

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

In re: Mirapex Products Liability Litigation	)	MDL No. 07-md-1836-JMR-FLN
	)	
This Document Relates to:	)	
	)	
ROBERT HUDSON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil No. 08-cv-00914-JMR-FLN
	)	
BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM	)	<b>AMENDED COMPLAINT</b>
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., a Delaware	)	<b>AND DEMAND</b>
corporation; PFIZER INC., a Delaware	)	<b>FOR JURY TRIAL</b>
corporation; PHARMACIA CORPORATION,	)	
a Delaware corporation; and	)	
PHARMACIA & UPJOHN COMPANY, LLC,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

Plaintiff Robert Hudson for his causes of action against the above-named defendants, alleges and states on information and belief as follows:

**PARTIES, JURISDICTION & VENUE**

1.

At all times material herein, Plaintiff Robert Hudson resided in, and currently resides in, Kingfisher Oklahoma. Plaintiff Robert Hudson developed a pathological gambling addition caused by his use of Mirapex.

2.

Defendant Pfizer Inc. (Pfizer”) is a Delaware corporation authorized to do business in the State of Oklahoma and has appointed an agent for service of process in this State.

3.

Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Boehringer Ingelheim:”) is a Delaware corporation authorized to do business in the State of Oklahoma and has appointed an agent for service of process in this State.

4.

Defendant Pharmacia Corporation (“Pharmacia”) is a Delaware corporation authorized to do business in the State of Oklahoma and has appointed an agent for service of process in this State. Defendant Pharmacia is a wholly-owned subsidiary of defendant Pfizer. On information and belief, Pharmacia was acquired by Pfizer pursuant to an Agreement and Plan of Merger dated July 13, 2002.

5.

Defendant Pharmacia & Upjohn Company LLC (“Pharmacia & Upjohn”) is a limited liability company whose sole member is Pharmacia, which is solely owned by Pfizer. Pharmacia & Upjohn is authorized to do business in the State of Oklahoma and has appointed an agent for service of process in this State. On information and belief, in

April 2000, Pharmacia & Upjohn completed a merger with Monsanto and Searle creating Pharmacia.

6.

Defendants Pfizer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Pharmacia and Pharmacia & Upjohn (collectively “defendants”) are in the business of researching, testing, developing, manufacturing, distributing, licensing, labeling, and marketing, either directly or indirectly through third parties or related entities, the pharmaceutical drug Mirapex, both in Oklahoma and throughout the United States.

7.

This action is properly before the Court because there exists complete diversity of citizenship between plaintiffs and defendants. In addition, the amount in controversy claimed by plaintiff exceeds \$75,000. As a result, this Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).

8.

Defendants are subject to the *in personam* jurisdiction of this Court, and venue is therefore proper herein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, because defendants did and/or do business within and have continuous and systematic contacts with the State of Oklahoma, have consented to jurisdiction in the State of Oklahoma and/or committed a tort in whole or in part in the State of Oklahoma against plaintiff, as more fully set forth herein. On

information and belief, defendants also advertised in this district, made material omissions and representations in this district, and breached warranties in this district.

## **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

9.

Defendants jointly created, developed, designed, researched, manufactured, tested, labeled, packaged, launched, supplied, marketed, sold, advertised, promoted, and distributed in interstate commerce the pharmaceutical pramipexole dihydrochloride under the brand name Mirapex. Mirapex is indicated for treatment of the signs and symptoms of idiopathic Parkinson's Disease. On information and belief, Mirapex is promoted by defendants and commonly prescribed for treatment of the signs and symptoms of Restless Legs Syndrom ("RLS").

10.

Parkinson's Disease is a chronic progressive neurological disease caused by degeneration of brain cells that produce the chemical messenger dopamine. Parkinson's Disease is marked especially by tremor of resting muscles, rigidity, slowness of movement, impaired balance, and a shuffling gait. RLS is also a neurological disorder believed to be caused by a dopamine imbalance in the brain. RLS is a condition in which you limbs, particularly your legs, feel extremely uncomfortable while sitting or lying down.

11.

Mirapex is within the class of drugs known as dopamine agonists. Dopamine agonists directly stimulate dopamine receptors and mimic the action of dopamine in the brain.

12.

There are at least five types of dopamine receptors in the brain, numbered D1 to D5. The ability of each type of dopamine agonist differs in its affinity or selectivity for binding to the different receptor types in the brain. Mirapex has the strongest affinity for D3 dopamine receptors and also binds to the D2 and D4 receptors. The D3 receptors are most highly concentrated in the brain's mesolimbic pathway, an area of the brain associated with pleasure, reward-seeking behavior and reinforcement systems.

13.

In December 1995, Pharmacia & Upjohn submitted an Application to Market a New Drug ("NDA") to the United States Food and Drug Administration ("FDA"). The application was resubmitted in January 1997. The applications sought approval to market Mirapex tablets containing doses of 0.125 mg, 0.25 mg, 1.0 mg, 1.25 mg, and 1.5 mg for the treatment of the signs and symptoms of Parkinson's Disease (NDA 20-667). In July 1997, the FDA approved Mirapex for treating adults with Parkinson's Disease.

14.

Defendants embarked upon a massive promotional campaign urging doctors to use Mirapex, but defendants never warned physicians that Mirapex could cause compulsive behaviors like pathological gambling addiction. Defendants have never sent out any “Dear Doctor” letters to inform doctors of the risk of Mirapex.

15.

Defendants changed the Mirapex label or prescribing information in March 2005 to reflect findings in the literature associating Mirapex with pathological gambling and other compulsive behaviors. Prior to this change, the Mirapex label made no mention to the link between compulsive behaviors, like pathological gambling, and Mirapex. The March 2005 label change added a short paragraph at the end of the ADVERSE REACTIONS section, on page 17 of 21, entitled “post-Marketing Experience” noting that “compulsive behaviors (including sexual and pathological gambling)” have been identified as adverse reactions to Mirapex. However, there was no warning of such risks in the “WARNINGS” section of the label or prescribing information.

16.

Defendants had, or should have had, knowledge that Mirapex can cause compulsive behaviors like pathological gambling addictions.

17.

In August 2005, doctors from the Mayo Clinic published a report in the *Archives of Neurology* entitled “Pathological Gambling Caused by Drugs Used to Treat Parkinson’s Disease.” This study reported on eleven Mayo patients with Parkinson’s Disease who had all recently developed a pathological gambling addiction and who were all on dopamine agonists, nine of which were on Mirapex. For the eight patients with whom the doctors were able to follow up, all of these patients’ gambling problems resolved after discontinuing the dopamine agonist. The Mayo doctors concluded that an association existed between pathological gambling and dopamine agonist therapy, that Mirapex was the agonist primarily implicated and that this may be related to the disproportionate stimulation of the D3 dopamine receptor. The study concluded that dopamine agonists “appear to be *uniquely implicated* as a cause of pathological gambling and that disproportionate stimulation of dopamine receptors in the brain may be responsible.

18.

Since the Mayo study was published, the lead author, Dr. M. Leeann Dodd, has stated that fourteen other Mayo Clinic patients have since been found to have the same problem. According to Dr. Dodd in the American Psychiatric Association publication *Psychiatric News*, affected patients are usually switched to different drugs or doses, and

the result is often dramatic, “like a light switch being turned off when they stopped the drug.”

19.

In 2003, two years before the Mayo study, Dr. Mark Stacy and his colleagues at the Muhammad Ali Parkinson Research Center at the Barrow Neurological Institute in Phoenix published a study linking dopamine agonists with pathological gambling. In this retrospective database review of 1,884 Parkinson’s patients, Dr. Stacy and his colleagues reported the correlation of Mirapex with pathological gambling. The authors found that the overall incidence of pathological gambling in their patients with Parkinson’s was .05%, regardless of therapy, but the incidence of pathological gambling for patients on Mirapex was 1.5%. The authors noted that their patients’ excessive gambling seemed to begin with an increase in dopamine agonist therapy and resolve with dosage reduction. The authors concluded with a statement on the appropriateness of informing patients of a potential risk of pathological gambling while on dopaminergic therapy, especially Mirapex.

20.

On information and belief, the FDA’s Adverse Event Reporting System contains at least 78 reports of Mirapex users with “compulsive disorder episodes,” including 52 involving gambling, through June 2005.

21.

Even when faced with evidence that showed Mirapex was causing compulsive behaviors like pathological gambling, and in the face of calls from the medical establishment to conduct further research and warn patients about this possible effect of Mirapex, defendants have either failed to investigate or conduct any studies on the possible compulsive behavior side effects of Mirapex or have failed to make public the results of any studies or investigations that they might have done.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(Strict Liability - Design, Manufacturing and Warning -  
in Tort against all Defendants)**

22.

Plaintiff Robert Hudson incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

23.

Defendants had a duty to provide adequate warnings and instructions for Mirpex, to use reasonable care to design a product that is not unreasonably dangerous to users, and to adequately test their product.

24.

The Mirapex manufactured and/or supplied to plaintiff Robert Hudson by defendants was defective in design or formulation in that, when it left the hands of the

manufacturer and/or supplier, it was an unreasonably dangerous and defective condition for its intended use and posed a risk of serious compulsive behaviors and harm to plaintiff Robert Hudson and other consumers which could have been reduced or avoided, *inter alia*, by the adoption of a reasonable alternative design.

25.

The Mirapex manufactured and/or supplied to plaintiff Robert Hudson by defendants was defective in design or formulation in that, when it left the hands of the manufacturer and/or supplier, Mirapex had not been adequately tested, was in an unreasonably dangerous and defective condition, and posed a risk of serious compulsive behaviors and harm to plaintiff Robert Hudson and other consumers.

26.

The Mirapex manufactured and/or supplied to plaintiff Robert Hudson by defendants was defective due to inadequate warnings or instructions because the defendants knew or should have known through testing, scientific knowledge, advances in the field or otherwise, that the product created a risk of compulsive behaviors, injury and serious harm and was unreasonably dangerous to plaintiff Robert Hudson and other consumers, about which defendants failed to warn.

27.

The Mirapex manufactured and/or supplied to plaintiff Robert Hudson by defendants was defective, dangerous, and had inadequate warnings or instructions at the time it was sold, and defendants thereafter acquired additional knowledge and information confirming the defective and dangerous nature of Mirapex. Despite this knowledge and information, defendants failed and neglected to issue adequate warnings or post-sale warnings that Mirapex causes compulsive behaviors, especially pathological gambling addictions, including failure to warn about the severity and duration of such compulsive behaviors. Defendants failed to provide adequate warnings to users, purchasers, or prescribers of Mirapex, including plaintiff Robert Hudson and his physicians, and instead continued to sell Mirapex in an unreasonably dangerous form without adequate warnings or instructions.

28.

As a direct and proximate result of defendants' conduct, including the inadequate warnings, lack of adequate testing, and the defective and dangerous nature of Mirapex, plaintiff Robert Hudson has suffered and will continue to suffer physical injury, emotional distress, harm and economic loss as alleged herein.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(Breach of Express Warranty by Defendants)**

29.

Plaintiff Robert Hudson incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

30.

Defendants expressly warranted to physicians and consumers, including plaintiff Robert Hudson and/or his physicians, that Mirapex was safe and/or well-tolerated.

31.

Mirapex does not conform to these express representations because it is not safe and/or well-tolerated as it causes pathological gambling addictions that can lead to financial ruin, job loss, familial devastation, and suicide attempts. Also, Mirapex does not conform to defendants' representations that scientific studies had shown that Mirapex was safe and/or well-tolerated.

32.

As a direct and proximate result of the breach of defendants' warranties, plaintiff Robert Hudson suffers, and will continue to suffer physical injury, emotional distress, harm, and economic loss as alleged herein.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION  
(Breach of Implied Warranty)**

33.

Plaintiff Robert Hudson incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

34.

At the time defendants marketed, sold, and distributed Mirapex, defendants knew of the use for which Mirapex was intended and impliedly warranted Mirapex to be of merchantable quality, safe and fit for such use.

35.

Defendants knew, or had reason to know, that plaintiff Robert Hudson and his physicians would rely on the defendants' judgment and skill in providing Mirapex for its intended use.

36.

Plaintiff Robert Hudson and his physicians reasonably relied upon the skill and judgment of defendants as to whether Mirapex was of merchantable quality, safe, and fit for its intended use.

37.

Contrary to such implied warranty, Mirapex was not of merchantable quality or safe or fit for its intended use, because the product was, and is unreasonably dangerous, defective and unfit for the ordinary purposes for which Mirapex was used.

38.

As a direct and proximate result of the breach of implied warranty, plaintiff Robert Hudson suffered, and will continue to suffer physical injury, emotional distress, harm, and economic loss as alleged herein.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(Negligence)**

39.

Plaintiff Robert Hudson incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

40.

At all times material herein, defendants had a duty to exercise reasonable care and the duty of an expert in all aspects of the design, formulation, manufacture, compounding, testing, inspection, packaging, labeling, distribution, marketing, promotion, advertising, sale, warning and post-sale warning, to assure the safety of the product when used as

intended or in a way that defendants could reasonably have anticipated, and to assure that the consuming public, including the plaintiff Robert Hudson and his physicians, obtained accurate information and adequate instructions for the safe use or non-use of Mirapex. Defendants had a duty to warn plaintiff, his physicians, and the public in general of Mirapex's dangers and serious side effects, including serious compulsive behaviors like pathological gambling addictions, since it was reasonably foreseeable that an injury could occur because of Mirapex's use.

41.

At all times material herein, defendants failed to exercise reasonable care and the duty of an expert and knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that Mirapex was not properly manufactured, designed, compounded, tested, inspected, packaged, labeled, warned about, distributed, marketed, advertised, formulated, promoted, examined, maintained, sold and/or prepared.

