Stephen C. Matthews (#055801994)

DLA PIPER LLP (US)

51 John F. Kennedy Parkway, Suite 120 Short Hills, New Jersey 07078-2704

Telephone No.: (973) 520-2541

Fax No.: (973) 215-2602 stephen.matthews@us.dlapiper.com

Attorneys for Defendants Sanofi U.S. Services, Inc.

and sanofi-aventis U.S. LLC

**FILED** 

May 12, 2023

HON. BRUCE J. KAPLAN, J.S.C.

SABRINA HALL,

Plaintiff,

VS.

SANOFI U.S. SERVICES INC., formerly known as SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. INC; SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, separately and doing business as WINTHROP U.S.; and SANDOZ, INC.,

Defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - MIDDLESEX COUNTY DOCKET NO. MID-L-7586-18

CASE TYPE: MCL NO. 628

Civil Action

In Re Taxotere Litigation

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW PRO HAC VICE APPEARANCE OF HILLARY NICHOLAS

**WHEREAS**, Defendants, Sanofi U.S. Services, Inc. and sanofi-aventis U.S. LLC., by and through its attorneys DLA PIPER LLP (US), upon notice to all interested parties, has moved before this Court for withdrawal of the *pro hac vice* admission of Hillary Nicholas; and the Court having considered the papers submitted in support thereof; and for other good cause shown,

IT IS on this 12th day of May, 2023;

**ORDERED** that the motion is granted, and the pro hac vice admission of Hillary Nicholas, Esquire, is hereby withdrawn for all purposes and in all proceedings in connection with the above-captioned matter, with an effective date of as of the date of this Order, and it is further

**ORDERED** that DLA PIPER LLP (US), shall forward a copy of this Order to the Treasurer of the New Jersey Fund for Client Protection within ten (10) days of the date of this Order, and it is further

**ORDERED** that the posting of this Order on eCourts shall constitute service upon all counsel of record. Pursuant to  $\underline{R}$ . 1:5-1(a), the movant shall serve a copy of this Order upon all parties not served electronically within seven (7) days of receipt of this Order.

ISI Bruce Q. Kaplan HONORABLE BRUCE J. KAPLAN, J.S.C.

## Unopposed

Having reviewed the within motion, this Court finds it to be meritorious on its face and is unopposed. Pursuant to  $\underline{R}$ . 1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers.