipt of written notice from any of the Settling States, Allergan shall provide a written response to the Settling State’s notification, containing either a statement explaining why Allergan believes it is in compliance with **Exhibit P**, or a detailed explanation of how the alleged violation occurred and a statement explaining how and when Allergan intends to remedy or has remedied the alleged violation. Allergan may request a reasonable amount of additional time to cure any violation through such remedial measures (“Cure Period”) and the Settling State shall not unreasonably withhold approval of such request.
- C. The Settling State may not take any action concerning the alleged violation of **Exhibit P** during the Response and Cure Periods. Nothing shall prevent the Settling State from agreeing in writing to provide Allergan with additional time beyond the thirty (30) days to respond to the notice. However, the Settling State may take any action, including, but not limited to legal action to enforce compliance with the Consent Judgment, without delay if the Settling State believes that a threat to the health or safety of the public requires immediate action.
- D. The Settling State may bring an action against Allergan to enforce the terms of **Exhibit P**, but only after providing Allergan an opportunity to respond to the notification and, if agreed upon, a period to cure any violation, as described above, or within any other period as agreed to by Allergan and the Settling State.
- E. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be interpreted to limit any Settling State’s Civil Investigative Demand (“CID”) or investigative subpoena authority, to the extent such authority exists under applicable state law.
- F. Nothing herein shall be construed to exonerate any failure to comply with any provision of **Exhibit P** after the Effective Date, or to compromise the authority of any Settling State to take action for any failure to comply with **Exhibit P**, consistent with this section.

EXHIBIT Q
[Intentionally Omitted]

EXHIBIT R
Agreement on Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses

This Agreement on Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Costs ("Fee Agreement") is entered between Teva, Allergan, and the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee appointed in the multidistrict litigation in the Northern District of Ohio, *In re National Prescription Opiate Litigation*, No. 1:17-md-02804 ("MDL PEC"), in connection with the Teva Global Opioid Settlement Agreement ("Teva Agreement") and the Allergan Public Global Opioid Settlement Agreement ("Allergan Agreement"). This Fee Agreement becomes effective on the Effective Date of the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement or the date that the Consent Judgments anticipated under the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement become final in 25 Settling States (whichever is later).

I. Definitions

- A. This Fee Agreement incorporates all defined terms in the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement, unless otherwise defined herein, and shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement.
- B. "*Allergan.*" Allergan Finance, LLC (f/k/a Actavis, Inc., which, in turn, was f/k/a/ Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.) and Allergan Limited (f/k/a Allergan plc, which, in turn, was f/k/a Actavis plc). *Allergan* does not include Teva Pharmaceuticals Industries Ltd. ("*Teva Ltd.*"), Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. ("*Teva USA*"), Cephalon, Inc. ("*Cephalon*"), Actavis LLC (f/k/a Actavis Inc.) ("*Actavis LLC*"), Watson Laboratories, Inc. ("*Watson*"), Actavis Pharma, Inc. (f/k/a Watson Pharma, Inc.) ("*Actavis Pharma*"), Actavis Elizabeth LLC ("*Actavis Elizabeth*"), Actavis Kadian LLC ("*Actavis Kadian*"), Actavis Laboratories FL, Inc. (f/k/a Watson Laboratories, Inc. - Florida) ("*Actavis Labs FL*"), Actavis Laboratories UT, Inc. (f/k/a Watson Laboratories, Inc. - Utah) ("*Actavis Labs UT*"), Actavis Mid Atlantic LLC ("*Actavis Mid*"), Actavis South Atlantic LLC ("*Actavis South*"), Actavis Totowa LLC ("*Actavis Totowa*"), or Anda, Inc. ("*Anda*").
- C. "*Applicant.*" Any Attorney or MDL Participating Counsel who seeks an award of attorneys' fees from the Attorney Fee Fund pursuant to the procedures established by the MDL Court and the Fee Panel.
- D. "*Attorney.*" Any of the following retained through a legal contingency fee or hourly fee contract: a solo practitioner, multi-attorney law firm, or other legal representative of a Participating Subdivision or MDL Participating Counsel. This does not include Subdivision in-house attorneys.
- E. "*Attorney Fee Fund.*" An account consisting of funds allocated to pay attorneys' fees approved pursuant to Section III of this Fee Agreement established by Order of and under the ongoing jurisdiction of the MDL Court, as provided below.
- F. "*Common Benefit.*" Work performed for the benefit of all Participating Subdivisions or Tribal Nations, including, but not limited to, pretrial matters,

discovery, trial preparation, trial, settlement negotiations, and all other work that advances the interests of the Participating Subdivisions.

- G. “*Common Benefit Fund.*” The sub fund of the Attorney Fee Fund described in subsection III.E.
- H. “*Contingency Fee Fund.*” The sub fund of the Attorney Fee Fund described in subsection III.F.
- I. “*Cost and Expense Fund Administrator.*” The administrator appointed by the MDL Court on August 12, 2021 (MDL Docket No. 3828), to administer the Cost Fund and its sub funds as provided in the Fee Agreement.
- J. “*Court Common Benefit Fund.*” The Common Benefit Fund established by the MDL Court in its orders of July 22, 2021, MDL Docket No. 3794, and May 9, 2022, MDL Docket No. 4428.
- K. “*Fee Entitlement.*” Any right, entitlement, or expectation, including but not limited to a fee contract, contingent fee contract, agreement, referral arrangement, co-counsel arrangement, State Back-Stop agreement, or any other arrangement by which counsel could receive compensation or other consideration. For the avoidance of doubt, the scope of Fee Entitlement under subparagraph III.G.3.a does not include any Attorneys’ fees associated with representation of a State.
- L. “*Fee Panel.*” The three-person panel appointed by the MDL Court on August 12, 2021 (MDL Docket No. 3828), to administer and make recommendations for the allocation and distribution of the Attorney Fee Fund and its sub funds as provided in the Fee Agreement.
- M. “*Later Litigating State.*” A State that first files a lawsuit bringing a Released Claim against a Released Entity after the Preliminary Agreement Date.
- N. “*MDL Court.*” United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio Eastern Division, Case No. 1:17-md-02804, Judge Dan Aaron Polster.
- O. “*MDL Direct Cost Fund.*” The cost fund described in subparagraph II.A.3.a below.
- P. “*MDL Participating Counsel.*” MDL Participating Counsel includes an attorney or firm authorized by MDL 2804 Lead Counsel to perform work for the Common Benefit of Participating Subdivisions. By way of example, it would include insurance counsel and appellant counsel.
- Q. “*MDL PEC.*” The Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee appointed by the MDL Court.
- R. “*Non-Participating Litigating Subdivision.*” A Litigating Subdivision that is not a Participating Subdivision.
- S. “*Non-Participating State.*” A State that is not a Participating State.

- T. “*Participating Litigating Subdivision.*” A Litigating Subdivision that is also a Participating Subdivision.
- U. “*Participation Agreement.*” An agreement executed by an Attorney that acknowledges the obligation to pay an appropriate MDL Common Benefit Assessment.
- V. “*Qualified Tribal Representation.*” Representation by an attorney of a Participating Tribal Government regarding Released Claims against Released Entities. Such counsel are eligible for Common Benefit Fee consideration. The Teva Tribal Global Settlement and the Allergan Tribal Global Settlement will provide for the contribution to the Common Benefit Fund as determined by the MDL Court.
- W. “*Qualifying Representation.*” Legal services provided for representation of the MDL PEC or Participating Litigating Subdivision regarding Released Claims against Released Entities.
- X. “*State Back-Stop Agreement.*” Any agreement by a Settling State and private counsel for Participating Subdivisions in that State (or legislation enacted in that State) to provide, adjust, or guarantee attorneys’ fees and costs, whether from the Attorney Fee Fund or any other source recognized in the agreement or legislation.¹
- Y. “*Subdivision Cost and Expense Fund.*” The fund created to pay approved Subdivision and Tribal Nations costs and expenses as set forth in subparagraph II.A.3.b.
- Z. “*Teva*” means (i) Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. and (ii) all of its respective past and present direct or indirect parents, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, joint ventures, predecessors, successors, assigns, including but not limited to Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., the Actavis Generic Entities, and Anda Inc.

II. MDL Direct Cost Fund and Subdivision Cost and Expense Fund (“*Cost Fund*”)

- A. The total Cost Fund shall be \$30 million dollars funded as set forth below.
 - 1. Total cost to be paid by Teva in each of the relevant Payment Years² under this Agreement shall be up to the following amounts, subject to the provisions set forth below:

	Cost Fund
--	-----------

¹ Nothing herein shall be understood to indicate approval for additional State Back-Stop Agreements or modifications of existing State Back-Stop Agreements.

² Payment Year shall have the same meaning for Teva as set forth in the Teva Agreement and Teva Exhibits M-1 and M-3. Payment Year shall carry the same definition for Allergan as set forth in the Allergan Agreement and Allergan Exhibits M-1 and M-2.