42.

Each of the following acts and omissions herein alleged was negligently and carelessly performed by defendants, resulting in a breach of the duties set forth above. These acts and omissions include, but are not restricted to, negligence and careless research and testing of Mirapex; negligent and careless design or formulation of Mirapex; negligent and careless failure to give adequate warnings that would attract the attention of

plaintiff Robert Hudson, his physicians, and the public in general of the potentially dangerous, defective, unsafe, and deleterious propensity of Mirapex and of the risks associated with its use; negligent and careless failure to provide instructions on ways to safely use Mirapex to avoid injury; negligent and careless failure to explain the mechanism, mode, and types of adverse events associated with Mirapex; negligent representations that Mirapex was safe and/or well-tolerated; and negligent and careless failure to issue adequate post-sale warnings that Mirapex causes an increased risk of compulsive behaviors, including pathological gambling.

43.

As a direct and proximate result of defendants' negligence, plaintiff Robert Hudson suffered, and will continue to suffer, physical injury, emotional distress, harm, and economic loss as alleged herein.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(Negligence Per Se)**  
**(Violation of 21 U.S.C. §§331, 352 and 21 C.F.R. §§ 201.56, 201.57, 202.1)**

44.

Plaintiff Robert Hudson incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

45.

At all times herein mentioned, defendants had an obligation not to violate the law, including the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and the applicable regulations, in the manufacture, design, formulation, compounding, testing, production, processing, assembling, inspection, research, promotion, advertising, distribution, marketing, promotion, labeling, packaging, preparation for use, consulting, sale, warning, and post-sale warning of the risks and dangers of Mirapex.

46.

By reason of its conduct as alleged herein, defendants violated provisions of statutes and regulations, including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Defendants violated the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. §§ 331 and 352, by misbranding Mirapex;
- b. Defendants failed to follow the “[g]eneral requirements on content and format of labeling for human prescription drugs” in violation of 21 C.F.R. § 201.56;
- c. Defendants failed to follow the “[s]pecific requirements on content and format of labeling for human prescription drugs” in violation of 21 C.F.R. §201.57;
- d. Defendants advertised and promoted Mirapex in violation of 21 C.F.R. §202.1.

These statutes and regulations impose a standard of conduct designed to protect consumers of drugs, including plaintiff. Defendants' violation of these statutes and regulations constitute negligence per se.

47.

As a direct and proximate result of defendants' statutory and regulatory violations, plaintiff Robert Hudson, a member of the class of persons protected by the above-mentioned statutes, suffered, and will continue to suffer, physical injury, emotional distress, harm, and economic loss as alleged herein.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(Negligent Misrepresentations)**

48.

Plaintiff Robert Hudson incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

49.

Defendants misrepresented to consumers and physicians, including plaintiff and his physicians and the public in general, that Mirapex was safe and/or well-tolerated when used as instructed when, in fact, defendants knew or should have known that Mirapex was dangerous to the well-being of patients. Specifically, defendants knew or should

have known of and/or possessed evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors, and yet defendants negligently misrepresented that there was no such evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors.

50.

In 2004 and 2005, after the media began to publicize reports of Mirapex patients developing compulsive behaviors, including gambling addictions, defendants made numerous false and misleading public misrepresentations denying the existence of any scientific evidence of a causal relationship between Mirapex and compulsive behaviors. Defendants made these false and misleading public misrepresentations denying the existence of any scientific evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behavior through PR statements to media organizations, including, but not limited to, television news stations, television programs, newspapers, and news organizations such as the Associated Press.

51.

Instances of defendants' public misrepresentations denying the existence of any scientific evidence of a causal link between Mirapex and compulsive behavior include, but are not limited to: 1) a statement by Defendant BIPI submitted to and broadcast on the nationally broadcast Good Morning America television program on or about December 23, 2004; 2) statements by Defendant BIPI submitted to and publicized by the Associated Press, in major newspapers including but not limited to the New York Times,

the Wall Street Journal, the Boston Globe, the Chicago Tribune, the Minneapolis Star Tribune, and on websites including but not limited to <http://www.boston.com>, <http://www.MSNBC.com>, <http://my.webmd.com>, and <http://health.dailynewscentral.com>, on or about July 11 and 12, 2005; 3) a statement by Defendant BIPI submitted to and broadcast on NBC News in Baltimore on February 10, 2005. Many of these statements were made by BIPI Public Relations Director Katherine King O'Connor. In these public statements, defendants expressly denied having any scientific evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors.

52.

Defendant BIPI also phrased the label submitted to the FDA in November 2004 in such a way as to downplay the evidence of a causal relationship, by stating that "[b]ecause these reactions are reported voluntarily from a population of uncertain size, it is not always possible to reliably estimate their frequency or establish a causal relationship to drug exposure." Defendants also used an "Objection Handler," by which defendants' agents distracted physicians from concerns about compulsive behavior, "neutralized" those concerns and led them to believe that any problems with compulsive behavior were off-set by benefits offered by Mirapex.

53.

Defendants also made public misrepresentations about whether compulsive behaviors were reported during the clinical trials of Mirapex. These statements denying any incidents of compulsive behavior in the clinical trials of Mirapex include, but were not limited to: 1) a statement made by BIPI Public Relations Director Katherine King O'Connor to WebMD and published on <http://my.webmd.com> on July 12, 2005, stating that defendants did not see any cases of compulsive behavior during the clinical development of Mirapex; 2) a statement by Kirk Shepard on November 20, 2004, on CBS News in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, stating the "In the trials where we determined the safety and effectiveness of the drug there were no cases of compulsive behavior."

54.

Defendants worked in concert to craft these public misrepresentations denying the existence of any evidence that Mirapex causes compulsive behaviors, and the misrepresentations were made on behalf of all defendants. Defendants communicated via e-mail, over the telephone, and through face-to-face meetings to collaborate on and agree upon the aforesaid public misrepresentations. Defendants made the aforesaid representations in the course of defendants' business as designers, manufacturers, and distributors of Mirapex despite having no reasonable basis for their assertion that these representations were true and/or without having accurate or sufficient information

concerning the aforesaid representations. Defendants were aware that without such information they could not accurately make the aforesaid representations.

55.

