UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: PROFEMUR HIP IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 2949

FILED	
-------	--

U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

Sep 23, 2024

Tammy H. Downs, Clerk By: JohnHibbs D.C. DEP CLERK (SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO -23)

On August 7, 2020, the Panel transferred 38 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See* 481 F.Supp.3d 1350 (J.P.M.L. 2020). Since that time, 47 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Eastern District of Arkansas. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Kristine G. Baker.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Eastern District of Arkansas and assigned to Judge Baker.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the <u>Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation</u>, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Eastern District of Arkansas for the reasons stated in the order of August 7, 2020, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Kristine G. Baker.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7–day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.



FOR THE PANEL:

Magcella R. hicken

Marcella R. Lockert Acting Clerk of the Panel

IN RE: PROFEMUR HIP IMPLANT PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 2949

SCHEDULE CTO-23 - TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

<u>DIST</u>	<u>DIV.</u>	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	CASE CAPTION
IDAHO			
ID	1	24-00373	Schaapman v.Wright Medical Technology, Inc., et al.