Payment Year 1	\$9,000,000.00
Payment Year 2	\$9,000,000.00

2. Total cost to be paid by Allergan in each of the relevant Payment Years under this Agreement shall be up to the following amounts, subject to the provisions set forth below:

	Cost Fund
Payment Year 1	\$6,000,000.00
Payment Year 2	\$6,000,000.00

3. The Cost Fund shall be split into the MDL Direct Cost Fund and the Subdivision Cost and Expense Fund.
- a. The MDL Direct Cost Fund shall be Seven Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$7,500,000), payable 50% in Year One, and 50% in Year Two. The MDL Direct Cost Fund shall make payment without any delay to reimburse the MDL PEC for an agreed-to portion of the expenses incurred, provided the costs have been approved by the Cost and Expense Fund Administrator appointed by the Court. The MDL Direct Cost Fund will be paid directly to the MDL Opiate Capital Account. The Cost and Expense Fund Administrator may include costs incurred by the MDL PEC in furtherance of litigation, mediation, implementation, and management of the Settlements.
 - b. The Subdivision Cost and Expense Fund shall be Twenty-Two Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$22,500,000), payable 50% in Year One and 50% in Year Two.
 - c. It is the intention of the Parties that the Cost Fund shall be administered by the Cost Fund and Expense Fund Administrator (MDL Docket No. 3828), who will be governed by the provisions of this Agreement and shall design the process and procedures for the allocation of costs pursuant to this Agreement and the MDL Court's Order.
 - d. The costs of the Cost and Expense Fund Administrator shall be paid from the Cost Fund and allocated by the Cost and Expense Fund Administrator between the MDL Direct Cost Fund and the

Subdivision Cost and Expense Fund to fairly charge each fund the cost incurred in implementing and supervising the specific fund.

- e. The Cost and Expense Fund Administrator shall set the process and procedures for submission of and criteria for applications for payment of Subdivisions' and Tribal Nations' costs and expenses. The Cost and Expense Fund Administrator shall receive and evaluate applications from Participating Litigating Subdivisions and litigating Tribal Nations, whether filed in Federal Court or State Court, to seek reimbursement for eligible costs in pursuit of claims against Allergan or Teva. The process shall require a showing that the costs or expenses sought were reasonably incurred in furtherance of active litigation of a designated state or federal bellwether trial-set case, or Common Benefit. The Cost and Expense Fund Administrator shall require transparency from all applicants as to any other sources for compensating Attorneys for Subdivisions and Tribal Nations for costs incurred. If funds remain after the reimbursement of approved out-of-pocket costs, the Cost and Expense Fund Administrator may consider reasonable and appropriate payment for client time, costs, or expenses incurred by recognized trial bellwether plaintiffs. At the conclusion of the process, any funds not allocated by the Cost and Expense Fund Administrator shall be transferred to the Common Benefit Fund established in this **Exhibit R**.

- 4. In the event that States and Subdivisions enter into an additional global settlement with a party or parties other than Teva or Allergan that is (a) under the jurisdiction of the MDL Court in MDL No. 2804, (b) creates a separate cost fund, and (c) unless the parties agree to another date, such agreement has an effective date prior to June 30, 2023, the Cost and Expense Fund Administrator shall have the authority to aggregate the Cost Fund with the cost fund created under that global settlement agreement. The Cost and Expense Fund Administrator shall have the authority to address the appropriate procedures and required information to allow the costs to be funded from the appropriate cost fund or shared by two or more cost funds.

III. Attorney Fee Fund

- A. An Attorney Fee Fund shall be paid in the following amounts and years:

	Teva Shall Pay	Allergan Shall Pay
Payment Year 1	\$ 46,215,837.93	\$ 40,778,855.53
Payment Year 2	\$ 46,215,837.93	\$ 40,778,855.53
Payment Year 3	\$ 55,215,837.92	\$ 46,778,855.53

Payment Year 4	\$ 55,215,837.92	\$ 46,778,855.53
Payment Year 5	\$ 55,215,837.92	\$ 0.00
Payment Year 6	\$ 55,215,837.92	\$ 0.00

B. The Attorney Fee Fund shall consist of the Contingency Fee Fund and the Common Benefit Fund.

2. It is the intention of the Parties that the Contingency Fee Fund and the Common Benefit Fund shall be administered by the Fee Panel (MDL Docket No. 3828), which will be governed by the provisions of this Fee Agreement and shall design the process and procedures for the allocation of fees pursuant to this Fee Agreement and the MDL Court’s Order.

C. The fees to be paid under this Fee Agreement are available for Attorneys engaged in Qualifying Representations and Qualified Tribal Representations only. Fees to be paid under this Fee Agreement are not available prior to the Effective Date of the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement or if the Teva Agreement does not proceed past Teva’s determination in **subsection XI.A** of the Teva Agreement or if the Allergan Agreement does not proceed past Allergan’s determination in **subsection X.A** of the Allergan Agreement. Fees to be paid under this Fee Agreement are not available for representation of States, Non-Participating Subdivisions or Non-Litigating Subdivisions and are not available for representation of private hospitals, third-party payors, NAS claimants, personal injury/wrongful death claimants, or any entity other than Participating Litigating Subdivisions. In addition, fees under this Fee Agreement are not available for representation of any individual or entity in matters other than those claims against Released Entities, but may include a reasonable share of representations that involve development of facts for pursuit of opioid-related claims against multiple defendants in the pharmacy, manufacturing, and distribution chain.

D. *Attorney Fee Fund and Sub Funds.*

1. There shall be a split of the Attorney Fee Fund into the Contingency Fee Fund and the Common Benefit Fund. The split shall be 40% to the Contingency Fee Fund and 60% to the Common Benefit Fund.

2. In no event shall Teva or Allergan be required to pay more into the Attorney Fee Fund in any Payment Year than the maximum amount specified for that Payment Year in subsection III.A., which amounts are reflected in **Exhibit M** to the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement. The amounts allocated to the Contingency Fee Fund and the Common Benefit Fund set by the Fee Panel shall be subject to the reductions and offsets set forth below.

3. Awards of fees from the Contingency Fee Fund shall be available to Attorneys with Qualifying Representations of Participating Litigating Subdivisions eligible to receive an allocation under the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement, as set forth in **Exhibits F-2** and **G** to the Teva Agreement and **Exhibits F** and **G** to the Allergan Agreement, and shall be made applying the Mathematical Model attached as Exhibit "A" to this Fee Agreement. The collection of the data and calculations for the Mathematical Model has been a cooperative effort among private counsel for a large number of Litigating Subdivisions. The analysis has been spearheaded by Joseph Tann and Andrew Arnold. The Fee Panel is encouraged to continue working with those counsel in application of the Model. The Fee Panel shall oversee the application of the Model and resolve any questions or disputes concerning the eligibility of a Counsel to participate as required in subsection III.G. The Panel is empowered to hear disputes concerning and ensure the accuracy of the mathematical calculation.
4. As to awards from the Contingency Fee Fund, there shall be no right of appeal.
5. Any appeal of an award of the Fee Panel from the Common Benefit Fund will be made to the MDL Court and be reviewed under an abuse of discretion standard.

E. *Common Benefit Fund (60% of the Attorney Fee Fund).*

1. Funds in the Attorney Fee Fund shall be allocated to the Common Benefit Fund according to the schedule set forth below, subject to the adjustments described in paragraph III.E.6. The payments are to be made on the following yearly schedule, subject to the adjustments set forth below:

	Teva Shall Pay	Allergan Shall Pay
Payment Year 1	\$ 27,729,502.76	\$ 24,467,313.32
Payment Year 2	\$ 27,729,502.76	\$ 24,467,313.32
Payment Year 3	\$ 33,129,502.75	\$ 28,067,313.32
Payment Year 4	\$ 33,129,502.75	\$ 28,067,313.32
Payment Year 5	\$ 33,129,502.75	\$ 0.00
Payment Year 6	\$ 33,129,502.75	\$ 0.00

2. The Common Benefit Fund shall be available to compensate Attorneys engaged in Qualifying Representations of Participating Litigating

Subdivisions and Qualified Tribal Representation of Tribal Participating Governments who:

- a. have performed work for the Common Benefit of all Participating Subdivisions and/or Tribal Nations consistent with the provisions to the guidelines established by Judge Polster set forth in MDL 2804 and the May 1, 2018 Order, under docket number 358, which is incorporated herein by reference; and
 - b. satisfy the eligibility criteria set forth in subsection III.G.
3. For purposes of Common Benefit Fund distribution, Attorneys representing Tribal Nations litigating against Teva or Allergan have also reached a settlement for Released Claims with Teva and Allergan. These settlements shall be the subject of separate agreements with Teva and Allergan. Attorneys representing Tribal Nations are eligible for Common Benefit consideration, provided such agreements with Teva and Allergan become effective under their terms. Such Attorneys must meet the eligibility criteria in subsection III.G.
4. For purposes of Common Benefit Fund distribution, MDL Participating Counsel not engaged in Qualifying Representations of Participating Litigating Subdivisions but who performed work for the Common Benefit pursuant to authorization from the MDL Co-Leads and meet the eligibility criteria in subsection III.G shall be eligible.
5. The Common Benefit Fund shall be overseen by the Fee Panel, which shall determine the allocation of funds to eligible Attorneys consistent with this Fee Agreement and the May 1, 2018 Order.
6. In assessing the benefits that an Applicant has conferred to Participating Subdivisions (including non-Litigating Subdivisions) and/or Tribes for purposes of any compensation decision, the Fee Panel shall give significant weight to the extent to which (i) the Applicant and his or her clients have contributed to increasing (or reducing) the Initial Participation in the Teva Agreement or the Allergan Agreement, and (ii) the Applicant and his or her clients have contributed to increasing (or reducing) the amounts achieved under Incentive Payments A-D through participation in the Teva Agreement, including the Teva Tribal Agreement, or the Allergan Agreement, including the Allergan Tribal Agreement. The Fee Panel shall also consider additional fee recoveries the Applicant may potentially obtain, including, but not limited to, from attorney fee funds under other settlement agreements, State Back-Stop Agreements, representations of States or Tribal Nations, representations of other clients in opioids-related matters, or through the representation of Subdivision clients, whether they participated in the Teva Agreement or Allergan Agreement or not. It is the intent of this provision to recognize that the goal of the Teva Agreement

and Allergan Agreement is to provide for maximum participation by the Subdivisions, maximum abatement funding for all Subdivisions nationally, and the maximum peace for Released Entities. Therefore, representing one or more Non-Participating States or Non-Participating Subdivisions does not further the goal of the Teva Agreement or Allergan Agreement, and should not be considered Common Benefit because it does not increase funds available to Participating Subdivisions' abatement programs. Representing one or more Later Litigating States or Later Litigating Subdivisions is antithetical to the Teva Settlement and the Allergan Agreement and detracts from Common Benefit. The Fee Panel shall consider this concept of "common detriment" set forth in this paragraph in all of its decision making with respect to the allocation of the Attorney Fee Fund among Applicants, as well as, in its discretion, any offsets provided to Teva or Allergan as set forth in subsection III.H. The Fee Panel shall consider the totality of the Applicant's Participating Litigating Subdivisions as compared to the Applicant's Non-Participating Litigating Subdivisions; the Parties recognize that, although the goal is for 100% participation, Applicants with a greater number of clients have a greater probability of having one or more Non-Participating Litigating Subdivisions. As used in this paragraph, "client" or "representing" a Subdivision shall include any Litigating Subdivision as to which the Applicant has a Fee Entitlement.

7. As set forth in subsection III.H, the Fee Panel must consider the factors described in paragraph III.E.6 to determine how and whether to reduce the amounts to be paid by Teva or Allergan under this Fee Agreement and to determine how to allocate funds among Applicants. They may also, at their discretion, consider other factors. Any reduction in payment obligation or credit to be given Teva or Allergan in this Fee Agreement shall be applied against the last Payment Year for that defendant and working backwards. Any reduction to an Applicant not credited to Teva or Allergan shall be allocated to attorneys whose Litigating Subdivision clients participated in the settlement by the Initial Participation Date.
8. The MDL PEC will seek, and the Attorneys General for Settling States, Teva, and Allergan, will not oppose, a Common Benefit Fee Order requiring an assessment of 7.5% on the gross recovery (by judgment or settlement) of any Non-Participating Subdivision that is subject to the federal court jurisdiction, represented by a MDL PEC firm, represented by any Attorney receiving fees from the Common Benefit Fund, represented by any Attorney that signed a Participation Agreement or paid in a case otherwise under the jurisdiction of the MDL Court.
9. If Teva and Allergan agree to go forward with their respective Agreements under subsections [XI.A and X.A] of their respective Agreements, they shall pay the full Common Benefit (60%) Fee into the Common Benefit Fund without regard to the number of Settling States or Participating Subdivisions. Should Teva and/or Allergan pay a judgment to, or settle

with, a Non-Participating State or a Non-Participating Litigating Subdivision subsequent to the Reference Date, and such settlement or judgment results in a common benefit fee assessment paid into the Common Benefit Fund or the Court Common Benefit Fund, the following shall apply:

- a. Teva or Allergan shall be credited dollar-for-dollar for the amount paid for the fee assessment up to 7.5% of the abatement amount derived from the application of the State Global Allocation Percentage as set forth in **Exhibit F-1** or the abatement amount derived from the application of the Subdivision and Special District Allocation Percentage as set forth in **Exhibit G** that the Non-Participating State or Non-Participating Litigating Subdivision would have received if it had participated in the Settlement Agreement;
- b. Except as set forth below in subparagraph III.E.9.c, for any settlement or judgment that meets the requirements of paragraph III.E.9 that exceeds the abatement amount derived from the application of the State Global Allocation Percentage as set forth in **Exhibit F-1** or the abatement amount derived from the application of the Subdivision and Special District Allocation Percentage as set forth in **Exhibit G**, no credits shall be taken against Teva or Allergan's obligation to make payments into the Common Benefit Fund for that portion of the settlement or judgment in excess of the abatement amount derived from the application of the State Global Allocation Percentage as set forth in **Exhibit F-1** or the abatement amount derived from the application of the Subdivision and Special District Allocation Percentage as set forth in **Exhibit G**;
- c. For any settlement or judgment that meets the requirements of paragraph III.E.9 that exceeds the abatement amount derived from the application of the State Global Allocation Percentage as set forth in **Exhibit F-1** or the abatement amount derived from the application of the Subdivision and Special District Allocation Percentage as set forth in **Exhibit G** that the Later Litigating State or Later Litigating Subdivision would have received if it had participated in the Settlement Agreement, where the Later Litigating State or Later Litigating Subdivision is represented by any member of the MDL PEC or that member's law firm, Teva or Allergan shall be credited dollar-for-dollar for the full amount of the 7.5% common benefit fee assessment paid into the Common Benefit Fund or the Court Common Benefit Fund;
- d. If a credit is made to Allergan or Teva pursuant to subparagraph III.E.9.c., then that amount shall be calculated as a direct reduction to any common benefit fee award made under this Fee Agreement

to the MDL PEC firm(s) that represented the Later Litigating State or Later Litigating Subdivision;

- e. Any credits shall be taken first against Teva’s or Allergan’s payment to the Common Benefit Fund in Teva’s or Allergan’s respective final Payment Year as set forth in paragraph III.E.1 (for Teva Year 6; for Allergan Year 4), up to the full amount of Teva’s or Allergan’s final year payment obligation, then from the next-to-final Payment Year’s payment obligation, and so on;
- f. Teva and Allergan shall not be entitled to any credits against the Common Benefit Fund for settlements or judgments paid after Teva’s or Allergan’s final fee Payment Year.

F. *Contingency Fee Fund (40% of the Attorney Fee Fund).*

- 1. Funds from the Attorney Fee Fund shall be allocated to the Contingency Fee Fund on the following yearly schedule, subject to the adjustments set forth below:

	Teva Shall Pay	Allergan Shall Pay
Payment Year 1	\$ 18,486,335.17	\$ 16,311,542.21
Payment Year 2	\$ 18,486,335.17	\$ 16,311,542.21
Payment Year 3	\$ 22,086,335.17	\$ 18,711,542.21
Payment Year 4	\$ 22,086,335.17	\$ 18,711,542.21
Payment Year 5	\$ 22,086,335.17	\$ 0.00
Payment Year 6	\$ 22,086,335.17	\$ 0.00

- 2. The Contingency Fee Fund shall be available to compensate Attorneys engaged in Qualifying Representations of Participating Litigating Subdivisions that meet the criteria set forth in subsection III.G.
 - a. The Contingency Fee Fund shall be available to Attorneys who represent Litigating Subdivisions that are Participating Subdivisions, whether their actions are filed in state or federal court, and meet the eligibility criteria of subsection III.G.
 - b. Participation in the Contingency Fee Fund by counsel that have a case that is not subject to the jurisdiction of the MDL Court shall not create, provide, or waive jurisdiction of the MDL Court over that Litigating Subdivision, that case or Attorneys, other than to oversee

the fairness of the distribution process, and enforcement of this Fee Agreement.