At the time defendants made the aforesaid representations, they did not have adequate proof upon which to base such representations, and in fact, given defendants' knowledge about the pharmacology of Mirapex and the adverse events reported to defendants, knew or should have known that these representations were false. At the time defendants made the aforesaid representations denying any evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors, defendants had significant knowledge of Mirapex's pharmacological properties, and had deliberately developed Mirapex to activate the brain's pathway that is involved in motivation and reward. In addition, defendants had evidence indicating that the drug did cause compulsive behaviors, for example:

- A. Defendants' own early investigations of the pharmacological properties of Mirapex, as summarized in defendants' Investigational New Drug Applications filed in 1990 and 1994, indicated that Mirapex targets D<sub>3</sub> receptors in the mesolimbic system and that the mesolimbic pathways are involved in motivation and reward, and that animals receiving high doses of Mirapex developed behaviors such as compulsive gnawing;
- B. Defendants received many reports of serious gambling and other compulsive behaviors among patients in the Mirapex clinical trials in the mid to late 1990's. At least eleven Mirapex clinical trial patients developed compulsive behaviors while on the drug, including at least five clinical trial patients who developed gambling addictions;

- C. Defendants had knowledge of an abstract presented in June 2000 by Drs. Samanta and Stacy at the Sixth International congress of Parkinson's Disease and Movement Disorders in Barcelona, Spain entitled *Compulsive Gambling with Dopaminergic Therapy in Parkinson's Disease*, which reported that eight PD patients developed compulsive gambling after taking dopaminergic drugs, including Mirapex;
- D. In 2002, 2003, and 2004, defendants received many post-marketing reports of Mirapex patients developing compulsive gambling;
- E. Defendants had knowledge of the September 2004 Clinical Expert statement issued by doctors from BI Germany, which concluded that data about gambling and Mirapex "strongly suggest a pharmacodynamic effect of pramipexole on pathological gambling; and that pathological gambling should be listed as a side effect of Pramipexole/Mirapex. Defendants' internal emails indicate that they were not surprised by this Clinical Expert statement, as it fit with defendants' own knowledge and understanding of Mirapex's pharmacology and its effect on the brain;
- F. Defendants knew that BI Germany changed the Basic Product Information sheet (BPI) in August 2004 to list pathological gambling as a side effect of Mirapex, because BI Germany believed that sufficient evidence for a causal association existed; and
- G. When defendants began to publicize statements denying they had any evidence of causation, one of the doctors from BI Germany emailed key decision-makers at defendant BIPI expressing concern about these public statements denying evidence of causation, and reminded them that their doctors had concluded in the Clinical Expert Statement that evidence indicated a causal relationship existed.

56.

Defendants failed to exercise reasonable care and competence in obtaining and/or communicating information regarding the dangerous side effects of Mirapex and

otherwise failed to exercise reasonable care in transmitting this information to Plaintiff, his physicians, and the public in general.

57.

Defendants' motive for covering up their knowledge of the fact that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors was financial gain. Defendants weighed the impact of a gambling warning upon sales of Mirapex. For example, one document concludes that a "Compulsivity Label Change" would have a "Negative Impact on Mirapex Share and Growth" and represents a "Potential Deviation" from an "incremental sales/expenses" line that trended upward. Similarly, defendants in another document compared the prevalence of compulsive side-effects at particular doses where Mirapex sales were greatest:

[T]otal dose of 1.5 mg/day [and] below you don't see ob/come behavior or sudden onset of sleep. This is low dose for monotherapy but effective dose for adjunct therapy where we get most of our business.

58.

Defendants' fraudulent conduct also included manipulating the medical literature. Defendants shaped the medical literature about Mirapex, such that the literature cannot accurately reflect Mirapex's dangers. According to the Standard Operating Procedure governing publications, Boehringer entities were required to develop a "publication strategy" for each project. The purpose of this strategy was not to disseminate important

data to the medical community, but to “generate a consistent image of the drug.” To this goal, Boehringer shaped the medical literature in order to 1) serve marketing needs of showing effectiveness and 2) downplay dangers of the drug. Boehringer’s policy was to ghost write draft publications which later surfaced as supposed objective medical literature. Alarmingly, Boehringer hired a group to draft articles. Articles were also drafted or outlined by a public relations firm, often before a medical author was even identified. The articles were then sent to the “client,” either “Pfizer medical” or “BI medical and mktg” who made changes. Only then were the articles sent to the person who would ultimately be listed as the author.

59.

Defendants manipulated literature on the very issues in this case. One publication considered by Boehringer’s Mirapex Publication Strategy was an article on “gambling” by a doctor who was once head of the Parkinson’s Disease Foundation. The Publication Strategy establishes that in a “Pub Plan Meeting [publication planning meeting] held on June 8, 2004, Boehringer “agreed to offer assistance to the doctor. The reason for BI’s willingness to assist was very self-serving, and undercuts the objectivity of any ultimate article: “BI agreed to offer assistance in development [of the article on gambling] to **manage message.**”

60.

Defendants also exercised veto and editing powers by restricting researchers' ability to publish data without prior approval. The question of whether data developed in clinical trials would be published was controlled by the defendants:

Prior to publication of any results pertaining to the clinical trial, the investigator must submit a copy of the manuscript, abstract, etc. to the medical monitor who will circulate the materials for review and approval according to the Upjohn Manuscript/Abstract Publication Approval Process.

61.

When negative data about Mirapex was published, such as the May Clinic study showing that agonists (and in 9 of 11 cases, Mirapex) were "uniquely implicated" as a cause of pathological gambling, defendants' consultants immediately challenged the data. On the other hand, when data seemed positive from defendants' point of view, defendants would facilitate its publication. For example, in May 2004, defendants reviewed a doctor's advance manuscript regarding depression and treatment with dopamine agonists in Parkinson's disease patients. The doctor reflected his understanding that the defendants would help with publicity and further development of his research: "I am sending you the article that has been written. . . . If the article is accepted then we can discuss how best to publicize it. . . . [A]n option would be to expand the article into a book[.]"

62.

Defendants' willingness to help publish selected data apparently led to editing powers over what was portrayed as objective data. The doctor's abstract discussing "Gambling, Sex and Parkinson's Disease," was sent to both Pfizer and Boehringer scientists with the alarming instructions to "please feel free to make any changes." Similarly, defendants inserted their own conclusions into the medical literature, editing manuscripts of the CALM-PD data prior to its publication, and then wrongfully portrayed those conclusions in promotional pieces as objective scientific conclusions by medical scientists.

63.

Defendants also fraudulently concealed and minimized, in their meetings with physicians, the fact that Mirapex causes compulsive behaviors. Defendants used purportedly positive data about Mirapex to deflect physicians' concerns about compulsive behaviors. The "Mirapex Objection Handler" instructs sales representatives who are asked about compulsive behavior side-effects to "Neutralize" the concern with a method called "Influence with off-setting benefit" by pointing to purportedly positive data. This positive data, however, was not objective science.

64.

At the time the aforesaid representations were made, defendants intended to induce Plaintiff and his physicians to rely upon such representations. Defendants knew that if known information about compulsivity was shared with physicians and patients, there would be a “negative impact on Mirapex share and growth.”

65.

At the time the aforesaid representations were made by defendants, and at the time Plaintiff received Mirapex, Plaintiff and his physicians, and the public in general reasonably believed them to be true. At the time Plaintiff Hudson received Mirapex, defendants failed to inform Plaintiff Hudson or his prescribing doctors, Drs. Adhikari M. Reddy, J.M. Banowitz, and Kevin L. Wood, that Mirapex caused compulsive behavior, including compulsive gambling, despite defendants being in possession of such evidence. Plaintiff Hudson received no warnings, either written or oral that Mirapex caused compulsions, including compulsive gambling, and relied on these omissions.

66.

In addition, in November 2004, defendants inserted information in the product label mentioning compulsive behaviors. However, this label was misleading to plaintiff's doctor because it downplayed a causal relationship, in spite of defendants' awareness of causation.

67.

During his first consultation with Dr. Lawrence W. Davis in early 2006, Plaintiff Hudson first became aware of the connection between Mirapex and compulsions, including compulsive gambling. As a result of defendants' failure to notify and inform Plaintiff Hudson and his doctors of what defendants knew, through their omissions and misrepresentations, Plaintiff Hudson was induced to remain on high dosages of Mirapex until early 2006.

68.

In reasonable and justified reliance upon defendants' representations and wrongful omissions by Plaintiff Hudson and his physicians, Drs. Adhikari M. Reddy, J.M. Banowitz, and Kevin L. Wood, Plaintiff Hudson was induced to, and did, purchase and ingest Mirapex, and was induced to remain on Mirapex. If Plaintiff Hudson had known the truth about the risks of using Mirapex, in particular, that it could cause compulsive behaviors, Plaintiff either would not have taken defendants' drug or, if he had taken the drug, would have been on notice at the time that his compulsions manifested themselves that the drug was causally involved and would have stopped taking the drug.

69.

As a direct and proximate result of reliance upon defendants' misrepresentations, Plaintiff Hudson has suffered, and will continue to suffer, physical injury, emotional distress, harm, and economic loss as alleged herein.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION  
(Fraudulent Misrepresentation)**

70.

Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

71.

Defendants misrepresented to consumers and physicians, including Plaintiff and his physicians and the public in general, that Mirapex was safe and/or well-tolerated when used as instructed, when, in fact, defendants knew that Mirapex was dangerous to the well-being of patients. Specifically, defendants knew of and/or possessed evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors, and yet defendants fraudulently misrepresented that there was no such evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors.

72.

In 2004 and 2005, after the media began to publicize reports of Mirapex patients developing compulsive behaviors, including gambling addictions, defendants made

numerous false and misleading public misrepresentations denying the existence of any scientific evidence or a causal relationship between Mirapex and compulsive behaviors. Defendants made these false and misleading public misrepresentations denying the existence of any scientific evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behavior through PR statements to media organizations, including, but not limited to, television news stations, television programs, newspapers, and news organizations such as the Associated Press.

73.

Instances of defendants' public misrepresentations denying the existence of any scientific evidence of a causal link between Mirapex and compulsive behavior include, but are not limited to: 1) a statement by Defendant BIPI submitted to and broadcast on the nationally broadcast Good Morning America television program on or about December 23, 2004; 2) statements by Defendant BIPI submitted to and publicized by the Associated Press, in major newspapers including but not limited to the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Boston Globe, the Chicago Tribune, the Minneapolis Star Tribune, and on websites including but not limited to <http://www.boston.com>, <http://www.MSNBC.com>, <http://my.webmd.com>, and <http://health.dailynewscentral.com>, on or about July 11 and 12, 2005; 3) a statement by Defendant BIPI submitted to and broadcast on NBC News in Baltimore on February 10, 2005. Many of these statements were made by BIPI Public Relations Director Katherine King O'Connor. In these public

statements, defendants expressly denied having any scientific evidence that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors.

74.

Defendant BIPI also phrased the label submitted to the FDA in November 2004 in such a way as to downplay the evidence of a causal relationship, by stating that "[b]ecause these reactions are reported voluntarily from a population of uncertain size, it is not always possible to reliably estimate their frequency or establish a causal relationship to drug exposure." Defendants also used an "Objection Handler," by which defendants' agents distracted physicians from concerns about compulsive behavior, "neutralized" those concerns and led them to believe that any problems with compulsive behavior were off-set by benefits offered by Mirapex.

75.

Defendants also made public misrepresentations about whether compulsive behaviors were reported during the clinical trials of Mirapex. These statements denying any incidents of compulsive behavior in the clinical trials of Mirapex include, but were not limited to: 1) a statement made by BIPI Public Relations Director Katherine King O'Connor to WebMD and published on <http://my.webmd.com> on July 12, 2005, stating that defendants did not see any cases of compulsive behavior during the clinical development of Mirapex; 2) a statement by Kirk Shepard on November 20, 2004, on CBS

News in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, stating that “In the trials where we determined the safety and effectiveness of the drug there were no cases of compulsive behavior.”

76.

Defendants worked in concert to craft these public misrepresentations denying the existence of any evidence that Mirapex causes compulsive behaviors, and the misrepresentations were made on behalf of all defendants. Defendants communicated via e-mail, over the telephone, and through face-to-face meetings to collaborate on and agree upon the aforesaid public misrepresentations. Defendants made the aforesaid representations in the course of defendants’ business as designers, manufacturers, and distributors of Mirapex despite having no reasonable basis for their assertion that these representations were true and/or without having accurate or sufficient information concerning the aforesaid representations. Defendants were aware that without such information they could not accurately make the aforesaid representations.

77.

At the time defendants made the aforesaid representations, they did not have adequate proof upon which to base such representations, and in fact, given defendants’ knowledge about the pharmacology of Mirapex and the adverse events reported to defendants, knew or should have known that these representations were false. At the time defendants made the aforesaid representations denying any evidence that Mirapex caused

compulsive behaviors, defendants had significant knowledge of Mirapex's pharmacological properties, and had deliberately developed Mirapex to activate the brain's pathway that is involved in motivation and reward. In addition, defendants had evidence indicating that the drug did cause compulsive behaviors, for example:

- A. Defendants' own early investigations of the pharmacological properties of Mirapex, as summarized in defendants' Investigational New Drug Applications filed in 1990 and 1994, indicated that Mirapex targets D<sub>3</sub> receptors in the mesolimbic system and that the mesolimbic pathways are involved in motivation and reward, and that animals receiving high doses of Mirapex developed behaviors such as compulsive gnawing;
- B. Defendants received many reports of serious gambling and other compulsive behaviors among patients in the Mirapex clinical trials in the mid to late 1990's. At least eleven Mirapex clinical trial patients developed compulsive behaviors while on the drug, including at least five clinical trial patients who developed gambling addictions;
- C. Defendants had knowledge of an abstract presented in June 2000 by Drs. Samanta and Stacy at the Sixth International congress of Parkinson's Disease and Movement Disorders in Barcelona, Spain entitled *Compulsive Gambling with Dopaminergic Therapy in Parkinson's Disease*, which reported that eight PD patients developed compulsive gambling after taking dopaminergic drugs, including Mirapex;
- D. In 2002, 2003, and 2004, defendants received many post-marketing reports of Mirapex patients developing compulsive gambling;
- E. Defendants had knowledge of the September 2004 Clinical Expert statement issued by doctors from BI Germany, which concluded that data about gambling and Mirapex "strongly suggest a pharmacodynamic effect of pramipexole on pathological gambling: and that pathological gambling should be listed as a side effect of Pramipexole/Mirapex. Defendants' internal emails indicate that they were not surprised by this Clinical Expert

statement, as it fit with defendants' own knowledge and understanding of Mirapex's pharmacology and its effect on the brain;

- F. Defendants knew that BI Germany changed the Basic Product Information sheet (BPI) in August 2004 to list pathological gambling as a side effect of Mirapex, because BI Germany believed that sufficient evidence for a causal association existed; and
- G. When defendants began to publicize statements denying they had any evidence of causation, one of the doctors from BI Germany emailed key decision-makers at defendant BIPI expressing concern about these public statements denying evidence of causation, and reminded them that their doctors had concluded in the Clinical Expert Statement that evidence indicated a causal relationship existed.