- c. Under the terms of the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement Litigating Subdivisions must become a Participating Litigating Subdivision under both Agreements to be eligible to participate. Therefore, **Exhibit R** applies jointly to Teva and Allergan with the Attorneys' Fee Fund and MDL Cost Fund to include the combined payment from Teva and Allergan.
3. Teva and/or Allergan shall each be entitled to a pro-rata reduction to their own portion of the Contingency Fee Fund payment(s) in accordance with subsection III.F.4., unless, by the Payment Date for the Initial Year Payment, (i) 41 states are Settling States for Teva or 43 states are Settling States for Allergan, (ii) 98% of all Litigating Subdivisions are Participating Subdivisions and/or Subdivisions Subject to a Bar, Case-Specific Resolution, and, (iii) 97% of all Non-Litigating Subdivisions with Populations over 10,000 as listed in **Exhibit I** are Participating Subdivisions and/or Subdivisions Subject to a Bar, Case-Specific Resolution, in which case no offset shall be applied.
4. If the participation conditions in paragraph III.F.3 are not met, then the amounts owed by Teva and/or Allergan to the Contingency Fee Fund shall be reduced as follows:
 - a. For Non-Settling States, the Contingency Fee Fund payments shall first be reduced by the amounts identified by the Fee Panel, pursuant to paragraph III.H.7, that would have been owed to counsel for Litigating Subdivisions in Non-Settling States, had those States and those Litigating Subdivisions been Settling States and Participating Subdivisions.
 - b. Following the calculation in subparagraph III.F.4.a., the Contingency Fee Fund payments shall be reduced to reflect the non-joinder of Litigating Subdivisions in Settling States by subtracting the amounts identified by the Fee Panel, pursuant to paragraph III.H.7, that would have been owed to counsel for Non-Participating Litigating Subdivisions in Settling States had such Litigating Subdivisions been Participating Subdivisions.
5. In the event that after the date of the Settlement Agreement Teva, prior to the Effective Date of the Teva Agreement, or Allergan, prior to the Effective Date of the Allergan Agreement, settles with any Litigating Subdivision that would have been eligible to participate in the defendant's Agreement, and, under such settlement agreement pays attorneys' fees, the Fee Panel shall treat those Litigating Subdivisions as Participating Litigating Subdivisions and, applying the same criteria applicable to all Attorneys for Participating

Litigating Subdivisions, determine what amount they would have been paid from the Contingency Fee Fund if they had become Participating Subdivisions under the Teva Agreement or the Allergan Agreement without such prior settlement. That sum, rather than being paid to the Attorney for the previously settling Litigating Subdivision, shall be credited and/or returned to Teva or Allergan as if determined under (a)(ii) above, except that such credit shall not be greater than the amount paid to the Attorneys under the Litigating Subdivision's prior settlement agreement and credits apply equally over the Fee Payment Years.

6. During the period between the Preliminary Agreement Date and the Effective Date, the MDL PEC, as well as Litigating Subdivisions' Attorneys, shall make best efforts to cease litigation activity against Teva and Allergan, including by jointly seeking stays or severance of claims against Teva and Allergan, where feasible, or postponements if a motion to stay or sever is not feasible or is denied, so long as such actions are not otherwise detrimental to the Litigating Subdivision.

G. *Eligibility.*

1. It is the intention of all parties participating in the Fee Panel process that there should be total transparency to the Fee Panel and to all fund participants. In connection with the process to be developed by the Fee Panel, any and all monies in attorney's fees received or awarded, including prior or future Contingency Fees, Common Benefit Fees, referral fees, expenses paid, promises for payment, or any other Fee Entitlement, to any Applicant in any opioid litigation shall be disclosed to the Fee Panel as a condition of participating in the Attorney Fee Fund and prior to an award from the Fee Panel. Any payment, expectation of payment or perceived entitlement to participate in a State Back-Stop Agreement or any other agreement reached with a Settling State or any Subdivision or any other source regarding payment of fees must be disclosed to the Fee Panel. Similarly, any right to payment from any other fund, for example a fund for payment to lawyers representing Settling States or Tribal Nations or Subdivisions shall be disclosed to the Fee Panel. Because it is anticipated that there will be multiple firms listed on contingent fee agreements with Litigating Subdivisions, the Fee Panel shall establish procedures, with input from Attorneys for Participating Litigating Subdivisions, for who should petition for fees from such groups and to whom the fee shall be paid and thereafter distributed to co-counsel in accordance with applicable agreements. For the avoidance of doubt, all Attorneys that are part of such groups must meet the eligibility criteria in paragraph III.G.3, must be subject to the criteria set forth in subsection III.C, and must be disclosed to the Fee Panel.
2. An Applicant may apply for and recover attorneys' fees from the Common Benefit Fund, the Contingency Fee Fund, and any fund created by a past or

future State Back-Stop Agreement, provided the Applicant satisfies the requirements relevant to each such fund and requirements for disclosure to the Fee Panel.

3. An Attorney may not receive any payment from the Attorney Fee Fund (which includes both the Contingency Fee Fund and the Common Benefit Fund) unless the following eligibility criteria are met and annually certified by the Attorney:
 - a. The Attorney must expressly waive the enforcement against the Litigating Subdivision client of all Fee Entitlements (other than under State Back-Stop Agreements) arising out of or related to any or all Qualifying Representations of any Participating Litigating Subdivision prior to applying for attorneys' fees from the Attorney Fee Fund. All applications for attorneys' fees under this Fee Agreement shall include an affirmation by the Attorney of such waiver and notice to the client(s) of such waiver. Such waiver shall not preclude the Attorney from submitting such Fee Entitlements to the Fee Panel as a factor for consideration in allocating payments from the Attorney Fee Fund or in connection with a State Back-Stop Agreement. For the avoidance of doubt, no Attorney may recover fees under this Fee Agreement unless the Attorney expressly agrees not to enforce Fee Entitlements as to each and every Participating Litigating Subdivision represented by that Attorney, but such Attorneys may participate in and receive funds from a State Back-Stop Agreement.
 - b. The Attorney must represent that s/he has no present intent to represent or participate in the representation of any Later Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating State with respect to Released Claims against Released Entities.
 - c. The Attorney must represent that s/he has not and will not engage in any advertising or solicitation related to Released Claims against Released Entities where such advertising or solicitation relates to a representation of a Subdivision eligible to be a Participating Subdivision after the Reference Date unless the Attorney is recommending participation in the Agreement.
 - d. The Attorney must represent s/he will not charge or accept any referral fees for any Released Claims brought against Released Entities by Later Litigating Subdivisions or Later Litigating States. This representation shall not prohibit Attorneys from receiving allocated shares of any future common benefit assessments arising out of settlements or judgments with Later Litigating Subdivisions or Later Litigating States that are the result of the MDL Court's Common Benefit order.

- e. The Attorney may not have and must represent that s/he does not have a Fee Entitlement related to a Later Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating State, other than a potential Common Benefit Fee.
 - f. The Attorney must fully disclose the participation, or the anticipation of participation, in any agreement with a Settling State or Participating Subdivision concerning fees arising out of or related to the Teva Agreement or Allergan Agreement, including any fees paid or anticipated to be paid or any State Back-Stop Agreement.
 - g. The Attorney must identify for the Fee Panel whether s/he utilized state litigation work product or MDL work product, including but not limited to ARCOS data, document repositories, experts developed in the MDL, trial transcripts, or deposition transcripts. The Attorney must identify whether s/he signed the MDL Participation Agreement.
 - h. Any Attorney who applies for fees from one or both Funds must represent that, having exercised his/her independent judgment, s/he believes the Teva Agreement and the Allergan Agreement to be fair and will make or has made best efforts to recommend both Agreements to his or her Subdivision clients in Settling States. For avoidance of doubt, each Attorney is expected to exercise his or her independent judgment in the best interest of each client individually before determining whether to recommend joining the settlement. All applications for attorneys' fees or costs under this subsection shall include an affirmation by the Attorney in compliance with the foregoing subparagraphs.
- 4. No Attorney receiving fees under this Fee Agreement may apply for or recover from the Attorney Fee Fund fees arising from representing a Non-Participating Subdivision except Common Benefit Fees as described in paragraph III.E.2. All applications for attorneys' fees under this subsection shall include an affirmation by the Attorney of compliance with this paragraph.
 - 5. An Attorney who has filed an application under this subsection and received an award of attorneys' fees shall provide a certification of compliance with the requirements of this Fee Agreement annually during the years upon which they are still entitled to receive attorneys' fee payments under this Agreement. This certification will be done as directed by the Panel.
 - 6. If, at any time, the Attorney is unable to make the representations set forth in this subsection, such representations become untrue, or the Attorney falsely represents compliance with the eligibility criteria, the Attorney shall cease to be eligible to receive funds from the Attorney Fee Fund until further

review by the Fee Panel of the Attorney's eligibility under and compliance with this subsection.

7. If an Attorney has a Fee Entitlement with a Later Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating State or otherwise becomes unable to reaffirm compliance with the eligibility criteria set forth above, the Attorney shall notify the Fee Panel. For the avoidance of doubt, any Attorney who undertakes any new representation of, or has a Fee Entitlement with, a Later Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating State shall be prohibited from receiving any future funds from the Attorney Fee Fund. If an Attorney fails to notify the Fee Panel of such Fee Entitlement with a Later Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating State, the Attorney shall be required to refund amounts previously paid. The Fee Panel shall notify Teva and Allergan when it receives notification.
8. To the extent an Attorney who has received compensation from the Attorney Fee Fund based on Qualifying Representations of Participating Litigating Subdivisions under the Teva Agreement or the Allergan Agreement, represents a Later Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating State, such Attorney shall be obligated to refund such amounts received as compensation from the Attorney Fee Fund to Teva or Allergan. Teva, Allergan, or such Attorney may bring any dispute as to whether such Attorney shall be obligated to refund such amounts received from the Attorney Fee Fund to Allergan or Teva to the Fee Panel. Nothing herein shall require a multi-attorney law firm that has received compensation from the Attorney Fee Fund to refund such amounts if an attorney of the firm that is no longer affiliated with such law firm, after such departure, represents a Later Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating State, provided that (a) neither the law firm nor any of its other attorneys have any contractual or financial arrangement regarding, stand to benefit directly or indirectly from, or directly or indirectly provide financial or other support of any kind to, the former attorney's representation of the Later Litigating Subdivision or Later Litigating State and (b) if the former attorney was a partner or owner of the multi-attorney law firm at the time that the law firm received compensation from the Attorney Fee Fund, the former attorney shall be obligated to refund such amounts as the former attorney earned as a result of the compensation that the law firm received from the Attorney Fee Fund.
9. In the event that an Attorney is deemed ineligible by the Fee Panel (whether based on its initial application or subsequent recertification), the Fee Panel shall provide notice to the Attorney and give the Attorney 30 days to provide additional information such that the Fee Panel could re-consider the Attorney's eligibility.
10. To the extent that an Attorney has a Fee Entitlement with a Participating Subdivision and is authorized to bring Released Claims against Released Entities, but such authorization is, in scope, less broad than the category of

Released Claims set forth in the Teva Agreement or Allergan Agreement, such Attorney may participate fully in both the Contingency Fee Fund and the Common Benefit Fund, without any reduction imposed by the Fee Panel due to the scope of the authorization, so long as the Participating Subdivision fully releases all Released Claims against Released Entities.

11. Attorneys applying to the Attorney Fee Fund knowingly and expressly agree to be bound by the decisions of the Fee Panel, subject to the limited appeal rights set forth in this Fee Agreement, and waive the ability to assert the lack of enforceability of the allocation reached through the procedures outlined herein.
12. Applicants are under an ongoing obligation to inform the Fee Panel in writing of any additional fees earned, expected, or received related to any Opioid litigation throughout the period of the Fee Panel's operation.

H. *Calculation of Amounts Due.*

1. The Fee Panel shall be solely responsible for determining the amount of fees to be paid to each Applicant. None of the Released Entities shall have any responsibility, obligation, or liability of any kind whatsoever with respect to how attorneys' fees are calculated under this subsection, except that the Fee Panel may receive information from Teva or Allergan as to (a) the identity of Participating, Non-Participating, Litigating, Later Litigating, and Non-Litigating Subdivisions; (b) the impact of non-participation by a Litigating Subdivision as is relevant to the Fee Panel's determination in paragraph III.E.6; and (c) such other information as Teva or Allergan may voluntarily elect to provide.
2. The Fee Panel shall establish procedures for making determinations under this Fee Agreement consistent with this Fee Agreement and orders of the MDL Court. Such procedures may include submission of documentary and/or other evidence, interviews with Applicants and/or other counsel (including counsel for Teva and Allergan) that the Fee Panel deems appropriate, and/or other means of creating a record upon which fee awards will be based.
3. In making determinations under this Fee Agreement, the Fee Panel must apply the eligibility criteria set forth in subsection III.G of this Fee Agreement and the criteria set forth in paragraph III.E.2. In addition, the Fee Panel will give consideration in regard to Common Benefit Fund awards to the *Johnson* factors, as well as the following factors (which factors may be applied and given relative weight in the Fee Panel's discretion):
 - a. The Applicant's contemporaneously recorded time and labor dedicated to Qualifying Representations along with the Applicant's

financial commitment to such Qualifying Representations. Claimed “time” will not be automatically accepted by the Fee Panel but will be critically reviewed and given substantially more weight and consideration if such time was subject to the audit process described in any Pretrial Order(s) governing the collection of common benefit time;

- b. The novelty, time, and complexity of the Qualifying Representations;
- c. The skill requisite to perform legal services properly and undesirability of the case;
- d. The preclusion of other employment by the Applicant due to time dedicated to Qualifying Representations;
- e. The Common Benefit, if any, alleged to have been conferred by the Applicant and whether such Common Benefit work product by that Applicant was used by others in parallel litigations against Released Entities whether within or outside the MDL, provided that any Applicant claiming that s/he substantially benefited cases other than those in which s/he entered an appearance as counsel must substantiate such claims by proffering factual support, such as proper supporting affidavits or other documents as determined by the Fee Panel with input from Attorneys for Participating Litigating Subdivisions;
- f. Any “common detriment,” as set forth in paragraph III.E.6.
- g. Any contingent fee agreement or other Fee Entitlement with Participating Subdivisions, enforcement of which, except for State Back-Stop Agreements, are waived in conjunction with the application, the nature and extent of any work for those Participating Subdivisions, whether such Participating Subdivisions actively litigated and, if so, the nature and procedural history of such case(s);
- h. The experience, reputation, and ability of the Applicant;
- i. Whether the Applicant’s clients brought Released Claims against Released Entities;
- j. The status of discovery in cases primarily handled by the Applicant;
- k. The nature of any work by the Applicant on “bellwether” cases or cases that were similarly active in litigation;

- l. Any pressure points successfully asserted by the Applicant in cases against Teva or Allergan or any risk for Teva or Allergan created by the Applicant in cases against them;
- m. Any risk for defendants created by Applicants in cases against Teva or Allergan;
- n. Successful and unsuccessful motion practice in cases worked on by the Applicant;
- o. The date of filing of any cases filed by the Applicant;
- p. Obtaining consolidation of the litigation in the Applicant's jurisdiction;
- q. The number and population of entities represented by the Applicant and the fees that would have been awarded under extinguished contingent fee arrangements;
- r. Whether the Applicant's clients brought claims against Teva or Allergan;
- s. Whether the Applicant has had a leadership role in the litigation, whether in state or federal court;
- t. Whether the Applicant has had a leadership role in any negotiations aimed at resolving the litigation;
- u. Whether the Applicant's cases have survived motions to dismiss;
- v. The extent to which the Applicant contributed to the work product used for the common benefit of opioids litigants, including, without limitation, work on ARCOS data, Prescription Data Monitoring Programs, IQVIA data, depositions, document production and analysis experts, motions, briefs and pleadings, trial preparations, and trials;
- w. The extent to which litigation was done prior to and contributed to completion of settlement negotiations, as distinct from litigation that was done litigating after the announcement of the Teva Agreement or Allergan Agreement, such latter litigation both being of less value and potentially resulting a common detriment to the settlement process; and
- x. Any other factors that the Fee Panel finds to be appropriate to consider after input from Applicants to the Attorney Fee Fund.

4. In the event that States and Subdivisions enter into an additional global settlement with a party or parties other than Teva or Allergan that is (a) under the jurisdiction of the MDL Court in MDL No. 2804, (b) creates a separate common benefit fund to be administered by the Fee Panel, and (c) unless the parties agree to another date, such agreement has an effective date prior to June 30, 2023, the Fee Panel may:
 - a. Consolidate the Common Benefit approval process to include evaluation of all Common Benefit Applications for all settlements entered after November 14, 2022;
 - b. Determine the fair and equitable allocation of the Aggregate Common Benefit Fees that come after November 14, 2022;
 - c. Give consideration to the amount and timing of each settlement, including the amount and timing of Common Benefit Fees;
 - d. The Fee Panel shall abide by the applicable Attorney Fee Agreement in each of the Settlements in Allocating the Common Benefit Fees provided for in the Settlement; and
 - e. Be guided in their work by the Orders of the Court related to Fees and Costs.