78.

Defendants' motive for covering up their knowledge of the fact that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors was financial gain. Defendants weighed the impact of a gambling warning upon sales of Mirapex. For example, one document concludes that a "Compulsivity Label Change" would have a "Negative Impact on Mirapex Share and Growth" and represents a "Potential Deviation" from an "incremental sales/expenses" line that trended upward. Similarly, defendants in another documents compared the prevalence of compulsive side-effects at particular doses where Mirapex sales were greatest:

[T]otal dose of 1.5 mg/day [and] below you don't see ob/come behavior or sudden onset of sleep. This is low dose for monotherapy but effective dose for adjunct therapy where we get most of our business.

79.

Defendants' fraudulent conduct also included manipulating the medical literature. Defendants shaped the medical literature about Mirapex, such that the literature cannot accurately reflect Mirapex's dangers. According to the Standard Operating Procedure governing publications, Boehringer entities were required to develop a "publication strategy" for each project. The purpose of this strategy was not to disseminate important data to the medical community, but to "generate a consistent image of the drug." To this goal, Boehringer shaped the medical literature in order to 1) serve marketing needs of showing effectiveness and 2) downplay dangers of the drug. Boehringer's policy was to ghost write draft publications which later surfaced as supposed objective medical literature. Alarming, Boehringer hired a group to draft articles. Articles were also drafted or outlined by a public relations firm, often before a medical author was even identified. The articles were then sent to the "client," either "Pfizer medical" or "BI medical and mktg" who made changes. Only then were the articles sent to the person who would ultimately be listed as the author.

80.

Defendants manipulated literature on the very issues in this case. One publication considered by Boehringer's Mirapex Publication Strategy was an article on "gambling" by a doctor who was once head of the Parkinson's Disease Foundation. The Publication

Strategy establishes that in a “Pub Plan Meeting [publication planning meeting] held on June 8, 2004, Boehringer “agreed to offer assistance to the doctor. The reason for BI’s willingness to assist was very self-serving, and undercuts the objectivity of any ultimate article: “BI agreed to offer assistance in development [of the article on gambling] **to manage message.”**

81.

Defendants also exercised veto and editing powers by restricting researchers’ ability to publish data without prior approval. The question of whether data developed in clinical trials would be published was controlled by the defendants:

Prior to publication of any results pertaining to the clinical trial, the investigator must submit a copy of the manuscript, abstract, etc. to the medical monitor who will circulate the materials for review and approval according to the Upjohn Manuscript/Abstract Publication Approval Process.

82.

When negative data about Mirapex was published, such as the Mayo Clinic study showing that agonists (and in 9 of 11 cases, Mirapex) were “uniquely implicated” as a cause of pathological gambling, defendants’ consultants immediately challenged the data. On the other hand, when data seemed positive from defendants’ point of view, defendants would facilitate its publication. For example, in May 2004, defendants reviewed a doctor’s advance manuscript regarding depression and treatment with dopamine agonists

in Parkinson's disease patients. The doctor reflected his understanding that the defendants would help with publicity and further development of the research: "I am sending you the article that has been written. . . . If the article is accepted then we can discuss how best to publicize it. . . . [A]n option would be to expand the article into a book[.]"

83.

Defendants' willingness to help publish selected data apparently led to editing powers over what was portrayed as objective data. The doctor's abstract discussing "Gambling, Sex and Parkinson's Disease," was sent to both Pfizer and Boehringer scientists with the alarming instructions to "please feel free to make any changes." Similarly, defendants inserted their own conclusions into the medical literature, editing manuscripts of the CALM-PD data prior to its publication, and then wrongfully portrayed those conclusions in promotional pieces as objective scientific conclusions by medical scientists.

84.

Defendants also fraudulently concealed and minimized, in their meetings with physicians, the fact that Mirapex causes compulsive behaviors. Defendants used purportedly positive data about Mirapex to deflect physicians' concerns about compulsive behaviors. The "Mirapex Objection Handler" instructs sales representatives who are

asked about compulsive behavior side-effects to “Neutralize” the concern with a method called “Influence with off-setting benefit” by pointing to purportedly positive data. This positive data, however, was not objective science.

85.

At the time the aforesaid representations were made, defendants intended to induce Plaintiff and his physicians to rely upon such representations. Defendants knew that if known information about compulsivity was shared with physicians and patients, there would be a “negative impact on Mirapex share and growth.”

86.

At the time the aforesaid representations were made by defendants, and at the time Plaintiff received Mirapex, Plaintiff and his physicians, and the public in general reasonably believed them to be true. At the time Plaintiff Hudson received Mirapex, defendants failed to inform Plaintiff Hudson and his prescribing doctors, Drs. Adhikari M. Reddy, J.M. Banowitz, and Kevin L. Wood, that Mirapex caused compulsive behavior, including compulsive gambling, despite defendants being in possession of such evidence. Plaintiff Hudson received no warnings, either written or oral that Mirapex caused compulsions, including compulsive gambling, and relied on these omissions.

87.

In addition, in November 2004, defendants inserted information in the product label mentioning compulsive behaviors. However, this label was misleading to plaintiff's doctor because it downplayed a causal relationship, in spite of defendants' awareness of causation.

88.

In early 2006, Plaintiff Hudson first became aware of the connection between Mirapex and compulsions, including compulsive gambling, during his first consultation with Dr. Lawrence W. Davis on or about February 28, 2006. As a result of defendants' failure to inform Plaintiff Hudson or his previous doctors of what they knew, through their omissions and misrepresentations, Plaintiff Hudson was induced to continue taking high doses of Mirapex until early 2006.

89.

In reasonable and justified reliance upon defendants' representations and wrongful omissions by Plaintiff Hudson and his physicians, Drs. Adhikari M. Reddy, J.M. Banowitz, and Kevin L. Wood, Plaintiff Hudson was induced to, and did, purchase and ingest Mirapex, and was induced to remain on high dosages of Mirapex. If Plaintiff Hudson had known the truth about the risks of using Mirapex, in particular, that it could cause compulsive behaviors, Plaintiff either would not have taken defendants' drug or, if

he had taken the drug, would have been on notice at the time that his compulsions manifested themselves that the drug was causally involved and would have stopped taking the drug. 90.