5. The Fee Panel shall develop procedures for receiving a single application, which may be updated or amended based on new information (such as participation by additional Litigating Subdivisions) from each Applicant seeking compensation from each sub fund of the Attorney Fee Fund pursuant to processes and procedures developed by the Fee Panel, which shall not be inconsistent with this Fee Agreement. Any request for attorneys' fees not included on the single application or through the updating/amendment process designed by the Fee Panel shall be deemed waived. For purposes of transparency and to permit the Fee Panel to conduct its work, the application from each Applicant shall, at a minimum, require each Applicant to:
 - a. Identify all Litigating Subdivisions for which s/he is seeking payment from the Attorney Fee Fund;
 - b. Identify all Subdivisions in both Settling and Non-Settling States (and, where applicable, Tribal Nations) with respect to which s/he has a Fee Entitlement with respect to Relevant Claims against Released Entities, and identify all co-counsel in such cases;
 - c. Identify which of those Subdivisions are Participating Subdivisions and which are not (with similar information for Tribal Nations, where applicable);

- d. Specify the specific fund or funds within the Attorney Fee Fund from which the Attorney is seeking compensation;
 - e. Demonstrate his or her eligibility for compensation from the relevant sub funds within the Attorney Fee Fund pursuant to the criteria set forth for the relevant sub fund;
 - f. Identify any and all Fee Entitlements from representations of States, Tribal Nations, or other plaintiffs related to Released Claims against Released Entities or in opioids-related matters;
 - g. Notwithstanding “a-f” above, the Panel may consider a supplemental application if the Applicant shows good cause why circumstances exist that will lead to consideration for additional Common Benefit award. Examples would include, but are not limited to, an Applicant having Non-Participating Litigating Subdivision clients that subsequently become Participating Subdivisions, a Bar Date passes that increases participation or the Participation Tier, or an Allocation Agreement is reached.
6. With respect to the Common Benefit Fund, the Fee Panel shall (subject to any applicable MDL Court Order):
- a. Review the applications of all Applicants seeking compensation from the Common Benefit Fund, including determining eligibility for each Applicant as set forth in subsection III.G.
 - b. Reduce, on an annual basis, Teva’s or Allergan’s payment obligations, as set forth in paragraph III.E.7. The Panel shall inform Teva or Allergan, and the MDL PEC of all such amounts and adjust payment obligations accordingly.
 - c. Using criteria set forth in subsections III.E and III.H, allocate amounts from the Common Benefit Fund to eligible Applicants, including payment amounts for each Payment Year. In making such allocations, the Panel shall apply the principles set forth in paragraph III.E.6 and shall allocate any reduction in the payments specified in paragraph III.E.7 to the amounts paid to Applicants with a Common Benefit Fee Entitlement.
7. With respect to the Contingency Fee Fund, the Fee Panel shall:
- a. Review the applications of all Attorneys seeking compensation from the Litigating Subdivision Fee Fund, including determining eligibility for each Attorney as set forth in subsection III.G.
 - b. Apply the Mathematical Model in Exhibit A to this Fee Agreement.

- c. Use such allocations to reduce on an annual basis the payment obligations of Teva or Allergan to the Attorney Fee Fund as set forth in paragraph III.F.4, and distributions therefrom, and inform Teva or Allergan and the MDL PEC of all such adjustments.
8. To the extent that there is a dispute about the calculations of the Fee Panel related to the amounts that Teva or Allergan is required to pay (including application of any reductions or offsets under this Fee Agreement), such disputes shall be presented to the Fee Panel and any disputed funds be paid into/held in escrow. The Fee Panel shall resolve such disputes expeditiously, with either Party having the right to seek review from the MDL Court.
9. For purposes of determination of fee or cost awards, allocations, reductions, and possible reversions under this Fee Agreement, unless specified otherwise a Subdivision will be considered a Non-Participating Subdivision if it is not a Participating Subdivision as of the deadline for the application for the fee at issue (or, if the determination does not involve a specific application, the date on which the record for such determination closes).
10. In the event that the Fee Panel, through the use of the Mathematical Model set forth in Exhibit A, allocates funds from the Contingency Fee Fund for an Attorney based on a Qualifying Representation of a Participating Litigating Subdivision and that Subdivision is in a Settling State in which the Consent Judgment has not been approved, such funds shall be placed into escrow until the Consent Judgment is approved, after which time they shall be released.

I. *Miscellaneous.*

1. The Fee Panel shall charge an hourly rate approved by the Court. The Pre-Effective Date costs associated with the Cost and Expense Fund Administrator shall be paid from funds in the Cost Fund. Post-Effective Date, the cost of the Fee Panel shall be charged against the applicable Fee Fund based on allocation by the Fee Panel and shall not be otherwise funded by Teva and Allergan.
2. The MDL PEC shall provide to Teva and Allergan information they have that identifies Attorneys who represent Litigating Subdivisions who are not Participating Subdivisions and who have an obligation to pay a common benefit assessment, either due to the MDL Court's orders or pursuant to a Participation Agreement.
3. Participating Subdivisions agree to instruct their counsel to treat information, work product and expert materials as confidential under Rule 1.6 of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct. Accordingly, an Attorney shall not share information or work product with, or experts or

materials to, non-participants (other than the Attorney's own current clients or their lawyers, consultants, experts or other representatives or agents). However, nothing herein shall prevent MDL Leadership or PEC Counsel from fulfilling their obligations in any MDL and the MDL Court Order.

IV. Miscellaneous

- A. *Termination.* If the Teva Agreement or Allergan Agreement does not proceed past the Reference Date, whether because Teva and Allergan do not determine to proceed or for any other reason, this Fee Agreement shall be null and void, neither Teva nor Allergan shall have any obligation to make any payments under this Fee Agreement other than Fee Panel costs advanced, and Teva, Allergan, and the PEC shall take such steps as are necessary to restore the *status quo ante*.
- B. *MDL Court Consideration.* This Fee Agreement shall be attached as an exhibit to the Teva Agreement and Allergan Agreement. This Fee Agreement shall also be submitted by Teva, Allergan, and the MDL PEC to the MDL Court for approval pursuant to the motion and order that shall be attached, prior to the Preliminary Agreement Date of the Agreements, as Exhibit B.
1. In the event that the MDL Court, through an order, makes any change to the amounts potentially to be paid by Teva and Allergan under this Fee Agreement, makes any change to the Fee Panel's consideration of the factors set forth in paragraph III.E.6, or any other material change to the draft Order attached as part of Exhibit B or the terms of this Fee Agreement, Teva, Allergan, and the MDL PEC shall meet and confer concerning such changes.
 2. If Teva, Allergan, and the MDL PEC are unable to reach agreement and revisions to this Fee Agreement, this Fee Agreement shall be null and void, Teva and Allergan shall have no obligation to make any payments under this Fee Agreement, and Teva, Allergan, and the MDL PEC shall take such steps as are necessary to restore the *status quo ante*.
- C. *Amendment.* Once the MDL Court has entered an order implementing this Fee Agreement, this Fee Agreement can only be amended by (1) written agreement of Teva, Allergan, and the MDL PEC and (2) approval by the MDL Court.
- D. *Jurisdiction and Enforcement.* The MDL Court shall have exclusive and ongoing jurisdiction over the enforcement and implementation of this Fee Agreement as set forth herein. The MDL PEC shall be the Authorized Party to enforce this Fee Agreement, as to the payment obligations of Teva and Allergan as set forth in this subsection and as to Attorneys making application to the Funds under this Fee Agreement. Solely for purposes of assessing or allocating common benefit fees, the MDL Court will continue to have jurisdiction over the work product developed in the MDL Court by and under the direction of the MDL PEC with respect to claims against Teva or Allergan, including data and documents, depositions, expert

reports, briefs and pleadings; and the MDL Court's protective orders, management orders, and other decisions regarding such discovery and other work product, including but not limited to, conditions on its use, will continue in full force and effect. Nothing in this subsection authorizes the MDL Court to act contrary to this Agreement or provides the MDL Court with jurisdiction over the Teva Agreement or Allergan Agreement.

EXHIBIT S
Agreement on the State Outside Counsel Fee Fund for Manufacturer Settlements

1. **Definitions.**

- a. “Manufacturer” means any of Teva and Allergan, and “Manufacturers” means all of the foregoing.
- b. “Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreement” means This Settlement Agreement along with the separate settlement of opioids-related claims among 30 or more states and the other Manufacturer.
- c. “This Settlement Agreement” means the settlement agreement between the Settling States and the Manufacturer to which this Agreement is attached as an Exhibit.
- d. “Settling Manufacturer” means the Manufacturer that is a party to This Settlement Agreement.
- e. “Settling States” has the meaning given such term in the relevant Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreement.

2. **Creation of a State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund.** The Settling States have agreed to the creation of a state outside counsel fee fund to pay reasonable attorneys’ fees of Settling States which have retained outside counsel in connection with litigation against one or more Manufacturers (such fund, the “State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund”).

3. **State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund Administration.** The State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund shall be administered separately from any other funds for the payment of attorney’s fees or costs in connection with This Settlement Agreement, including any common benefit fund, contingency fee fund for subdivision counsel, state cost fund, or MDL expense fund. If necessary, a committee of Attorneys General shall be convened to oversee the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund (the “Manufacturers Fee Fund Committee”). The Manufacturers Fee Fund Committee shall be appointed by the Settling State Members of the Enforcement Committee and shall be comprised solely of Attorneys General of Settling States that engaged outside counsel to pursue litigation against one or more Manufacturers. The Settlement Fund Administrator (the “Fee Fund Administrator”) shall administer the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund according to this Exhibit and, if convened, the guidelines and directives of the Manufacturers Fee Fund Committee.