As a direct and proximate result of reliance upon defendants' misrepresentation, Plaintiff Hudson has suffered, and will continue to suffer, physical injury, emotional distress, harm, and economic loss as alleged herein.

**EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION  
(Fraudulent Concealment)**

91.

Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

92.

Defendants failed to disclose and in fact concealed and suppressed material and substantial facts to consumers and physicians, including Plaintiff and his physicians and the public in general, about the dangerousness of Mirapex, including Mirapex's impact on the brain's addiction pathways. Defendants concealed information about the risks of Mirapex when making the fraudulent statements detailed above, as well as generally failing to inform Plaintiff, his physicians, and the public of the known risks of Mirapex.

Defendants also used an “Objection Handler,” during a time period including but not limited to May through September of 2005, to distract physicians from concerns about compulsive behavior and lead them to believe that any problems with compulsive behavior are off-set by benefits offered by Mirapex.

93.

The fact that defendants knew or should have known that Mirapex causes compulsive or addictive behaviors and acted to conceal this information from the public, physicians, and Plaintiff was also clear from decisions by Upjohn and BI to withhold samples of Mirapex from researchers who might implicate Mirapex in addictive behavior, including: 1) a decision by the Upjohn/BI Development Team in February 1994 not to give samples of Mirapex to the National Institute on Drug Abuse; 2) a decision by representatives of Upjohn and BI in February 2004 not to give samples of Mirapex to a researcher named Torben Kling-Petersen who planned to use the samples in studies of intracranial self-stimulation. The fact that defendants knew of should have known that Mirapex causes compulsive or addictive behaviors and acted to conceal this information from the public, physicians, and Plaintiff was also made clear by a decision in April 1995 by BI, which is also communicated to Upjohn, to block a researcher named Kjell Svensson from publishing a proposed abstract that discussed Mirapex and addiction.

94.

At the time defendants promoted Mirapex as safe and/or well-tolerated, they in fact knew that Mirapex was dangerous to the well-being of Plaintiff and others, based on the pharmacology of Mirapex and adverse events reported to defendants. Defendants knew that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors and knew of Mirapex's impact on the brain's addictive pathways when they represented that Mirapex did not cause compulsive behaviors and concealed material facts about Mirapex and addiction despite their duty to provide accurate warnings and information to Plaintiff, other consumers, and physicians as needed to clarify their other public statements and ensure that their representations regarding safety were not misleading.

95.

Defendants worked in concert to conceal material information about the dangerousness of Mirapex, including Mirapex's impact on the brain's addiction pathways. Defendants made the aforesaid representations and/or concealments in the course of defendants' business as designers, manufacturers, and distributors of Mirapex despite knowing that those representations were false and/or that their concealments involved material and substantial facts about the dangerousness of Mirapex. At the time defendants made the aforesaid representations and/or concealments about the dangerousness of Mirapex, including Mirapex's impact on the brain's addiction

pathways, defendants had significant knowledge of Mirapex's pharmacological properties, and had deliberately developed Mirapex to activate the brain's pathway that is involved in motivation and reward. In addition, defendants had the evidence indicating that the drug did cause compulsive behaviors, for example:

- A. Defendants' own early investigations of the pharmacological properties of Mirapex, as summarized in defendants' Investigational New Drug Applications filed in 1990 and 1994, indicated that Mirapex targets D<sub>3</sub> receptors in the mesolimbic system and that the mesolimbic pathways are involved in motivation and reward, and that animals receiving high doses of Mirapex developed behaviors such as compulsive gnawing;
- B. Defendants received many reports of serious gambling and other compulsive behaviors among patients in the Mirapex clinical trials in the mid to late 1990's. At least eleven Mirapex clinical trial patients developed compulsive behaviors while on the drug, including at least five clinical trial patients who developed gambling addictions;
- C. Defendants had knowledge of an abstract presented in June 2000 by Drs. Samanta and Stacy at the Sixth International congress of Parkinson's Disease and Movement Disorders in Barcelona, Spain entitled *Compulsive Gambling with Dopaminergic Therapy in Parkinson's Disease*, which reported that eight PD patients developed compulsive gambling after taking dopaminergic drugs, including Mirapex;
- D. In 2002, 2003, and 2004, defendants received many post-marketing reports of Mirapex patients developing compulsive gambling;
- E. Defendants had knowledge of the September 2004 Clinical Expert statement issued by doctors from BI Germany, which concluded that data about gambling and Mirapex "strongly suggest a pharmacodynamic effect of pramipexole on pathological gambling; and that pathological gambling should be listed as a side effect of Pramipexole/Mirapex. Defendants' internal emails indicate that they were not surprised by this Clinical Expert

statement, as it fit with defendants' own knowledge and understanding of Mirapex's pharmacology and its effect on the brain;

- F. Defendants knew that BI Germany changed the Basic Product Information sheet (BPI) in August 2004 to list pathological gambling as a side effect of Mirapex, because BI Germany believed that sufficient evidence for a causal association existed; and
- G. When defendants began to publicize statements denying they had any evidence of causation, one of the doctors from BI Germany emailed key decision-makers at defendant BIPI expressing concern about these public statements denying evidence of causation, and reminded them that their doctors had concluded in the Clinical Expert Statement that evidence indicated a causal relationship existed.

96.

Defendants' motive for covering up their knowledge of the fact that Mirapex caused compulsive behaviors was financial gain. Defendants weighed the impact of a gambling warning upon sales of Mirapex. For example, one document concludes that a "Compulsivity Label Change" would have a "Negative Impact on Mirapex Share and Growth" and represents a "Potential Deviation" from an "incremental sales/expenses" line that trended upward. Similarly, defendants in another document compared the prevalence of compulsive side-effects at particular doses where Mirapex sales were greatest:

[T]otal dose of 1.5 mg/day [and] below you don't see ob/come behavior or sudden onset of sleep. This is low dose for monotherapy but effective does for adjunct therapy where we get most of our business.

97.

Defendants' fraudulent conduct also included manipulating the medical literature. Defendants shaped the medical literature about Mirapex, such that the literature cannot accurately reflect Mirapex's dangers. According to the Standard Operating Procedure governing publications, Boehringer entities were required to develop a "publication strategy" for each project. The purpose of this strategy was not to disseminate important data to the medical community, but to "generate a consistent image of the drug." To this goal, Boehringer shaped the medical literature in order to 1) serve marketing needs of showing effectiveness and 2) downplay dangers of the drug. Boehringer's policy was to ghost write draft publications which later surfaced as supposed objective medical literature. Alarming, Boehringer hired a group to draft articles. Articles were also drafted or outlined by a public relations firm, often before a medical author was even identified. The articles were then sent to the "client," either "Pfizer medical" or "BI medical and mktg" who made changes. Only then were the articles sent to the person who would ultimately be listed as the author.

98.