4. **State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Eligibility.**

- a. To receive any amount from the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund, both of the following must be true:
 1. an outside counsel to a Settling State must have filed and maintained an action in the name of a Settling State or its Attorney General against a Manufacturer in a state or federal court as of November 1, 2022; and
 2. the State must become a Settling State for each Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreement for which it is eligible.

- b. No Settling State (or its outside counsel) shall receive funds from both the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund and any “Additional Restitution Amount” as may be provided for in This Settlement Agreement.
- c. In addition to the eligibility criteria set forth in Paragraph 4.a, above, and for the avoidance of doubt, only Settling States under This Settlement Agreement are eligible to receive any funds paid into the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund as a result of This Settlement Agreement.

5. **State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund Amount.** The Settling Manufacturer shall pay funds into the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund in an amount equal to, and on the schedule identified in, **Exhibit M** (the “Contribution”). The Settling Manufacturer’s Contribution shall be subject to a reduction as described in Paragraph 8, below.

6. **State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund Availability and Calculation of Amount.**

- a. The State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund shall be available to compensate private outside counsel for Settling State Attorneys General for approved fees arising out of representation of the Settling State pursuant to the schedule attached to this agreement as Schedule I (the “Fee Schedule”).
- b. The Fee Schedule is intended to reflect the fee calculation in subparagraphs 6.c and ~~6.ed~~, below (the “Fee Calculation”). Subject to adjustments required by Paragraph 8, below, in the event of any discrepancy between the Fee Schedule and the Fee Calculation, the Fee Schedule shall control. Each Settling State, by becoming a Participating State in This Settlement Agreement, agrees that the Fee Schedule reflects the Fee Calculation and waives any right to contest the accuracy of the Fee Schedule, absent manifest error, the exclusion of a Settling State, or the inclusion of a Non-Settling State. The version of the Fee Schedule reflecting any necessary adjustments shall be the “Final Fee Schedule.”
- c. Except as provided in Paragraph ~~6.ed~~, below, fees shall be aggregated across the Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreements and be calculated by adding two components: (a) a fixed amount consisting of fifty percent (50%) of the amount of remediation funds allocated to a Settling State and its Subdivisions pursuant to the Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreements multiplied by 4.5% (or, if lower, the applicable contingency fee percentage in the Settling State’s outside counsel contract); and (b) a proportional percentage of the remaining fee due under that Settling State’s contract with its outside counsel assuming that fifty percent (50%) of the Settling State’s recovery is allocable to a Settling State (rather than allocable to the Settling State’s Participating Subdivisions) so that the fees of all eligible Settling States (minus the fixed amount that would have been allocated to any Non-Settling States had they become Settling States) exhausts the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund. The proportional share percentage will be the same for each Settling State

included in the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund. Except as set forth in Paragraph 6.c, fees shall be split proportionally among each Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreement, as set forth on the Fee Schedule.

- d. Notwithstanding the foregoing, fees for the State of Oklahoma, if it becomes a Settling State under the Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreement with Allergan, shall be limited to Oklahoma's share of the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund derived from Allergan's Contribution. Oklahoma's share of the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund derived from Teva's Contribution shall be reallocated proportionally among the other Settling States eligible to receive payments from the State Outside Counsel Manufacturer Fee Fund.
- e. All amounts paid will be less the following:
 1. Any costs or fees of the Fee Fund Administrator. The Fee Schedule reflects a holdback amount of \$50,000 for such administrative expenses of the Fee Fund Administrator, the remainder of which shall be disbursed proportionally to States receiving monies from the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund at the conclusion of such administration.

7. Payment by the Fee Fund Administrator.

- a. The Fee Fund Administrator shall hold the Contribution in escrow until the earlier of (1) both Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreements become effective or (2) when instructed by the Settling State Members of the Enforcement Committee.
- b. Subject to eligibility pursuant to Paragraph 4, above, a Settling State's outside counsel may receive funds from the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund in the following scenarios ("Payment Scenarios"):
 1. The Settling State's outside counsel agrees that the amount listed for such state on the Final Fee Schedule either satisfies in full or exceeds the amounts owed to all such Settling State's outside counsel and such counsel has provided written notice waiving all entitlement to additional fee in respect of any Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreement.
 2. The Settling State and its outside counsel enter into a signed writing establishing the amount owed to the counsel, which includes an agreement on the payment of the amount listed for such state on the Final Fee Schedule and waives any right of the State or its outside counsel to additional amounts from the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund.
 3. A final judgment is entered that is no longer appealable, which judgement adjudicates the amount owed to the Settling State's counsel in respect of This Settlement Agreement and directs the Manufacturers Fee Fund Committee how to pay the amount listed on the Final Fee Schedule for such State.

If no Payment Scenario is applicable with respect to a Settling State, then the Settling State's share shall be placed in an interest-bearing escrow account (less reasonable expenses of the Fee Fund Administrator) and held unless and until a Payment Scenario is applicable.

- c. Upon the applicability of a Payment Scenario 1 with respect to a Settling State, the Fee Fund Administrator shall pay that Settling State's outside counsel the amount identified on the Final Fee Schedule for such state or such lesser amount that satisfies the Settling State's obligation to its outside counsel in full. Any remaining allocation to such State shall be paid to the Settling State.
- d. Upon the applicability of a Payment Scenario 2 or 3 with respect to a Settling State, the Fee Fund Administrator shall release monies from the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund in either the amount held by the Fee Fund Administrator, if the amount of the agreement or judgment is equal to or more than the amount held, or the amount indicated in the agreement or in the final judgment, if the amount in the agreement or judgment is less than the amount held.
- e. Nothing herein, including the amounts listed in Paragraph 5 above or on any Fee Schedule, shall prevent a Settling State from arguing in any proceeding with its outside counsel that (i) its recovery was less than fifty percent (50%) of the recovery in the settlement agreement down to and including fifteen percent (15%) of the total recovery; (ii) any payment should be discounted by an appropriate discount rate commensurate to the risk of the settlement agreement and the timeline that the Settling State is receiving its payments; (iii) the settlement amount should be lower because the amount a Settling State receives was reduced because such Settling State's outside counsel failed to obtain joinder from a Settling State's Subdivision(s) that the outside counsel also represented; or (iv) any limitation placed by the Settling Manufacturer bars payment of a higher fee to outside counsel.
- f. In the event the amount due to the Settling State's outside counsel from an escrow account is less than the total amount of funds escrowed on the account of the Settling State, the balance shall be paid to the Settling State. In no event, other than a State becoming a Non-Settling State, shall funds revert to a Manufacturer.

8. **Non-Settling States; Reversion and Redistribution.** Amounts owed by the Settling Manufacturer to the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund shall be reduced by amounts allocated to the fixed amount for such State under This Settlement Agreement in the event that a listed State becomes a Non-Settling State. The payments for the other Settling States reflected in the Fee Schedule shall be adjusted by the Fee Fund Administrator to reflect a recalculated proportional percentage under the Fee Calculation.

9. **Interpretation.**

a. This Agreement shall be an Exhibit to each Multistate Manufacturer Settlement Agreement and shall include the Fee Schedule setting forth the presumptive payment calculations for each eligible Settling State. By joining This Settlement Agreement, each State agrees on the presumptive accuracy of the Fee Schedule, absent manifest error, the inclusion of a Non-Settling State, or the exclusion of a Settling State.

b. It is the intent of all parties that the State Outside Counsel Manufacturers Fee Fund function in a similar manner, with similar calculations and mechanics, as the “State Outside Counsel Fee Fund” established in **Exhibit S** of that certain settlement agreement dated as of July 21, 2021 setting forth the terms of settlement between and among McKesson Corporation, Cardinal Health, Inc., and AmerisourceBergen Corporation, on the one hand, and certain settling states and certain participating subdivisions, on the other hand.

Schedule I

Fee Schedule

State	Total Fee	Allergan Share	Teva Share
Alaska	\$1,252,625.36	\$424,966.99	\$827,658.36
Delaware	\$2,194,254.56	\$744,425.11	\$1,449,829.45
Georgia	\$6,557,324.06	\$2,224,644.65	\$4,332,679.41
Hawaii	\$1,272,349.43	\$431,658.60	\$840,690.83
Idaho	\$1,413,869.58	\$479,670.88	\$934,198.70
Kentucky	\$5,087,998.16	\$1,726,159.60	\$3,361,838.56
Mississippi	\$1,737,202.53	\$589,365.16	\$1,147,837.38
Nevada	\$6,279,564.47	\$2,130,411.64	\$4,149,152.83
New Mexico	\$5,218,189.24	\$1,770,328.36	\$3,447,860.88
Ohio	\$6,831,882.94	\$2,317,791.78	\$4,514,091.16
Oklahoma	\$1,470,349.73	\$1,470,349.73	\$-
Puerto Rico	\$4,823,581.25	\$1,636,453.24	\$3,187,128.01
South Dakota	\$673,251.45	\$228,408.00	\$444,843.46
	Admin Expense	\$18,047.03	\$31,952.97
	Holdbacks		
	Total	\$16,192,680.76	\$28,669,762.00

EXHIBIT T
Agreement on the Joint- State Cost Fund Administration

1. **Definitions.**

- a. “Opioids Defendant” means Teva, Allergan, or such other defendant in opioids-related litigation that enters into a Multistate Settlement after November 1, 2022, and “Opioids Defendants” means all of the foregoing.
- b. “Multistate Settlement” means this Settlement Agreement along with any other settlement of opioids-related claims among 30 or more states and an Opioids Defendant.
- c. “Settlement Agreement” means the settlement agreement between the Settling States and the Opioids Defendant to which this Agreement is attached as an Exhibit.
- d. “Settling Opioids Defendant” means the Opioids Defendant that is a party to the Settlement Agreement.
- e. “Settling States” has the meaning given such term in the Settlement Agreement.