Defendants manipulated literature on the very issues in this case. One publication considered by Boehringer's Mirapex Publication Strategy was an article on "gambling" by a doctor who was once head of the Parkinson's Disease Foundation. The Publication

Strategy establishes that in a “Pub Plan Meeting [publication planning meeting] held on June 8, 2004, Boehringer “agreed to offer assistance to the doctor. The reason for BI’s willingness to assist was very self-serving, and undercuts the objectivity of any ultimate article: “BI agreed to offer assistance in development [of the article on gambling] **to manage message.**”

99.

Defendants also exercised veto and editing powers by restricting researchers’ ability to publish data without prior approval. The question of whether data developed in clinical trials would be published was controlled by the defendants:

Prior to publication of any results pertaining to the clinical trial, the investigator must submit a copy of the manuscript, abstract, etc. to the medical monitor who will circulate the materials for review and approval according to the Upjohn Manuscript/Abstract Publication Approval Process.

100.

When negative data about Mirapex was published, such as the Mayo Clinic study showing that agonists (and in 9 of 11 cases, Mirapex) were “uniquely implicated” as a cause of pathological gambling, defendants’ consultants immediately challenged the data. On the other hand, when data seemed positive from defendants’ point of view, defendants would facilitate its publication. For example, in May 2004, defendants reviewed a doctor’s advance manuscript regarding depression and treatment with dopamine agonists

in Parkinson's disease patients. The doctor reflected his understanding that the defendants would help with publicity and further development of his research: "I am sending you the article that has been written. . . . If the article is accepted then we can discuss how best to publicize it. . . . [A]n option would be to expand the article into a book[.]"

101.

Defendants' willingness to help publish selected data apparently led to editing powers over what was portrayed as objective data. The doctor's abstract discussing "Gambling, Sex and Parkinson's Disease," was sent to both Pfizer and Boehringer scientists with the alarming instructions to "please feel free to make any changes." Similarly, defendants inserted their own conclusions into the medical literature, editing manuscripts of the CALM-PD data prior to its publication, and then wrongfully portrayed those conclusions in promotional pieces as objective scientific conclusions by medical scientists.

102.

Defendants also fraudulently concealed and minimized, in their meetings with physicians, the fact that Mirapex causes compulsive behaviors. Defendants used purportedly positive data about Mirapex to deflect physicians' concerns about compulsive behaviors. The "Mirapex Objection Handler" instructs sales representatives who are

asked about compulsive behavior side-effects to “Neutralize” the concern with a method called “Influence with off-setting benefit” by pointing to purportedly positive data. This positive data, however, was not objective science.

103.

At the time the aforesaid representations and/or concealments were made, defendants intended to induce Plaintiff and his physicians to rely upon such representations and/or concealments. At the time the aforesaid representations and/or concealments were made by defendants, and at the time Plaintiff received Mirapex, Plaintiff and his physicians, and the public in general reasonably believed them to be true. Up until early 2006 Plaintiff was unaware of the connection between Mirapex and compulsive behavior, including gambling. In reasonable and justified reliance upon said representations and omissions by Plaintiff and his physicians, Plaintiff purchased and ingest Mirapex, which he would not have done but for defendants’ fraudulent concealment.

104.

As a direct and proximate result of reliance upon defendants’ misrepresentations and/or concealments, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, physical injury, emotional distress, harm, and economic loss as alleged herein.

### NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Violation of State Deceptive Acts and Practices, Unfair Trade Practices, Consumer Protection, Merchandising Practices, and False Advertising Acts)**

105.

Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

106.

By reason of the conduct as alleged herein, and by inducing Plaintiff Hudson and his physicians to use Mirapex through the use of deception, fraud, false advertising, false pretenses, misrepresentations, unfair and/or deceptive practices and the concealment and suppression of material facts, including fraudulent statements, concealments and misrepresentations identified above and those which are incorporated by reference due to the limitations imposed by the Protective Order applicable in this case, defendant violated the provisions of Minn. Stat. §§325F.67, 325D.13, and 325D.44, or in the alternative, if the court finds that Minnesota law does not apply, New York General Business Law §§ 349,350,350(a), and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42-110(b).

107.

As a direct and proximate result of defendants' statutory violations, Plaintiff Hudson used high doses of Mirapex, which he would not have done had defendants not used deception, fraud, false advertising, false pretenses, misrepresentations, unfair and/or

deceptive practices and the concealment and suppression of material facts to induce Plaintiff Hudson and his physicians to use high doses of Mirapex.

108.

By reason of such violations and pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 8.31, sud. 3a, and §§325D.44, 325F.67, and 3125F.68-70, or, in the alternative, if the court finds that Minnesota law does not apply, New York General Business Law §§ 350(e), New York General Business Law §§ 349(h), and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42-110(g), and for the public benefit, plaintiff is entitled to seek compensatory damages, attorneys fees, injunctive and equitable relief, and other remedies as determined by the Court pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 8.31, subd. 3a, and §§ 325D.44, 325F.67, and 325F.68-70, New York General Business Law §§ 350(e), New York General Business Law §§ 349(h), and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42-110(g).

**TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(Civil Conspiracy to Defraud)**

109.

Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

110.

Defendants' fraudulent representations about Mirapex's causation of compulsive behaviors and material concealments about Mirapex and addiction, detailed above, were motivated by community of purpose and/or a common understanding to defraud. Defendants worked in concert to accomplish the unlawful purpose of defrauding Plaintiff and/or pursued a lawful purpose by unlawful means.

**ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION  
(Punitive Damages)**

111.

Plaintiff Robert Hudson incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

112.

Defendants' acts and omissions with regard to Plaintiff's claim were in reckless disregard for their obligations to Plaintiff. Defendants acted intentionally and with malice. Defendants should be punished for engaging in this reckless, intentional and malicious conduct and to serve as an example to Defendants and others who might attempt the same type of conduct.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, plaintiff seeks judgment in his favor as follows:

1. Awarding actual damages to plaintiff incidental to the purchase and ingestion of Mirapex in an amount to be determined at trial;
2. Awarding the costs of treatment for plaintiff's injuries caused by Mirapex;
3. Awarding injunctive relief, including disgorgement of all profits made from and monies paid for Mirapex;
4. Awarding damages for plaintiff's physical pain and suffering;
5. Awarding damages for plaintiff's mental and emotional anguish;
6. Awarding pre-judgment and post-judgment interest to plaintiff;
7. Awarding the costs and expenses of this litigation to plaintiff;
8. Awarding reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to plaintiff as provided by law;
9. Awarding punitive damages and other exemplary relief pursuant to the Order filed November 27, 2007, in *In re: Mirapex Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1836; and;
10. For such further relief as this Court deems necessary, just and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury, pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on all claims and issues so triable.

Dated: 6-13-08



Lisa Mueggenborg  
Bar Number: 18595  
Attorney for Plaintiff, Robert Hudson  
KLINE, KLINE, ELLIOTT & BRYANT, PC  
720 N. E. 63rd Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Telephone (405) 848-4448  
Facsimile (405) 842-4539  
lmueggenborg@klinefirm.org