2. **Creation of a State Cost Fund.** The Settling Opioids Defendant and the Settling States agree to the creation of a fund to pay costs and expenses associated with litigation and investigations related to the opioids litigation (such fund, the “State Cost Fund”). The State Cost Fund shall be administered separately from any other funds for the payment of attorneys fees or costs in connection with the Settlement Agreement, including any common benefit fund, contingency fee fund for subdivision counsel, subdivision cost fund, or MDL expense fund. However, the State Cost Fund shall be administered jointly with similar “State Cost Funds” created in other Multistate Settlements after November 1, 2022; any state cost funds jointly administered in this manner shall be referred to as the “Joint State Cost Fund.” To the extent permissible and feasible, the Joint State Cost Fund may also be jointly administered with any fund for reimbursement of states’ litigation and investigation costs established by a bankruptcy plan, including the Mallinckrodt bankruptcy plan, any plans that may emerge from the bankruptcies of Purdue and Endo, and any similar bankruptcies of opioids defendants. To the extent feasible, the Joint State Cost Fund may also be jointly administered with the State Cost Funds established pursuant to the Distributors Multistate Settlement and the Janssen Multistate Settlement.

3. **State Cost Fund Amount.** The Settling Opioids Defendant shall pay into the State Cost Fund in the amount listed on, and on the schedule set forth in, **Exhibit M** (the “Settling Opioids Defendant’s Contribution”) for the purpose paying States’ costs and expenses associated with to the opioid litigation.

4. **Joint State Cost Fund Committee.** A committee of Attorneys General or their designated representatives (such committee, the “Joint State Cost Fund Committee”) shall oversee the Joint State Cost Fund. The committee shall be appointed by the Settling State Members of the Enforcement Committee, who shall aim to (i) have equal representation between states that retained contingency fee outside counsel and states that did not retain contingency fee outside counsel with respect to opioids-related litigation, and (ii) maintain consistency of committee membership across state cost funds that compose the Joint State Cost Fund. The Settling State Members of the Enforcement Committee may by majority vote add to or change the composition of the Joint State Cost Fund Committee.

5. **Joint State Cost Fund Administrator.**

- a. The Joint State Cost Fund Committee may select an administrator (the “Joint State Cost Fund Administrator”), who shall administer the Joint State Cost Fund and direct payments to Settling States according to the guidelines and directives of the Joint State Cost Fund Committee. While the expenses of the Joint State Cost Fund Administrator shall be reimbursable pursuant to the principles and guidelines listed below, the Joint State Cost Fund Administrator shall first rely on any separate funds that may be set aside for such purpose in any Multistate Settlement.
- b. The Joint State Cost Fund Administrator shall be responsible, under the direction and supervision of the Joint State Cost Fund Committee, for receiving and reviewing applications for reimbursement from the Joint State Cost Fund. This may include the creation of an audit process to ensure the integrity of submissions, as well as reimbursement rules to incentivize accurate submissions.

6. **State Cost Fund Guidelines and Principles.**

- a. Monies in the State Cost Fund shall be released without any delay to reimburse Settling States for documented costs incurred or paid in connection with litigation and investigation related to the opioid litigation.
- b. In allocating the Joint State Cost Fund, the Joint State Cost Fund Committee shall seek to comply with the following principles:
 1. Each State Cost Fund should be used to reimburse costs incurred by States that are Settling States in the Multistate Settlement from which funds are paid. (However, the foregoing sentence does not preclude a Non-Settling State that joins a separate Multistate Settlement from participating in the Joint State Cost Fund with respect to contributions made by other Opioids Defendants.)
 2. Funds in any State Cost Fund shall be primarily used to reimburse

costs incurred prior to the date on which the relevant Multistate Settlement was first made available for participation to eligible States. Regardless of other factors considered in prioritizing payments, all costs incurred prior to January 1, 2023, shall be paid before any costs incurred after that date are paid.

3. The Joint State Cost Fund shall prioritize the reimbursement of the following over reimbursement of any State's litigation or investigation costs:
 - the reasonable costs of the Joint State Cost Fund Administrator;
 - repayment of National Association of Attorneys General grants made in connection with opioid investigations and litigation, without regard to when the grants were made;
 - repayment of state-attributable costs of any mediator in connection with negotiations of a Multistate Settlement;
4. The Joint State Cost Fund shall seek to prioritize costs in the following order:
 - litigation-related costs; then
 - investigation-related costs; then
 - settlement and negotiation related costs; then
 - cost shares.
5. Costs incurred by a State's outside counsel that the State is contractually obligated to reimburse shall be treated as costs incurred by a State.
6. As between similar categories of costs (e.g., defendant-specific litigation-related costs), the Joint State Cost Fund shall first reimburse costs incurred by a State's outside counsel that the State is contractually obligated to reimburse out of its recovery, and then reimburse costs directly incurred by States.
7. The Joint State Cost Fund shall be available to reimburse only those costs which have not yet been reimbursed to a State from any other source, including any other fund set aside in a Multistate Settlement or bankruptcy plan for the reimbursement of costs or any individual

state settlements.

8. The Joint State Cost Fund should not reimburse expenses that are expected to be reimbursed from another source, such as a bankruptcy debtor, unless such expected reimbursements do not come to fruition within a reasonable amount of time. This includes cost shares paid by states.
 9. When coordinating among different state cost funds that each could be used to reimburse a given expense, the Joint State Cost Fund Committee may set guidelines to equitably distribute reimbursements across all state cost funds in a manner that prioritizes costs unlikely to be otherwise reimbursed to a similarly situated State.
 10. The Joint State Cost Fund may deny reimbursement of costs, on either an individual basis or a categorical basis, that a supermajority (75%+) of the Joint State Cost Fund Committee determines to be unreasonable.
 11. After all costs identified in the foregoing have been reimbursed, the remaining funds in the Joint State Cost Fund shall be distributed to states in proportion to their allocation of remediation payments in the Mallinckrodt bankruptcy plan. Such distribution shall be treated as a reimbursement for States' unenumerated costs of administering the Multistate Settlements and no subdivision shares shall be carved out of such disbursement, nor shall any attorney's fees be assessed against such distribution (unless individually agreed to by a State).
- c. In applying the foregoing principles, the Joint State Cost Fund Committee shall have the discretion to vary their application in order to ensure equity among similarly situated states and to facilitate the ease and speed of administering the Joint State Cost Fund. The Joint State Cost Fund Committee may also apply percentages to approximate costs attributable to a particular Opioids Defendant (or categories of Opioids Defendants) in a manner that seeks to treat similarly situated states equitably.
 - d. The Joint State Cost Fund Committee shall establish guidelines for the submission and approval of expenses eligible for reimbursement from the Joint State Cost Fund, which guidelines may be coordinated and consolidated with any similar cost funds in other state opioid settlements for purposes of joint administration and efficiency.
 - e. Unless waived by the Joint State Cost Fund Committee, the Joint State Cost

Fund Administrator shall, in accordance with such guidelines, receive from Settling States records sufficient to demonstrate the incurrence and payment of each expense.

- f. Where the Joint State Cost Fund Committee determines by a supermajority vote (75%+) that outside counsel for a Settling State has failed to exercise reasonable diligence in reviewing submitted costs for allowability, and such failure has resulted in the reimbursement of unallowed costs to such outside counsel, the Committee shall have the discretion to reduce or recover payments made to such outside counsel in an amount calculated to incentivize the exercise of reasonable diligence.

7. **State Undertakings.** Each State submitting for reimbursement of costs from the Joint State Cost Fund agrees:

- a. to only submit costs allowable under this Joint State Cost Fund Agreement;
- b. to provide all back-up documentation that may be requested with respect to any submitted cost and to make itself available for any questions related to such costs;
- c. to exercise reasonable diligence to ensure that all submitted costs are allowable under (i) this Joint State Cost Fund Agreement, (ii) the State's contract with its outside counsel, if relevant, (iii) state law, and (iv) the policies and procedures applicable to the State's retention of outside counsel, if relevant; and
- d. to promptly return any excess payments made to the State or its outside counsel from the Joint State Cost Fund, including payments made for costs that were reimbursed from another source or are not allowable hereunder.